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ABSTRACT

In the past few years important manuscript discoveries have been uncovered in the course of the excavation of the archeological site at the ancient city of Mes Aynak in Afghanistan. This article, the first of a series, examines this new manuscript evidence providing an analysis of seven groups of manuscript fragments found at Mes Aynak consisting of only a part of the total material uncovered at the site. The fragments under the scope of this article are all copied on birch bark folios in the Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I script and date from the 6th–7th centuries of the Common Era. Works identified include witnesses of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa, Bahubuddhāvadāna verses, the Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra, and the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā. Several unidentified fragments are also analyzed. Transliterations are given for all fragments and reconstructions or parallels and transliterations are supplied for all identified works. It is hypothesized that the bundle containing the Maitreyavyākaraṇa and Bahubuddhāvadāna verses represents the first witness discovered of the heretofore lost Mūlasarvāstivāda Kṣudrakapiṭaka. The Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā fragments discussed are also of great interest, representing the first example of that work discovered within the area of Greater Gandhāra from this period, placing it among the earlier witnesses of this work discovered to date. It also appears to mark an earlier transmission of the work that differs from later, known transmissions.

Mes Aynak is an archeological site located near Kabul, Afghanistan. Situated over vast coper deposits, the site contains the remains of a city complex continuously inhabited from the Bronze Age until the 10th century CE. The site is well-known and has been somewhat of a cause célèbre over the years due to its archeological excavation happening under the shadow of a $2.83 billion mining contract between the Chinese and

1 The research conducted for this article was funded by the Research Foundation – Flanders (FWO), file number: 63607 and the European Research Council (ERC).
Afghan governments made in 2007 and has even been the focus of a popular documentary film. Since 2007, the Chinese government has thus far accomplished little in the way of mining and the excavation of the site continued with two excavations having been completed to date, the first by UNESCO and the second conducted under the auspices of the Archaeology Institute of Afghanistan (AIA). While the site is already world-renowned for important discoveries surrounding Buddhist artifacts including sculptures and murals, little by way of manuscript evidence has appeared from Mes Aynak beyond small, scattered fragments. However, in late 2017 several important manuscript discoveries were uncovered in Sites 117 and 115 of the excavation. I first became aware of this find in 2018 and since 2019, I have been working in coordination with the Archaeology Institute of Afghanistan to subject this material to scholarly analysis. Site 117 appears to have housed a local administration or storeroom the primary function of which seems to have been the housing of manuscript materials. The manuscripts found are preserved on birch bark folios and the overwhelming majority thus far uncovered have been copied in the Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I script, which may be described as a type of round Gupta Brāhmī. These manuscripts date from between the 6th–7th centuries of the Common Era. A Bactrian document likely dated from around the 6th–7th centuries and mixed fragments of manuscripts copied in the Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II script (Proto-Śāradā) likely dated from around the 7th–8th centuries have also been found at this site. In this article, only the materials transmitted in Gilgit/

---

2 I wish to extend my sincere gratitude to Noor Agha Noori, now the former Director of the Archaeology Institute of Afghanistan, who kindly provided me with the first manuscript images from Mes Aynak upon which this article is focused and had worked together with me for several years in order to make the material discussed in this article available for academic study. I also wish to thank all of the archeologists and staff of the Archaeology Institute of Afghanistan who have done, and continue to do, important work to preserve the cultural heritage of Afghanistan. Without their dedicated and tireless effort, no research on the Mes Aynak site would be possible. I would additionally thank the following scholars who have, in one way or another, provided some measure of assistance or resources that were beneficial to the research from which this article has resulted: Kazunobu Matsuda, Fumi Yao, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Ven. Dhammadinnā, Péter-Dániel Szántó, Mitsuyo Demoto-Hahn, and Hiromi Habata.

3 Oscar von Hinüber has also taken to calling this script Gandhāran Brāhmī.
Bamiyan Type I will be considered. Other material that has been uncovered, including the Bactrian and Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II material, will be discussed in future publications. The site sits in a cosmopolitan area with two Buddhist temples and what appear to be two Zoroastrian shrines in the nearby surrounding vicinity (fig. 1).

The manuscripts uncovered at Mes Aynak are rather unique among the manuscripts recovered from Greater Gandhāra in that their exact provenance is recorded down to the site of their archeological discovery. This opens many possibilities for our understanding of how manuscripts were used and stored in this region and era. It also presents some unique challenges in terms of study. The manuscripts discussed in this article were all photographed on site at Mes Aynak, mostly in situ before the completion of their excavation. This means that in many instances a portion of a folio that could have been read under optimal circumstances is obstructed from view and that in all but one instance only one side of each of the fragments discussed is visible. Additionally, we find several instances where the photograph is blurred or at a lower resolution than one would prefer making readings for certain fragments difficult. Despite these difficulties, it is clear that the Sanskrit manuscripts thus far uncovered appear to be part of larger folio bundles with subsequent folios often observed beneath the upper folios visible in the images taken from the excavation site indicating that a potentially significant portion of these manuscripts have been preserved. Indeed, it is quite possible, perhaps we might even say probable, that the entirety of many of the works discussed here, in addition to untold others, are extant either mostly or completely intact at the site. This may come to light with the planned continued excavation of the Mes Aynak site and the conservation of the material already excavated, both of which have been organized as part of the Gandhāra Corpora ERC project. Although excavation continued slowly for a period, it slowed substantially with the global coronavirus pandemic and it has come to a complete halt since 2021 with further excavations only planned from 2024. Indeed, after a period of some doubt about the future of the site, there is cause for optimism considering the plans for further excavation by AIA in collaboration with the Gandhāra Corpora project. Nevertheless, the conservation and study of the material already
excavated remains of the utmost importance. For the past years, the Archaeology Institute of Afghanistan has not had the required expertise in manuscript conservation and restoration and thus the material already excavated has thus far been stored left encased in a layer of surrounding earth making examination of the manuscript bundles impossible. This is ideal for the moment until proper restoration begins as it is better that such material stays intact but hidden from view as opposed to being improperly restored and potentially damaged or destroyed. While the situation has been difficult in the recent past, now that I have secured resources to assist AIA with the restoration and digitization of this

Fig. 1: Manuscript findspot and surrounding area.\textsuperscript{4}
Courtesy H. Yasui, K.K. Kyodo News, Tokyo

\textsuperscript{4} The numbers on this landscape represent the following: 1. Site 117, Room 003; 2. Site 117, Room 004; 3. Zoroastrian shrine; 4. Buddhist temple; 5. Zoroastrian shrine; 6. Buddhist temple.
manuscript material we can expect much higher quality images to become available within the course of the project. In the meantime, I have been able to utilize and work with the images available.

In this article, seven groups of fragments will be discussed. From these fragments, four distinct Buddhist works have been identified: the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, *Bahubuddhāvadāna* verses, the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, and the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*. In addition to the identified works, several smaller fragments of Sanskrit material have been uncovered that are seen to be scattered and jumbled together. The state of research on these manuscript finds at Mes Aynak is only just beginning. Indeed, with the images available mainly consisting of manuscripts still in the ground, we are quite literally only scratching the surface of the research potential of the site. It is not an exaggeration to state that the recent manuscript finds at the Mes Aynak site have the potential to be among the most important discoveries of Buddhist textual material in several decades, if not the last century. Therefore, this article should be viewed as an initial publication with more planned to follow as new images become available. In subsequent publications, the transliterations and reconstructions below may be emended as better images are taken and new manuscript material is uncovered. It is beyond doubt that more manuscript witnesses may yet be found with further excavation and the potential for more significant discoveries in the study of Buddhist manuscripts and textual transmission remains high.

**Fragments 1–4: A multiple-text manuscript consisting of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*, *Bahubuddhāvadāna* verses, and unidentified folios**

Fragments 1–4 are damaged folios ranging from mostly intact to highly fragmentary that were all found at Mes Aynak Site 117 in Room 003 laying scattered around one another (fig. 3). These fragments were all copied by the same hand and make up several folios from a multiple-text manuscript consisting of at least two works concerning *vyākaraṇa* and *avadāna* related literature of unclear canonicity. The manuscript bundle these fragments are a part of may be material that was part of the
heretofore lost Kṣudrakapiṭaka, or Miscellaneous Basket, of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, who did not transmit a Kṣudrakāgama as they did not accept kṣudraka material to be canonical as opposed to other Buddhist traditions such as the Theravāda who accepted the canonicity of their own Khud-dakanikāya. However, the Mūlasarvāstivādins, despite not accepting a Kṣudrakāgama did nevertheless transmit what could be described as an unofficial collection of miscellaneous works that were not necessarily considered to be buddhavacana and therefore not included in any āgama. The works represented here may be the first manuscript evidence of such a collection to be uncovered.

Fragment 1 (figs. 3 = top left and 4 = left) consists of a damaged yet relatively complete folio from the Maitreyavyākaraṇa. Only one side of the folio is visible, and it is quite likely that this folio sits atop a bundle presumably consisting of further folios of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa, or whatever work precedes it, depending on whether this is the recto or verso. We can probably assume that this is the verso as the folio number would almost surely be at least partially visible on the recto. It is approximately 25 cm × 5 cm running seven lines consisting of approximately 30–35 akṣaras per line with a string hole, which is no longer extant, interrupting lines 3–5 suggesting a typical folio in the manuscript would be around 250–275 akṣaras in total. This would make it a relatively smaller-sized manuscript in contradiction to the Maitreyavyākaraṇa fragment held in the Schøyen Collection, which intact would have been around double that size (Hartmann 2006). The folio covers seven verses in Anuṣṭubh meter spanning the 2nd–8th verses of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa with the folio beginning the third pāda of the 2nd verse and ending five akṣaras into the fourth pāda of the 8th verse. This is probably the second folio of the manuscript. As the material before the verses in our folio of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa likely consisted of only the thinnest of narrative frames and a single verse as can be seen in the two manuscripts where the first folio is extant (Ishigami 1989: 296 and Li and Nagashima 2013: 218), it is possible that the first folio of this manuscript was shared between the Maitreyavyākaraṇa in the last lines and the end of another work in the first lines.
This fragment marks just the seventh manuscript of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* known to be extant. Of those six, only three correspond to Fragment 1: Ishigami’s complete edition from a Nepalese manuscript along with Yijing’s translation into Chinese (T 455), Li and Nagashima’s complete edition from a manuscript held in the Potala Palace in Tibet, and Wille’s edition of a small, four-line (on the *recto* and *verso*) fragment discovered in Turfan. Lévi’s edition is from a Pāla period manuscript held by the Asiatic Society of Calcutta, which is missing the first folios and correspondingly verses 1–25ab. Lévi substituted these missing verses with a translation of the Tibetan parallel in the Kangyur and gave a French translation. This translation, which was published eighty-nine years ago and made of an incomplete manuscript, remains the only translation of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* into a European language. Similarly to Lévi’s edition, Majumder’s edition of a manuscript from the Gilgit manuscript cache is also missing its first folios and begins with the 31st verse. The Schøyen fragment consists of just five lines on one side of the folio and spans fives verses between verses 47–50 of the Gilgit manuscript.

Fragment 1 joins the Gilgit manuscript edited by Majumder and the fragment from the Schøyen collection edited by Hartmann as the third manuscript recovered from the area of Greater Gandhāra. This is of particular interest as the Gilgit manuscript was copied in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II while the Schøyen fragment and Fragment 1 are both in the Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I script, making these two among the oldest extant witnesses of this work along with the Turkestan Gupta-type SHT fragment. The most obvious conclusion for Fragment 1 and the Schøyen fragment being preserved in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I and the Gilgit manuscript in Type II is the simple fact that the former two would have been copied earlier, in the 6th–7th centuries, than the latter, which would have been copied in the 7th–8th centuries. However, another possible
consideration is the doctrinal attribution of the text itself. As Kudo has
pointed out, Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I is nearly always used for Mahāyāna
compositions and Type II is generally reserved for non-Mahāyāna works
(Kudo 2019: 173). The status of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa itself as
a Mahāyāna work has apparently been somewhat unclear over the centu-
ries. While it is certainly not a Mahāyāna sūtra in content, or at least does
not display any signs of being so, it was explicitly stated to be a Mahāyāna
sūtra in the colophon to the Nepalese manuscript edited by Ishigami.6
This may suggest a fluidity of affiliation as far back as at least its trans-
mission in Greater Gandhāra. Hartmann has stated that the work is not
included in any extant Indian canonical collection and was only later
recorded as buddhavacana in Chinese and Tibetan canons (Hartmann
2006: 7). A lack of a clear canonical affiliation such as the case here may
have been a contributing factor in the use of both Gilgit/Bamiyan Type
I and II in addition to the dates these three witnesses were copied. Indeed,
the Maitreyavyākaraṇa is almost certainly a work that was composed
after the turn to the Common Era and therefore would not have been
contained within any of the established āgama collections transmitted by
the Buddhist communities within Greater Gandhāra, most especially the
Mūlasarvāstivādins. While not a Mahāyāna sūtra itself, the Maitreyavy-
ākaraṇa would nonetheless not have been accepted as an āgama work
either. Regardless, it was clearly a popular work that was read in the
region in the first millennium of the Common Era and would be an excel-
luent candidate for the so-called Kṣudrakapiṭaka being transmitted Mūla-
sarvāstivādins alongside the popular Mahāyāna works of the era and
traditionally accepted āgama works.

Fragment 2 (figs. 3 = top right, 4 = right, 5 = left, and 6) was found
directly next to Fragment 1. It consists of seven Bahubuddhāvadāna
verses in Anuṣṭubh meter, just like the verses of the Maitreyavyākaraṇa
in Fragment 1. It measures approximately 25 cm × 5 cm, the same size
as Fragment 1 and also contains seven lines per folios. Fragment 1 and
Fragment 2 were copied by the same hand. That the same scribe copied
these two works in verse, along with the fact that the two folios are of

6 iti maitreyavyākaraṇaṃ nāma mahāyānasūtraṃ samāptam
the same size, strongly indicates that this folio is from a multiple-work collection that was part of the same bundle as Fragment 1, perhaps along with Fragments 3 and 4. It is relatively intact but is completely broken on the left side where the string hole would have been, which most likely would have interrupted lines 3–5 as we see in Fragment 1. This break seems to be where the folio is bifurcated by Fragment 3, which appears to have laid on top of it. There is a small fragment near the end of line 7, Fragment 2a. It is unclear whether this small fragment was part of this folio or another.

These seven verses on this fragmentary folio are among the first manuscript evidence in Sanskrit known to be extant of the *Bahubuddhāvadāna* verses, with only one other having been recently identified, and perhaps the earliest. Only the fourth verse of Fragment 2 has a Sanskrit parallel. This is from Mural 9 of the Bezeklik caves in Turfan written in North Turkistan Brāhmī A. The second and third verses are quoted in Śamathadeva’s *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā* extant only in Tibetan. The first five verses are closely related in content to the fragment numbered B400 extant in Tocharian B. All seven verses are extant in Tibetan and Chinese translation in the respective translations of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavastvāgama*. The *Bahubuddhāvadāna*

---

7 Manuscript fragments of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* in Sanskrit that also contain *Bahubuddhāvadāna*, which are missing from the Sanskrit *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscript witness from among the Gilgit finds, have recently been identified in a private collection in Virginia and the Schøyen Collection from among the manuscript find containing the *Dirghāgama* manuscript that has long been the subject of ongoing study (for a description of the manuscript see Hartmann and Wille 2014: 146 and 149–151). However, the verses in the newly identified *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscript do not contain the verses found on the manuscript discovered at Mes Aynak. Fumi Yao is currently working on this new *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscript. Both of these manuscripts are from the area of Greater Gandhāra and, while it is not yet certain which of them is older, the fact that the Mes Aynak witness is copied in Gilgit/Bamiyan type I and the newly identified *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscript is copied in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II may suggest that the verses in question here were copied somewhat earlier.

8 See note 46 below for details.


11 Tibetan: D 1, ‘*dul ba, kha* 276a3–7; Chinese: T 1448,24.73c20–74a3–4.
verses transmitted within the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* have been translated into English by Fumi Yao as part of her translation of that long work for the 84000 project (*Bhaiṣajyavastu Translation Team 2021*).

Despite the fact that these verses appear in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, I do not believe that Fragment 2 belongs to that work. Rather, the evidence at hand suggests that this fragment, along with Fragment 1 and Fragment 3, make up a witness of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Kṣudrakapiṭaka* consisting of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* and *Bahubuddhāvadāna* verses as component works. In the *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā*, Śamathadeva recounts *Bahubuddhāvadāna* narratives in prose and then follows this excerpt with the remark that the same narrative is found in the verses of the former lives of the many buddhas (sangs rgyas mang po rtogs pa brjod pa tshigs su bcad pa, *bahubuddhāvadānagāthā*) of the *Kṣudraka* (phran tshegs)  

Based upon this attribution by Śamathadeva, it has been hypothesized that these *Bahubuddhāvadāna* verses may have come from either the *Kṣudrakavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinayavastvāgama* or the lost *Kṣudrakapiṭaka* containing the works transmitted by the Mūlasarvāstivādins that were not considered to be *buddhavacana*. It does not seem likely that the *Bahubuddhāvadāna* verses recorded in Fragment 2 belong to either the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* nor the *Kṣudrakavastu* for two reasons. The first is that the verses in Fragment 2 were copied in a multiple-text manuscript also containing Fragment 1, Fragment 3, and Fragment 4 by a single scribe. If Fragment 2 were from either of the *vinayavastu* in question, both of which are lengthy works, then it would most likely not be included within a multiple-text manuscript. The second, and perhaps most simple reason is that Fragment 2 was copied in the Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I script, which is not likely to have been used for the transmission of *vinaya* or other canonical literature, at least not by the Mūlasarvāstivādins, based upon the extant manuscript evidence available.

---

12 *di nyid phran tshegs las sangs rgyas mang po’i rtogs pa brjod par tshigs su bcad par byas te* (*Upāyikā*, D 4094, mngon pa, ju 233a4).
13 Dhammadinnā’s 2018 article provides the best research on this topic to date.
14 It is possible that the Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I and II scripts were employed simply based upon the time and location of the copying of any particular manuscript witness without any consideration as to the nature of the work itself. If this were so, it would
While the Mūlasarvāstivādins have only been known in extant manuscript evidence to have transmitted their canonical material in the Gilgit/Bamiyan Type II script, the Mahāsāṃghika is the only known Buddhist tradition to have transmitted their vinaya in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I. However, because we also find these verses very similarly transmitted within the Bhaiṣajyavastu of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, it is less likely that the verses in question here are from the Mahāsāṃghika transmission. Of course, this objection naturally raises the question that if these Bahubuddhāvadāna verses also appear within the Mūlasarvāstivāda Bhaiṣajyavastu, which is considered canonical, then why would they simultaneously be circulating within the Kṣudrakapiṭaka? This is a potential sticking point but, nonetheless, the fact that these verses were copied in Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I as outlined above strongly suggests that this would not have been considered canonical material. In any case, given the amorphous and textually adaptive nature of Buddhist textual transmissions where one finds works present in multiple Āgamas and sometimes transmitted in both Sūtrapiṭakas and Vinayapiṭakas, it is not at all surprising to see portions of one work that is considered canonical to be present in other works that may have been considered differently by the traditions in which they were transmitted. In her 2018 article, after carefully considering issues about the Kṣudrakapiṭaka similar to those discussed here, Dhammadinnā concludes that “the possibility that the Kṣudraka mentioned by Śamathadeva is to be understood as a canonical collection (piṭaka or āgama) rather than a scriptural division of a Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya is an attractive one, but far from proven” (Dhammadinnā 2018: 74). With the fragments from Mes Aynak discussed here strongly imply that the Mahāyāna was the overwhelmingly popular genre in the 5th and 6th centuries and the Śrāvakayāna only became popular from the 7th century. This should cause some pause, however, as it is almost a certainty that both Mahāyāna and Śrāvakayāna works were transmitted simultaneously within the region for many centuries from at least the turn of the Common Era. It is also possible that we simply do not have access to what was potentially a large number of works copied in both scripts. However, from what is available to us presently, it does seem clear that there was a distinction between the two scripts used within the transmission of Mahāyāna and Śrāvakayāna works, whether this was due to temporal and geographical happenstance, doctrinal considerations, or some combination thereof is not yet certain.
it is hoped that this attractive possibility is perhaps a bit closer to being proven.

Fragment 3 (fig. 3 = bottom right and fig. 5 = partial, bottom right) and Fragment 4 (fig. 3 = bottom right) were found lying relatively tangled together and with Fragment 2. Both fragments consist of heavily damaged folios running seven lines. As noted above, the left-side quarter of Fragment 3 laid atop Fragment 2. Only a small portion of this part of the folio remains, however. Fragment 4 lays atop the latter half of Fragment 3. The image of Fragments 3 and 4 is not very sharp and without access to more clear images, deciphering these fragments has proven difficult. This is compounded by their very damaged condition with only a small number of *akṣaras* extant on either fragment. The right-hand margin of Fragment 3 appears to be preserved and we can see the general outline of its shape thanks to the pieces of the folio being *in situ*. When it was complete, it must have measured approximately 25 cm × 5 cm just like Fragments 1 and 2. The left and right-hand margins of Fragment 4 are both missing making the extant portion from somewhere in or near the middle of the folio. It measures approximately 16 cm × 5 cm, and there is little doubt that it also measured 25 cm × 5 cm like the three previous fragments.

Fragment 4 is of particular note because we find a decorated circle with floral embellishment in the center of the fragment interrupting lines 3–5 (see fig. 2 for detail). The circle is damaged and only some of the petals of the floral embellishment are clearly visible. From this, we can nonetheless see that this circle is not nearly as intricate as the decorated circles at the ends of the both the *Dīrghāgama* and *Vinayavastvāgama* manuscripts (Melzer 2014: 232–234). It is unclear whether the circle itself was made with a compass like that of the *Dīrghāgama* and *Vinayavastvāgama* manuscripts. However, unlike those two manuscripts, the flower appears to have been drawn by hand. Somewhat similar but smaller circles may be seen in several instances in the Gilgit manuscript finds recorded in facsimile.15 Unlike the floral circle in Fragment 4, which is a single large circle, the circles in the Gilgit manuscript facsimiles

---

15 For example, in GBM 7: 1432, 1507, 1542, 1567, 1692, and 1706.
are nearly always double circles without the floral embellishment and interrupt only two lines. GBM 1542 incidentally, or perhaps not so incidentally, contains two double circles marking the colophon at the end of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa* manuscript testimony from the Gilgit finds. One possible scenario is that Fragment 4 represents the end of one work transmitted as part of the *Kṣudrakapiṭaka* and the beginning of another. Perhaps the end of the *Bahubuddhāvadāna* verses and the beginning of the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa*? This may of course be a coincidence, but once more clear images of these fragments become available, further examination into the possible relationship of Fragments 1, 2, 3, and 4 must be done to confirm whether this fragment is related to the *Maitreyavyākaraṇa/Bahubuddhāvadāna* verses.

![Fig. 2: Detail of decorated circle with floral embellishment on Fragment 4.](image)

Below, I provide transliterations of the Fragment 1 and Fragment 2 folios along with critical reconstructions and English translations. In my reconstruction of Fragment 1 I mainly follow Ishigami and give all differences found between the manuscript, Ishigami’s and Li and Nagashima’s editions while noting the corresponding parallels with the SHT fragment. Hartmann has recorded that while the Sanskrit texts and their translations are related, “there are several minor differences, not least in the number of verses or *pādas* each version contains, but also in the wording” (Hartmann 2006: 7). This holds true with Fragment 1 where in its span of a single folio, we see several such differences in wording.

16 Liu 2019a: 205: 309r5: © [*maitreyāvyākaraṇaṃ samāptam*] ©
My reconstruction of Fragment 2 is accompanied with the single extant Sanskrit parallel from Bezeklik (corresponding to the fourth verse of Fragment 2), the quotations from the *Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā* extant in Tibetan, and the corresponding Tibetan, Chinese, and Tocharian B translations as they are available. I also provide English translations of the Tibetan, which seems closer to the Sanskrit than the Chinese. Because no identification has been made for Fragments 3 and 4, I only give a transliteration below for these fragments.

**Fragment 1: Maitreyavyākarāṇa**

Transliteration:¹⁷

1 .. [t]reya .. t .. .r . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . k[e] • tasyāham vista[r]a[m] [sa]rva śr. . + + + + + + + +
3 [v]istara .. sya buddha .. ○ maitreyasya śṛ. oḥ [m]e .. 4 || udadhi + + kāl. + +
5 [daśay]. [j]. .. [sāha] ○ .. jaṃbuvī .. .. .y[a]t[i] • ālayasarva .ū[t] ānāṃ vis,[a] ..
6 na [ntat]ahsama¹⁸ [ṛ]ddhiḥṣpha .. .. .. padā a .. .. anupadravā • tatra kale bhaviṣ[y]amāt. ..
7 .. .. [Ś]ubha .. [ṛmaṇi] .. m aka .. [k]āś c[āga]ha[n]ā samāharitaśādvalāḥ bhū[m]i .. .. ..

¹⁷ All editorial conventions used throughout the article are listed at its end.
¹⁸ Metathesis, *samantataḥ*. 
Reconstruction:¹⁹

(yo ’sāv anāgato buddho nirḍiṣṭo lokanāyakah²⁰ l)

(F1.1) (mai)treya (ī) t(i)nāmnā ’sau sūtrapūrvvāparānti)ke²¹ • <2 ll>

tasyāhaṃ vistaraṃ sarvaṃ²² śr(otum icchāmi nāya)(F1.2)ka²³ <||>

(r(dh)i)(ī cā)syānubhāvaṃ ca tan me brūhi) pṛcchataḥ²⁴ <|| 3 ll>

athainam ava<da>c²⁵ chāstā vyā(karisyaṃmy ahaṃ tava l)²⁶

(F1.3)vistaraṃ(t)asya buddha(sya) maitreyasya śṛ(n)ohī me²⁷ (ll) 4 ll

udadhi(s tena) kāl(ena dvā(F1.4)trimśatśatay)ojanahah²⁸ l)

śoṣam āy(a)sya(te ya)s(māc) cakravarti²⁹ (yathā) hy asau ll 5 ll

(F1.5)daśay(o)j(ana)sāha(srā) jambudvī(po bhaviṣ)yatim³⁰ •

ālaya(ḥ) sarva(bh)ūtānāṃ vis(t)ar(era)(re)(F1.6)na³¹ <sama>ntatah {sama} <|| 6 ll>

ṛddhi(ḥ)sphī(tā jana)padā a(danḍa) anupadravā(ḥ) •

tatra kāle bhaviṣyaṃti(ī na(F1.7)rūs te) śubha(ka)rūnāṃ(ya)m³² <|| 7 ll>

¹⁹ Cf. Ishigami 1989: 297, Li and Nagashima 2013: 218–219, and Wille and Bechert
²⁰ SHT 9, 2013.33Vw: /// [ ] stō lokanāyaka { {ḥ} } l … // [sic].
²¹ sūtre pūrvvāparāntake, Maitr-vyāk(LN).
²² vistaraṃ caivaṃ, Maitr-vyāk(I). vistaraṃ sarvam, Maitr-vyāk(LN). Note Tibetan

translation: don thams cad (Lévi 1932: 382.4).
²³ SHT 9, 2013.33Vx: /// [ ] icchāmi nāya] + + ///.
²⁴ narottama, Maitr-vyāk(I) and Maitr-vyāk(LN).
²⁵ avadac, Maitr-vyāk(I) and Maitr-vyāk(LN).
²⁶ śṛṇum andho mahāmato l, Maitr-vyāk(LN). vyākārisyaṃmy ahaṃ tava l, Maitr-vyāk(I).
²⁷ mahātmanah, Maitr-vyāk(LN).
²⁸ SHT 9, 2013.33Vz: /// [ ] cchatayojanah + ///.
²⁹ ca[kravarti, ms.
³⁰ SHT 9, 2013.33R1: /// [ ] dvipo bhaviṣyati .. ///.
³¹ vistarāya, Maitr-vyāk(LN), vistareṇa, Maitr-vyāk(I).
³² śubhakarminah, Maitr-vyāk(I), śubhakāriṇah, Maitr-vyāk(LN). Cf. Tibetan: dge ba

byed pa. The image of the manuscript is very blurry here and my reconstruction is tentative.

When better images become available these akṣaras should be looked over once more.
aka(ṇṭa)kāś cāgahanā\textsuperscript{33} samāharitaśādvalāḥ\textsuperscript{34} | bhūmi .. .. <+ + + + + + + + + + + || 8 ||\textsuperscript{35}

Translation:

2. That future buddha who is the guide to the world has been foretold by name as Maitreya in the \textit{Pūrvāparāntakasūtra}.

3. I wish to hear the full extent of this guide’s supernormal power and potency. Asking this, tell me.”

4. Then the teacher spoke: “I will explain to you the extent [of the supernormal power] of the Buddha Maitreya. Listen to me.

5. At that time the ocean will evaporate for 3,200 \textit{yojana}s to accommodate that Cakravartin.

6. To this extent, Jambudvīpa, the abode of all beings, will completely span 10,000 \textit{yojana}s.

7. The people, flourishing by this supernormal power, are non-violent and free from calamity. At this time, those men will be ready for that which is good.

8. Thornless, cleared, level, verdant, and grassy: the earth…

\textbf{Fragment 2: Bahubuddhāvadāna verses}

Transliteration:

\textbf{Fragment 2}

2 nāhaṃ traipīṭak[o] bha .. /// /// .. .. .. .ṛ[ā]ty uktavāṃ n[ā]haṃ vacoduśca[r]jitaṃ śru .. + +

\textsuperscript{33} \textit{vasumatī}, Maitr-vyāk(I) and Maitr-vyāk(LN). Note \textit{bhūmi} begins the third \textit{pāda} seeming to take the value of \textit{vasumatī}.

\textsuperscript{34} \textit{samāharitaśādvalā}, Maitr-vyāk(I) and Maitr-vyāk(LN). SHT 9, 2013.33R2: /// [〇] mā hari[ta] .. ± + ///.

\textsuperscript{35} \textit{unnamantī namantī ca mṛdutūlapicūpamā}, Maitr-vyāk(I) and Maitr-vyāk(LN).
4 + [ny]āsu jātiṣu .r. /// /// .. .. .m [d]īpa .. le .. + [s]i ..m traimāsyānām a .. + +
dh[ā]nam [addā]di .. +
6 + + [hā]pra[nā]dāṃ [ṣ]r. /// /// .. .[i][dā] .. .. bhīstū[p]. .. + .. [samucch]r. tāh .r +
7 + + + vam buddhāṃ dvīje .. /// /// [sap]ra .. [syā] .[i] .rama .. a+ + + ..
mi na kītamaṃ

Fragment 2a36
1 /// + .r. .i. ///
2 /// .. .[i] + [na]m .. ///
3 .. .y. vi .. .. ..

Fragment 2b
1 /// .. .. ///

Partial reconstruction and translation with Tibetan, Sanskrit, Chinese, and Tocharian B parallels:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;śreṣṭhiduhitā&gt;37 (F2.1) (a)bha(vam)38 pūrvam anyāsu (jātiṣu) &lt;i&gt;</td>
<td>Bhaiṣajyavastu, D 1, ’dul ba, kha 276a3–4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36 Fragment 2a is seen laying atop fragment 2. Its location is indicated by the superscript “a” in Fragment 2.7.
37 tshong dpon bu mo, Tibetan; śreṣṭhintse kācer, Tocharian B. However, śreṣṭhidārikā is just as likely. Due to such ambiguity, I am wary of reconstructing Sanskrit from another language such as Tibetan (let alone Tocharian B) from which back translation is always dangerous and cannot be guaranteed to match the extant Sanskrit, and therefore do so sparingly.
38 Note the parallel phrase seen in the Bezeklik mural abhūvan pūrvāṃ anyāsu jātiṣu corresponding to Fragment 2.3–4 below.
Previously in another birth, when I was the daughter of a guild leader. …

Previously, I was well-versed in the tripitaka of the Buddha Aparajita. … I called [them] “women.”

39 The numeration here and below corresponds to the number of these verses among the one-hundred present in in the bahubuddha section of the Bhaiṣajyavastu. The verses are not numbered in the Tibetan, and I have added them for the reader’s convenience.

40 Hackstein, Habata, and Bross 2020: 67–68. German translation:
1a Ich war die Tochter eines Großkaufmanns, zu Ehren des Buddha Kauṇḍinya machte ich
1b einen großen Kranz der Lampen, um durch Würde und Gläubigkeit zum Buddha zu werden. (Hackstein, Habata, and Bross 2020: 68).
Previously, I was well-versed in the *tripiṭaka* of the Buddha Aparājita. Arguing with the community of monks, I referred to the community as women.

Previous, I was well-versed in the *tripiṭaka* of the Buddha Aparājita. Arguing with the community of monks, I referred to the community as women.

---

misdeed of speech … became a woman … and attained manhood.

committing this misdeed of speech, I instantly became a woman. once again made confident in thought, I became one who attained manhood.

---

Previously in another birth, I was the daughter of a king. I honored my brother, Ratnaśikhin, with an oil lamp.  

Previously in another birth, I was the son of a king. I honored my brother, Ratnaśikhin, with the donation of an oil lamp.

---


43 (a)bha(vam), Fragment 2.1 above, which uses the same phrase: (a)bha(vam) pūrvam anyāsu (jātiṣu). abhūvan, Bezeklik mural, but this is not as nice for the meter.

44 upasthitāḥ, Bezeklik mural.

45 Both the Tibetan and Chinese refer to a prince (rgyal po'i sras) and (王子) while the Tocharian reads daughter (miñcuṣka). My feeling is that Fragment 2 and the verse from Bezeklik are better read following the Tocharian in this matter as opposed to the Tibetan and Chinese and so I make no emendation to the reading.

46 My reading of the verse transmitted in North Turkistan Brāhmī Type A contained in the Praṇidhi Scene Number 9 mural at Bezeklik in Turfan. An image of this mural may be found in Tafel 25 of von Le Coq 1913. This volume has been scanned in high resolution by the Toyo Bunko and is also available online: https://doi.org/10.20676/00000194.
As mentioned in note 45 above, while Fragment 2 and the Bezeklik mural verse discuss a princess, in the parallel in the Bhaiṣajyavastu the bodhisattva is a prince. Here we find a princess named Ratnacūḍā instead of an unnamed prince. The Tocharian verses also expand the narrative stating that the princess eventually became a man and went on to become a tripiṭaka master. This is of course, quite similar to the content of the second and third verses of Fragment 2 and is, in fact, continuing the narrative of these verses and calling back to The Bodhisattva’s transformation into a woman when he was a tripiṭaka master during the time of Aparājita which is made clear in Śamathadeva’s explanation in Upāyikā 4069 (fourth chapter, canonical quotation no. 69) in D 4094. See Dhammadinnā 2018: 72, n. 49 for related discussion.

48 This pāda appears to be hypermetrical.
For sixty seasons, I was the servent of Kṣemaṅkara.  
When he passed into nirvāṇa, I offered all my wealth into his stūpa.

T 1448, 24.73c28–29  
三月曾供養 安隱佛世尊  
佛滅度之後 以舍利起塔

Guild leader … Praṇāda … raised … stūpa …

Bhaiṣajyavastu, D 1, ’dul ba, kha  
276a6  
nga ni tshong dpon gyur pa na ll sgra snyan dbyang la zla gsum mchod ll de yi mchod rten mthon po ni ll dgu bcu rtsa gcig rtsig tu bcug ll 12 ll

When I was a guild leader, I honored Praṇāda for three months.  
I raised a stūpa for him hidden within ninety-one walls.

Bhaiṣajyavastu, D 1, ’dul ba, kha  
276a6–7  
nga ni bram zer gyur pa na ll sangs rgyas dpal ’byung mthong nas dga’ ll legs par thal sbyar de nas yang ll mi mchog la ni mchod pa byas ll 13 ll

(F2.6) šre(ṣṭhi) /// /// š(e)ym • kṣemaṅkarem pañākte kāṣṭhānte śkaska pakaccānta yama(ṣṣamai vyākarit kālpāwa tarya naumyen(taṃ)s pakana samudtārne karpāwa pañī(kte)⁴⁹

(Guild leader … Praṇāda … raised … stūpa …)

(Brahmin … the Buddha Śrīsambhava … joined palms … best of men.)

⁴⁹ Hackstein, Habata, and Bross 2020: 74. German translation:  

⁵⁰ tshong dpon, Tibetan.
When I was a brahmin, I delighted in seeing Śrīsambhava.
Respectfully joining my palms together, I honored that best of men.

T 1448.24.74a3–4
後見有勝佛 梵志中為最
舉手合掌敬 供養人中尊

Fragment 3: Unidentified

Transliteration:

1 /// ..ī .. [vi]ḥ .. [daṃ e] + + +
2 /// [sam]āyaṃ [pa] .[t]. .. + +
3 /// .aiḥ [p]aṭa[ka] .y. .. +
4 /// [tī] na [c]a [ta] .. ..
5 /// .. /// /// [yam e] .. ..
6 /// .. .. /// /// .. .. [y]. .. ..[m] .. /// /// .. [nam] .. .. ..
7 /// .. .. .. .. /// /// .. .. .. .. [r]. /// /// .. [gh]. ..

Fragment 4: Unidentified

Transliteration:

1 /// .[āṇa] .[ā] .. .. + + + + .. [y]. [pa] ///
2 /// .. + + .. .o .. .. [y]. .. .. .. .. .. .[ā] .. ///
3 /// .. .[jñā] .. .. [ya] ..[m] .[r] .. ///
4 /// .. .. .. .. .. [sa] .. [sṛā] .. [vika] .[i] .. .. ///
5 /// .. .. .. .. .. + [tyu] .. .. .. .. [raṃ] .r. .r. ..[m] .. .. ///
6 /// .. .. .. [tta] ..[m] .. + + + + [vi] .. .. .. [yam] .. .. .. ///
7 /// .. .. .. + + + + ..ḥ ..[m] .. .. .. tah [vi] .. .. ///
Fig. 3: Fragments 1–4.\textsuperscript{51}
Courtesy the Archaeological Institute of Afghanistan

Fig. 4: Fragments 1, left, and 2, right.
Courtesy the Archaeological Institute of Afghanistan

\textsuperscript{51} Fragment 1, top left, Fragment 2, top right, Fragment 3 and Fragment 4, bottom.
Fig. 5: Detail, Fragment 2 (right).
Courtesy the Archaeological Institute of Afghanistan

Fig. 6: Detail, Fragment 2 (left).
Courtesy the Archaeological Institute of Afghanistan
Fragments 5–5e: Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra

Fragments 5–5e were found in Mes Aynak Site 117, Room 004. They consist of a partially visible bundle of damaged folios from the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. We have two images of this bundle. The first image is of the fragments in situ (fig. 7) and the second is after excavation but without any attempt at restoration or separation of the folios (fig. 8). Only one side is visible on each of these fragments. Fragment 5 measures approximately 22 cm × 6 cm. Six lines are extant, but the folio possibly contained more when it was intact. Only around 15–20 aksaras are extant per line, but based upon the reconstruction, the complete folio likely ran approximately 85–90 aksaras per line. Neither the left nor right-hand margins are extant nor are any string holes visible, making the exact area of the folio the fragment belonged to difficult to determine. The fragment is broken on the left-hand side after the first aksaras. Several other folios are visible in the area of this break confirming that this is a sūtra bundle. Based on the estimated aksara count, it is probable that this bundle represents a larger-sized manuscript, possibly up to between 12–14 lines per folio. These fragments are in a different hand than Fragments 1–4 above and Fragment 6 below. Fragment 5a is the folio sitting directly beneath Fragment 5. Unfortunately, only a few aksaras from the beginning and end of each line of the fragment are visible. Fragments 5b and 5c sit directly above the left-hand side of Fragment 5. Fragments 5d and 5e sit directly below the right-hand side of Fragment 5. These are all small fragments of only a few aksaras. They do not appear to be from the same folio as Fragment 5 but are almost surely from other sections from within the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. Fragment 5 corresponds to the final three verses of the 18th chapter, Dharmabhāṇakānuśaṃsā, and the first paragraphs of the 19th chapter, Sadāparibhūta, of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra.

The Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra seems to have enjoyed popularity in nearly all regions and times in the course of its textual transmission and this is reflected by the numerous extant manuscripts of it in Sanskrit. It is the second most preserved work in Greater Gandhāra alone with nine distinct manuscript witnesses extant after the Saṃghāṭasūtra with
thirteen witnesses. Below I provide a transliteration of Fragments 5–5e and a critical reconstruction and translation of Fragment 5. The historic popularity of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra has not abated with time and it is now an object of veneration worldwide. Its far-reaching charisma is evident even in the numerous academic studies conducted upon it and there are an abundance of editions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra based on various Sanskrit manuscripts. I have consulted ten of these editions in my reconstruction noting any differences in reading between Fragment 5 and the various editions. However, there are few variations of any great substance and Fragment 5 appears not to deviate very far from the attested transmissions of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra upon which these previous editions were based. Seishi Karashima began a critical edition of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra consulting all material available including Chinese and Tibetan translations but none of these portions correspond to Fragment 5. Numerous translations of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra into modern languages have been made but these are almost exclusively from the Chinese. Given the popularity of the work it is surprising that the only translation to English from Sanskrit remains Kern’s (1884), which although highly admirable, was published one hundred and forty years ago now making a new translation desirable.

Transliteration:

Fragment 5

1 /// .. .. [sū] + [t]. .. [rma]+ sa tāṣati [nīt]y. [kā] .. + + + + + + + + ///

52 For details on the Gilgit manuscripts of both the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra and the Saṃghāṭasūtra, see the corresponding entries for each in von Hinüber 2014: 121.

53 Fragments 5a–e are too small to confidently place in their corresponding sections of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra.

54 Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912; Wogihara and Tsuchida 1934; Dutt 1953; Vaidya 1960b (it is unclear if Vaidya consulted any manuscripts in the preparation of his edition or simply re-edited the previous editions); Watanabe 1975 (containing editions of two witnesses corresponding to Fragment 5); Jiang 1988, 2006a, 2006b, and 2006c.

55 Karashima 2003, 2004, 2005, and 2006. It is highly regrettable that with his tragic and untimely passing, this valuable work will not continue.
2 /// [y]a dharmaṃ ni + + .. ūkuśalaś ca bhoti ima dhā[ra] .. + + + + +
///
3 /// pta pa[ry]. + .. vam v[e]ditavyam yathā ye imam e[vam] .. + + +
///
4 /// .. visy. + + + .. ācā pari[kī]rtayitu[m] ye .. [m]. m[e] ///
5 /// kī[rt].+ + + + + .. kṣuḥśrotraghrāṇ[aj]ivā[k]ā[y]ama ///
6 /// .r.itasvarā[jo] .. ma tath. ga ///

a Fragment 5a\textsuperscript{56}

1 /// .. a /// /// i .. ///
2 /// .. /// /// .. ///
3 /// .. .. [m]. .. ///
4 /// .. ///
5 /// .. hā[sth]. /// /// hā[sa] .. • ///
6 /// m .. .. /// /// .. .. ///

Fragment 5b

1 /// .. ///
2 /// .. [ṣ]ajyarāja ku[l]. ///
3 /// .. .. y[a] /// /// ve [r].[a] ni • vi .i .. ///

Fragment 5c\textsuperscript{57}

1 /// .. .y. .y. .. ///
/// ve [r].[a] ni • vi .i .. ///

Fragment 5d

1 /// .. śi .. ..ḥ vasa[m] ///
2 /// tra .. .. [v]isa .. ///

\textsuperscript{56} Only the few first and latter akṣaras of this folio are visible as the rest of the folio is obscured by Fragment 5, which lies atop it.

\textsuperscript{57} Found directly to the right of Fragment 5a, but it does not seem to belong to the same folio.
Reconstruction of Fragment 5:58

(yaṃ⁵⁹ bhāṣitam⁶⁰ bhoti ha⁶¹ dīrgharātraṃ pūrvehi⁶² lokācari(F⁵r₁)-yehi) sū(traṃ l)

(t(ām dh)arma sa⁶³ bhāṣati⁶⁴ nity(a)kā(laṃ asaṃtrasanto pariṣāya⁶⁵ madhye || 18.74 l)⁶⁶

(mana-indriyāṃ iḍrśam⁶⁷ asya bhoti dhāretva sūtraṃ imu⁶⁸ vācayitvā⁶⁹ l

na ca tāvāsaṅgam⁷⁰ labhate ha⁷¹ jñānaṃ⁷² pūrvaṃgamaṃ⁷³ tasya imaṃ
tu bhoti || 18.75 ||)⁷⁴


59 yad, Saddhp(J2) and Saddhp(J3). ye, Saddhp(W2), which Watanabe suggests in a footnote to read as yaṃ.

bhāṣitao, Saddhp(J3).

bhotiha, Saddhp(D) and Saddhp(J). bhoti hi, Saddhp(J1), bhoti ’ha, Saddhp(J2) and Saddhp(J3). bhotiha, Saddhp(W2).

pūrvam hi, Saddhp(J) and Saddhp(J2), pūrvāhi, Saddhp(J3).

so, Saddhp(KN), Saddhp(WT), Saddhp(D), Saddhp(V), Saddhp(J1), and Saddhp(J3).

dharmu so, Saddhp(J2) and Saddhp(W2).

64 tāsati, ms.

65 parśāya, Saddhp(J).

66 Saddhp(W1) 145.1–2: ... tyakālaṃ asaṃtrasantaḥ pariṣāya madhye ||

67 iḍyśu, Saddhp(J).

68 ima, Saddhp(J1).

69 vācayed vā, Saddhp(J) and Saddhp(J2).

70 tāva sāṅgaṃ, Saddhp(KN). tav’ asaṅgaṃ, Saddhp(WT). tāva asaṅgaṃ, Saddhp(D).

However, Dutt gives sāṅgaṃ as a variant reading along with the Tibetan ma chags. tāvasāṅgam, Saddhp(J). tav asaṅgaṃ, Saddhp(J1), Saddhp(J2), and Saddhp(J3). tava saṃjñaṃ, Saddhp(W2), Watanabe suggests in a footnote reading tāvāsaṅgaṃ.

71 la{ŋ} bhat e ’ha, Saddhp(J1). Saddhp(J3) omits. labhateha, Saddhp(W2).

72 jñā na, Saddhp(J). sajñānam, Saddhp(J3).

73 pār(r)vaṅgame, Saddhp(J1).

74 Saddhp(W1) 145.6: ... tasya imaṃ tu bhoti ||
(ācāryabhūmau\(^{75}\) hi\(^{76}\) sthitas\(^{77}\) ca bhotisattvāna kathe)(F\(^{5r2}\)-ya\(^{78}\) dharmay\(^{79}\) \{\})

ni(ruktiko)tiṣkuṣalas\(^{80}\) ca bhoti\(^{81}\) ima\(^{82}\) dhāra(yanto sugatasya sūtram \| 18.76 \})\(^{83}\)

(iti śrīsaddharma*pundarīkē dharma)paryāye dharma*bhāṇaka-nāsuṃsāparivarto nāmaśāsamaṃ)\(^{84}\)

(atha khalu bhagavān mahāsthāmaprāptam bodhisattvaṃ mahāsattvam āmantrayate\(^{85}\) \| sma \| anenāpi\(^{86}\) tāvan\(^{87}\) mahāsthāmaprā)(F\(^{5r3}\)pta pary(āyenai)yaṃ\(^{88}\) veditavyaṃ yathā ye\(^{89}\) imam\(^{90}\) evaṃ(rūpaṃ dharma)paryāyaṃ\(^{91}\) prati śeṣpyanti\(^{92}\) evaṃrūpams\(^{93}\) ca sūtrāntadhārakāṃs\(^{94}\)

\(^{75}\)āścabhū +, Saddhp(J).

\(^{76}\)Saddhp(J3) omits.

\(^{77}\)sthi {hi}tas, Saddhp(J1), sthitas ca, Saddhp(J2), sthitataś, Saddhp(J) and Saddhp(J3).

\(^{78}\)kathe hi, Saddhp(J), katheyaṃ, Saddhp(J2).

\(^{79}\)sūtram, Saddhp(J).

\(^{80}\)kusālas, Saddhp(J3).

\(^{81}\)bheti, Saddhp(W2), Watanabe suggests bhoti in a footnote.

\(^{82}\)imi, Saddhp(KN), Saddhp(WT), Saddhp(D), Saddhp(V), Saddhp(J2), Saddhp(J3), and Saddhp(W2). imi, Saddhp(J).

\(^{83}\)Saddhp(W1) 145.7–10: ācaryabhāmāvīsā paṃsāparivarta aṣṭāsamaṃ, Saddhp(J). iti \| \| \| \| dharma*bhāṇaka-parīvaro aṣṭāsamaṃ, Saddhp(J1). iti \| \| dharma*bhāṇaka-parīvaro aṣṭāsamaṃ, Saddhp(J2).

\(^{84}\)iti \| \| \| dharmabhāṇaka-nāsuṃsāparivarto nāmaśāsamaṃ \| \| \| Saddhp(J3). Saddhp(W1) 145.11: dharmabhāṇaka-parīvaro \| \| \| \| \| Saddhp(J1).

\(^{85}\)ā\[na\] nt(r)ya[e] [sic], Saddhp(J3), ā ... yāmāsa, Saddhp(W2), Watanabe suggests āmantrayāmāsa in a footnote.

\(^{86}\)anena, Saddhp(J).

\(^{87}\)Saddhp(J1), Saddhp(J3), and Saddhp(W2) omit tāvan.

\(^{88}\)pṛyāyenavam, Saddhp(J1). Saddhp(D) gives a variant reading by Mironov of a Central Asian fragment: pṛyā[yen].

\(^{89}\)ya, Saddhp(KN), Saddhp(WT), Saddhp(D), Saddhp(V), Saddhp(J), and Saddhp(J1).

\(^{90}\)imem, Saddhp(J), kecid imam, Saddhp(J3). kecid idam, Saddhp(W2).

\(^{91}\)dharma paṃsāṃ, Saddhp(J2).

\(^{92}\)prati śeṣpyanti, Saddhp(J1).

\(^{93}\)evaṃrūpā[ṃs], Saddhp(J3).

\(^{94}\)evaṃrūpasūtrāntadhārakās, Saddhp(J1).
ca\textsuperscript{95} bhikṣubhikṣunyupāsakopāsikā\textsuperscript{96} ākrośisyanti\textsuperscript{97} paribhāṣisyanti\textsuperscript{98} asatyayā paruṣayā vācā samudācariṣyanti teṣām evam\textsuperscript{99} aniṣto vipāko (F\textsuperscript{5r4}) bhaṇḍaṇy (ati yo na śakyam\textsuperscript{100} v)ācā\textsuperscript{101} parikīrtayitum \(\langle\rangle\) ye (ce) m(a)m\textsuperscript{102} e(vamṛupam sūtrāntaṃ dhārayiṣyanti\textsuperscript{103} vācayiṣyanti deśayiṣyanti\textsuperscript{104} par-yavāpsyanti\textsuperscript{105} parebhyaś ca vistareṇa samprakāśisyanti\textsuperscript{107} teṣām evam\textsuperscript{108} iṣṭo\textsuperscript{109} vipāko bhaviṣyatī yādṛśo mayā pūrvaṃ pari(F\textsuperscript{5r5})-kīrt(īta\textsuperscript{110} evamṛupam ca\textsuperscript{111} ca)kṣuḥsrotaghrāṇajihvākāyayama(h)pārisud-dhīm\textsuperscript{112} adhigamiṣyanti\textsuperscript{113} ||

(bhūtapūrvaṃ\textsuperscript{114} mahāsthāmapiṣṭatīte 'dhvany asamkhayeśaḥ kalpair asamkhyyatatarair vipulair aprameyair acintyaiś\textsuperscript{115} tebhyaḥ pareṇa paratareṇa yadāsit\textsuperscript{116} tena kālena tena samayena bhīṣma(F\textsuperscript{5r6})garr-

\textsuperscript{95} Saddhp(J), Saddhp(J2), Saddhp(J3), and Saddhp(W2) omit ca and immediately preceding sandhi.
\textsuperscript{96} \(\upāsakopāsikā\), Saddhp(J), Saddhp(J2) and Saddhp(J3).
\textsuperscript{97} ākrāmisyanti, Saddhp(J), ākarosisyanti, Saddhp(J1).
\textsuperscript{98} paribhāsisyante, Saddhp(J) and Saddhp(J1).
\textsuperscript{99} vi, Saddhp(J), eva, Saddhp(J1). Saddhp(J2) and Saddhp(J3) omit evam.
\textsuperscript{100} sakyam, Saddhp(J3).
\textsuperscript{101} vācayā, Saddhp(J), Saddhp(J2) and Saddhp(J3). vācāya, Saddhp(J1) which Jiang emends to vācayā.
\textsuperscript{102} cemam, Saddhp(J), Saddhp(J1), Saddhp(J2), and Saddhp(J3).
\textsuperscript{103} dhārayisyanti, Saddhp(J1).
\textsuperscript{104} … caiṣyanti paryavāpsyanti, Saddhp(W1). Presumably, deśayiṣyanti would have been in the lacuna.
\textsuperscript{105} paryavāpsyanti deśayiṣyanti, Saddhp(J), Saddhp(J2), paryavāpsyanti desayiṣyanti,
Saddhp(J3). paryayāpsyanti deśayiṣyanti, Saddhp(J1).
\textsuperscript{106} paresāṃ, Saddhp(W1) and Saddhp(J). paresāṇi, Saddhp(J1), Saddhp(J2), and Saddhp(J3).
\textsuperscript{107} samprakāśisyanti, Saddhp(J1) and Saddhp(J3).
\textsuperscript{108} Saddhp(J) and Saddhp(J2) omit.
\textsuperscript{109} iṣṭa, Saddhp(J2). \(\langle\rangle\) iṣṭo, Saddhp(J3). iṣṭaṃ, Saddhp(W2), Watanabe suggests iṣṭo in a footnote.
\textsuperscript{110} parikīrtitan, Saddhp(J2), parikīrtitana, Saddhp(J3).
\textsuperscript{111} Saddhp(J1) omits ca.
\textsuperscript{112} kṣuḥsrotaghrāṇajihvākāyayamaṇa, ms. \(\langle\rangle\) srota…, Saddhp(J1). \(\langle\rangle\) jihvākāyamanah pariṣuddhim, Saddhp(J2), cakṣusrotaghrāṇa jihvākāyamanah pariṣuddhim, Saddhp(J3).
\textsuperscript{113} adhigacchanti, Saddhp(J1).
\textsuperscript{114} pūthāhūrvam, Saddhp(J).
\textsuperscript{115} acintyair apramāṇais, Saddhp(J2) and Saddhp(J3).
\textsuperscript{116} yadāsit, Saddhp(J).
(j)itasvararājo\textsuperscript{117} (nā)ma tathāga(to 'rhan samyaksambuddho\textsuperscript{118} loka\textsuperscript{119} udapādi\textsuperscript{120} vidyācaraṇasampannah sugato lokavid anuttaraḥ puruṣadamyasārathiḥ\textsuperscript{121} sāstā devānāṃ ca manusyānāṃ ca buddho bhagavān\textsuperscript{122} vinirbhoge\textsuperscript{123} kalpe mahāsaṃbhavāyāṃ\textsuperscript{124} lokadhātau\textsuperscript{125} )

Translation:

18.74: That sūtra, which has been uttered by the previous teachers for so long, is the dharma he always states in the midst of the assembly without trembling.

18.75: Upholding and causing this sūtra to be recited, his faculty of mind is such that although he has not obtained knowledge of non-attachment, he has that which precedes it.

18.76: Stationed at the stage of the teacher, he should tell this dharma to all beings. Upholding this sūtra of the Sugata, he is one skillful in tens of millions of interpretations.

Here ends the chapter on the benefits to preachers of the dharma named 18th in the dharma discourse, the Esteemed Lotus of the True Dharma.

Then, the Blessed One addressed the bodhisattva, the mahāsattva, Mahāsthāmaprāpta: Therefore, Mahāsthāmaprāpta, with this discourse it is to be known in this way: namely, those who will reject a dharma discourse of this kind, who will abuse and rebuke the upholders of the sūtras of this kind, monks, nuns, laymen, and laywomen, and will address them with false and harsh speech, for them there will thus be ominous

\textsuperscript{117} bhīṣmagarjitasvararājā, Saddhp(J2). bhīṣmasava…, Saddhp(W1), Watanabe suggests bhīṣmaagarjitasvararājo in a footnote.
\textsuperscript{118} samyaksambuddhā, Saddhp(J1).
\textsuperscript{119} loke, Saddhp(J2).
\textsuperscript{120} udapādita Saddhp(J). utpādī, Saddhp(J1) and Saddhp(J3).
\textsuperscript{121} puruṣadamyasā rathih, Saddhp(J3).
\textsuperscript{122} bhagavāna, Saddhp(J3).
\textsuperscript{123} vinirbhoga, Saddhp(J). vinirbhige, Saddhp(W2), Watanabe suggests vinirbhoge in a footnote.
\textsuperscript{124} mahāsaṃbhave, Saddhp(J).
\textsuperscript{125} Saddhp(D) gives a variant reading by Mironov of a Central Asian fragment: yāṃ loka dhātau.
consequences, which words are not able to relate. Those who will master a *sūtra* of this kind, who will cause it to be upheld, recited, and taught, and will cause it to be extensively manifested to others, for them there will accordingly be agreeable consequences of such a sort I have previously related. They will attain a purification of eye, ear, nose, tongue, body, and mind of this kind.

Formerly, Mahāsthāmaprāpta, in the past before innumerable eons, even more innumerable than that, huge and immeasurable, and even before that. At that time there was a *tathāgata*, an *arhat*, a completely and perfectly awakened one named Bhīṣmagarjitasvararāja who had appeared in the world, perfect in knowledge and conduct, a *sugata*, world-knowing, unsurpassed, a charioteer of men in need of training, a teacher of gods and men, a buddha, a blessed one in the Vinirbhoga eon in the Mahāsaṃbhāva world-system.

**Fragments 6–6b: Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā**

Fragments 6–6b (figs. 9–12) were discovered in Mes Aynak Site 115. They consist of either two or three fragments from the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*. These fragments were not photographed *in situ* and measurements are not available. Fragment 6 is the only fragment among these Mes Aynak fragments where the *recto* and *verso* of the folio is visible (figs. 9, *recto*, and 10, *verso* and portions of lines 5–7 of the *recto*). It is a relatively small fragment with both the left and right-hand margins missing. It runs seven lines on each side, indicating a witness of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* subfamily as opposed to the longer *Mahāprajñāpāramitā* subfamily of works which are seen on larger folios and run variously between 11–15 lines per folio in order to accommodate the longer length. A portion of the *recto* side is folded over onto the *verso* unfortunately obscuring several *akṣaras* on the *verso* side that would otherwise have been visible. Between 12–14 *akṣaras* are visible per line on the *recto* side, but due to the *recto* being folded over the *verso*, lines v1–5 are obscured, making only 6–8 *akṣaras* visible on those lines while the final two lines are similar in number of *akṣaras* to those on the *recto*.

---

126 It is not clear at the moment in which room these fragments were found.
Fig. 7: Fragments 5–5e in situ.
Courtesy the Archaeological Institute of Afghanistan

Fig. 8: Fragments 5–5e excavated.
Courtesy the Archaeological Institute of Afghanistan
Fragments 6a and 6b are quite small, each only spanning a few aksaras over 3 lines. Fragment 6a is clearly laying atop several other folio fragments presumably also from the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā. This suggests that further folios from this work are also preserved at the Mes Aynak site and it is not hopeless to consider that a great portion of, or perhaps the entire manuscript may be present. All three fragments were copied by the same hand. This hand is unique from the other two scribes who copied the folios of Fragments 1–4 and 5–5e.

These fragments are the first manuscript testimony of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā ever to have been found in Greater Gandhāra in a Gilgit/Bamiyan type script. Therefore, the discovery of this manuscript fragment represents an important new data point in the study of the development of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā and Prajñāpāramitā literature and the strong likelihood that further witnesses of this manuscript are yet to be uncovered or identified at Mes Aynak only deepen the importance of the site. The Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā is thought to have been supplanted by the development of the Mahāprajñāpāramitā works in Central Asia until the Pāla period (Zacchetti 2015: 180). This seemingly was also the case in Greater Gandhāra where three manuscript witnesses are preserved of the Mahāprajñāpāramitā in the Gilgit manuscripts. In addition to the witnesses discovered at Gilgit, a number of

127 My thanks to Jens-Uwe Hartmann, who checked the unpublished material from the Schøyen Collection, and Klaus Wille † for both confirming that no other fragments or folios of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā have ever been discovered from this period in the area of Greater Gandhāra in the Gilgit/Bamiyan type I script.

128 von Hinüber 2014: 119 and 120. von Hinüber refers to the Mahāprajñāpāramitā as both the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā and the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikāpra-jñāpāramitā listing the same manuscript corresponding to numbers 24, 25, and 28, which he titles simply Prajñāpāramitā for each in his index. In a recent article, Hartmann remarks in a list that there were three manuscripts each for both the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāpra-jñāpāramitā and the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikāpra-jñāpāramitā referring to the list in von Hinüber 2014 (Hartmann 2019: 20). However, with his list following the two essentially repeated entries in von Hinüber’s index, I think he has inadvertently conflated the rather nebulous nature of the Mahāprajñāpāramitā (the Gilgit witnesses of which are closer to the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāpra-jñāpāramitā than any other Prajñāpāramitā work) into two distinct works implying there are six manuscript witnesses of two works from the Gilgit finds when there are only three distinct manuscript witnesses of what may be called the Mahāprajñāpāramitā consisting of three separate works numbered 24, 25, and 28; 26 and 27; and 50 and 52.
Mahāprajñāpāramitā manuscript witnesses from Greater Gandhāra have also been uncovered in recent years. There are only three other extant early manuscript testimonies of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā: fragments of a 1st–2nd century Gāndhārī language Prajñāpāramitā birch bark scroll likely recovered from the Pakistan-Afghanistan border area related to an early transmission of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā family of Prajñāpāramitā literature, fragments of a Kuśāṇa period manuscript likely recovered around Bāmiyān, and a single fragment from an 8th–9th century manuscript in South Turkestan Gupta Brāhmī found in Xinjiang. Fragments 6–6b represent the fourth discovery of an Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā predating the later Nepalese manuscript traditions and, being from the 6th–7th centuries of the Common Era, are the third oldest extant witnesses of this work.

Fragment 6 corresponds to the latter portion of the 20th chapter, Upāyakauśalyamīmāṃsā, of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā, spanning the end of the 4th chapter of the Abhisamayālaṃkāra, Sarvākarābhisambodha, and the beginning of the 5th chapter, Mūrdhābhisamayādhikāra. Unfortunately, it does not correspond to any of the other three early manuscript witnesses. Sander’s 2002 edition also contains fragments that are quite close in location to where Fragment 6 should be located within the discourse, however, corresponding to what would amount to only a few mere folios before the content of Fragment 6 within the Upāyakauśalyamīmāṃsā chapter (Sander 2002: 41–42, MS 2375/49d). I have not been able to place Fragments 6a and 6b to their corresponding sections of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā due to their having few aksaras extant and differences from the editions of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā.

129 There are at least three further manuscripts known to me at the moment. One is in the Kurita Collection (Karashima 2017: 13 and Karashima and Tamai 2019: viii). The material in question in this collection was previously in Japan but is now being worked on by Shaoyong Ye in Beijing. I am presently working on editing at least two – I say at least because it is possible that due to the fragmentary nature of some of these witnesses that there may be a third unique witness – more Mahāprajñāpāramitā manuscript witnesses from Greater Gandhāra that have recently come to light ranging from intact to quite fragmentary folios. These will be the subject of publications that are currently being prepared within the scope of the Gandhāra Corpora project.

A partial parallel for Fragment 6 may also be found in the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā,131 which is not surprising considering the Mahāprajñāpāramitā works are all elaborations upon the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā. A closer parallel is to be found when examining the Gilgit witnesses of the Mahāprajñāpāramitā corresponding to this section of the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā.132 Curiously, line 2 in Fragment 6a

131 PvsP IV, 199.14–V, 2.1. This caused me to consider that Fragments 6–6b might be identified as this work. However, the similarities to the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā are not nearly as close as they are to the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā with the word order differing from Fragment 6 in the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā and generally matching in the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā and all lines of the recto and verso appearing in the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā while line 2, 3, and 6 of the recto side are completely missing in the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā.

132 A parallel of the reading of Fragment 6 may be found in the second extant Mahāprajñāpāramitā manuscript from the Gilgit manuscript finds (no. 26 and 27, see von Hinüber 2014: 120) reproduced in facsimile in Karashima and Tamai 2019: 47 (MP II 254r7–255r7) spanning the end of the 54th and beginning of the 55th chapters of that work. Unfortunately, these folios are damaged with around a fourth of the folio missing on the right-hand side of both. Frustratingly, this is often where the manuscript contained the aṣṭaras corresponding to Fragment 6. Another partial parallel to the above is found in a fragmentary folio of the first Mahāprajñāpāramitā manuscript from Gilgit (no. 24, 25, and 28, see von Hinüber 2014: 120) corresponding to MP II 254r10–254v7. This folio is missing approximately one third of the left-hand side and one third of the right-hand side leaving only the central third of the folio extant. Due to the right-hand side being missing and the surrounding folios not being available, the exact folio number is unclear. It may indeed be folio 214 as Karashima suspected or it may be 215. This confusion spreads to another corresponding folio from MP I, folio 215b according to Conze (Conze 1962: 3) but described as folio 218v by Karashima (Karashima et al. 2016: viii). Whatever its number, this folio corresponds to MP II 255r1–7. I have not been able to access an image of the folio, but it was edited by Conze in his edition of what he called the Aṣṭādaśasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā (Conze 1962: 3.1–4.8), although it is better regarded as the first Mahāprajñāpāramitā manuscript from Gilgit as Karashima has described it. In order to compare these correspondences to Fragment 6, I made transliterations of the folios MP I 214(?)v 214v4–14 and MP II 254r7–255r7 (taking note of Conze’s edition while reading MP II 255r1–7). While the readings of the folios from the two Mahāprajñāpāramitā witnesses generally resemble Kimura’s edition of the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā containing differences from Fragment 6, they also contain instances where they differ from the PvsP and agree more with Fragment 6. However, they also disagree with one another in places, creating difficulties in interpretation. It is clear that there is a relationship between the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā as testified in Fragment 6 and the corresponding sections in the two Mahāprajñāpāramitā manuscripts from Gilgit, but the exact nature of that relationship is presently unclear. Indeed, this should be expected as I suspect that the Mahāprajñāpāramitā from Gilgit and Fragment 6 from Mes Aynak both represent an instance of a parallel transmission of the
seems only to appear within the *Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā*. This is in all probability an attestation to the fluid transmission of the *Prajñāpāramitā* literature and the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* testified in Fragments 6–6b likely represents an Indic transmission of the text not known before, warranting further study in comparison to the other extant manuscripts, editions, the Chinese and Tibetan translations and other *Prajñāpāramitā* manuscript material from Greater Gandhāra.

Three editions of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* have been produced from later Sanskrit manuscripts. While these all largely agree with one another, Fragments 6–6b appear to represent a different transmission of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* and in these fragments we find what is either a strong brevity of the language or a change in wording from what is found in the later Nepalese manuscript transmission. This has made a critical reconstruction impossible. Therefore, below I provide a transliteration, a parallel edition of the corresponding section of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* created from the three previous editions where the phrases that parallel Fragment 6 are underlined noting all difference among the three editions and Fragment 6, and a translation of this parallel edition. The *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* has been translated three times into modern languages from the Sanskrit. Once into Japanese by Kajiyama and Tanji, once into French by Burnouf, and once into English by Edward Conze (Kajiyama and Tanji 1974–1975, Burnouf

---

*Prajñāpāramitā* in Greater Gandhāra where the corresponding material within *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* and *Mahāprajñāpāramitā* subfamilies shared closer similarities than found within the later, Nepalese manuscript traditions. This may explain the instances of abbreviation or rewording found in Fragment 6 when compared to the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* editions based upon later manuscripts. I believe that the *Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā* manuscript represented by Fragment 6 may have often shared similarities in readings with the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā* material from the same region and era. In the probable event that more fragments or folios from the manuscript Fragment 6 is a part of come to light, a careful comparison of them to the *Mahāprajñāpāramitā* witnesses from Greater Gandhāra may yield fruitful results for our understanding of the complex relationship between the *Prajñāpāramitā* subfamilies and the development of *Prajñāpāramitā* literature.

---

133 Mitra 1888, Wogihara 1932–1935, and Vaidya 1960a. It should be noted that it is not clear if Vaidya consulted any manuscripts directly in his edition or simply re-edited the previous work of Mitra and Wogihara.
Although it was finally published in 2022, Burnouf’s translation was made in the 1840s and while I do not take such a dim view as others have of Conze’s research in recent years, the fact remains that his translations of the Prajñāpāramitā literature are often quite free, glossing over much that should not have been skipped and thus new translations of this work should be made.

Transliteration:

Fragment 6

Recto

1 /// tathā kaṇṭiṣyāmi yathā [et]e do .. ///
2 /// .. saṁmanvāgataḥ imeṣāṃ gaṁ .. .. ///
3 /// [dha]rmasamanvāgato anabhisa. ///
4 /// + .. dharmaṇāṃ parijayaḥ kartavya[h] ///
5 /// ramitāṃ ca bhāvayet sacet subhūṭ. ///
7 /// āven[t]ko avaiva[rtyasya] [y][a] bodhisatvasya .. ///

Verso

1 /// dhisatvasya bhū .. ///
2 /// k[ā] punar e[v]aṃ [v]i[sa] .. ///
3 /// śalāmūlaṃ vedayi .. ///
4 /// + vakabhumau vā pr[a] ///
5 /// ◊ [syāv]aivartyalakṣaṇaṃ v. ///
6 /// .. [gha]◊[pa]rivṛtam bhikṣusamgha .. ///
7 /// .vapn[ta]◊[ragato bodhi]satva .. ///

134 Beyond the Sanskrit, surprisingly few translations from other languages have been published with the only one complete translation from the Tibetan into French (Driessens 2007). Two further English translations are currently in progress from the Tibetan and Chinese: one from the Tibetan by Greg Seton for the 84000 Translating the Words of the Buddha project and one from Kumārajīva’s Chinese translation (T 227) by Matthew Orsborn and Lewis Lancaster for the BDK English Tripiṭaka project. These should both appear in the coming years.
Fragment 6a

1 /// gatam arha ///\(^{135}\)
2 /// y[e p]j te anāsravā [dh]. ///\(^{136}\)
3 /// [ā]tya[t]. .. .. ///

Fragment 6b

1 /// [c]a .* i[h]. ///
2 /// [it]y api atītānāgataprat[yu] ///\(^{137}\)
3 /// [hi] .. ///

Parallel Text:\(^{138}\)

(F6r1) tathā\(^{139}\) karisyāmi yathaiṣām ete\(^{140}\) doṣāḥ sarveṣa sarvam sarvathā sarvam na bhavisyanti na prajñāsyante ity evam sarvasattvān samanvāharatīl evaṃ ca bodhisattvo mahāmahāvīhāreṇānena cittotpādēna samanvāgataḥ upāyakauśalyena (F6r2) ca samanvāgataḥ prajñāpāramitayā ca parighītāḥ evam eteśāṃ gambhirāṇāṃ\(^{141}\) dharmāṇāṃ

\(^{135}\) This line appears to possibly be part of line v6 of the larger fragment. However, the other lines in this fragment do not easily line up with the received edited witnesses of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā.

\(^{136}\) This phrase only seems to occur once in edited Prajñāpāramitā literature, in the Pañcaviṃśatisāhasrikā at PvsP VI–VIII: 98.14–15: evam yāvat sarvadharmanāṃ jñāyā mocayati, ye 'pi te anāsravā dharmās tad yathā... This does not necessarily bolster a conclusion that these fragments are from the PvsP, or a Mahāprajñāpāramitā, rather we might conclude that given the complex development of Prajñāpāramitā literature where the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā and Mahāprajñāpāramitā subfamilies shared a mélange of similarities and differences throughout their transmissions it is quite feasible that this phrase would occur in a recension of the Aṣṭasāhasrikā from a Greater Gandhāran transmission in the Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I script.

\(^{137}\) Atītānāgatapratyutpanna appears often in the Aṣṭasāhasrikā, however, it has not previously been recorded to have been preceded by ity api.


\(^{139}\) tathā, AsP(M). Mitra also gives a variant: tathā ceti.

\(^{140}\) yathā ete, ms.

\(^{141}\) /// .. sa manvāgataḥ imeśāṃ gami .. .. ///, ms. Either the word order is different here between the ms. and the three editions or this ms. displays an abbreviated transmis-
dharmatāṃ prayavekṣaṃanāḥ śūnyatāto vā ānimittato vā apranihitato vā
anabhisaṃskārato vā anutpādato vā ajātito vā abhāvato vā l asthānam etat
subhūte 'navakāśo, yat sa bodhisattvo mahāsattva evaṃ (F6r3) jñāna-
manvāgato142 'nabhisaṃskāre143 vā patet traḥdātukuṇa vā sārdhaṃ saṃvase
tvā naitat sthānaṃ vidyate ||
evāṃ hi subhūte bodhisattvo mahāsattvah pariprasṭavayo144 bodhisat-
tvena mahāsattvenānuttarāṃ samyaksambodhim abhisambodhdhukāmena
l kata(F6r4)maṃ dharmāṃ pariṣayah kartavyah kiyad rūpāṇi ca citt-
tāny abhinirhartavyāni yāni cittāny abhinirhran bodhisattvo mahāsattvo
na śūnyatāṃ sākṣātkarotī nānimittatāṃ sākṣātkarotī nāpraṇihitam sākṣāt-
karotī, nānabhisaṃskāraṃ sākṣātkarotī nānuptādaṃ sākṣātkarotī nājātāṇa
sākṣātkarotī nābhāvaṃ sākṣātkarotī, prajñāpā(F6r5)ramitāṃ ca
bhāvayati145 ||
sacet146 subhūte bodhisattvo mahāsattvo bodhisattvavem parṣṭa evaṃ
vyākarotī i śūnyataiva bodhisattvavem mahāsattvavem manasikartavyā147
l nānimittam evāpranihitam evānabhisaṃskāra evānup-
pāda evāṣṭhit evābhāva eva bodhisattvavem mahāsattvavem manasikar-
tavyā148 iti ||

sion than the later manuscripts used by Mitra, Wogihara, and Vaidya. However, most other
lines from the ms. line up fairly well with the later edited exemplars.
142 dharmasamanvāgato, ms. evaṃ jñānasa-
manvāgato, AsP(M), AAA, and AsP(V). Cf.
PvsP IV, 199.28: evaṃ jñānadhar- 
masamanvāgato. In PvsP we see a resolution where both
jñāna and dharma are present in the compound.
143 anabhisaṃskāre, AsP(M) (along with AAA and AsP(V), both of
which relied heavily upon Mitra’s efforts). Mitra also gives a variant reading of abhis-
smāskāre. This reading would also work, but it disagrees with our ms. and the sense is that
a bodhisattva would neither fall back to worldly life nor ‘back’ into spiritual achievement
that would prevent him from continuing with his bodhisattva goal.
144 pariprṣṭavayo, AAA.
145 bhāvayet, ms. bhāvayati, AsP(M), and AAA. Cf. PvsP IV, 200.7: prajñāpāramitāṃ
cä bhāvayed iti, suggesting perhaps that the Gilgit/Bamiyan script transmissions of Pra-
jñāpāramitā literature followed such a reading.
146 sa cet, AsP(M). AAA more felicitously reads sacet and AsP(V)follows this.
147 manasi kartavyā, AsP(M) and AsP(V). Again, AAA gives the better reading.
148 manasi kartavyā, AsP(M) and AsP(V) once more.
saceṭ\(^{149}\) taṃ sarvasattvāparityāgacī(\(F6r6\))totpādan\(^{150}\) nopadarśayed\(^{151}\) upāyakauśalyam\(^{152}\) vā na vyākuryāt veditavyam etat subhūte nāyaṃ vyākṛto bodhisattvo ‘nuttarāyāṃ samyaksambodhāv avinivartaniyatve taih pauvakais tathāgatair arhadbhīḥ samyaksambuddhāḥ ||

tat kasya hetoh \(F6r7\) avinivartaniyasya bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasvāveniko\(^{153}\) dharmas\(^{154}\) taṃ dharmaṃ na sūcayati na prabhāvayati nopadarśayati na prajānāti paripṛṣṭa na vyākaroti na visarjayati na tāṃ bhūmim avakrāmayati yo ‘vinivartaniyasya bo(\(F6v1\))dhisattvasya mahāsattvasya bhūmir\(^{155}\) iti ||

subhūtir āha \(F6v2\) syāt punar bhagavan paryāyo yena paryāyena bodhisattvo mahāsattvo ‘vinivartaniyāyo bhavet ||

bhagavān āha \(F6v2\) syāt subhūte sa paryāyo yena paryāyena sa bodhisattvo mahāsattvo ‘vinivartaniyāyo bhavet \(F6v3\) saced\(^{156}\) bodhisattvo mahāsattvaścītm prajñāpāramitāṃ śrutvā vā ‘śrutvā\(^{157}\) vā\(^{158}\) evaṃ pratipadyeta, evaṃ visarjayed\(^{159}\) avinivartaniyāyo bodhisattvo mahāsattvo veditavyāḥ ||

subhūtir āha \(F6v3\) tena hi bhagavan bhahōvā bodhāya caranti \(F6v4\) alpa(\(F6v2\)) kāḥ punar ya evam visarjayanti ||

bhagavān āha \(F6v5\) tathā hi subhūte ‘Ipakās\(^{160}\) te bodhisattvā mahāsattvā ye vyākṛtā avinivartaniyāyāṃ jñānabhūmau ye punas te vyākṛtā bhavisyanti te evaṃ visarjayisyanti \(F6v6\) te te bodhisattvā mahāsattvā uttaptāvāropitau(\(F6v3\))śalamūlaṃ veditavyāḥ\(^{161}\) \(F6v7\) te te bodhisattvā mahāsattvā asaṃhāryāḥ sadevamānuṣāsūreṇa lokena ||

\(^{149}\) sa cet, AsP(M).

\(^{150}\) sarvasattvāparityāgacītotpādāṃ, AsP(M), AAA, and AsP(V).

\(^{151}\) nopadarśayet, AsP(V), which also adds punctuation after requiring a change to sandhi.

\(^{152}\) nopa[d]iśati [v]i[ś]a[d]a .. ///, ms. diverging from the edited texts.

\(^{153}\) /// āven[ī]ko avaiva[ṛyas]y[ā] boddhasatvasya .. ///, ms. One sees that the word order of the ms. differs here from the three editions.

\(^{154}\) dharmaḥ, AsP(V).

\(^{155}\) Ms. omits mahāsattvāya: // dhisatvasya bh[ū] .. ///.

\(^{156}\) sa ced, AsP(M).

\(^{157}\) aśrutvā, AsP(V).

\(^{158}\) vā, AsP(V).

\(^{159}\) visarjayet, AsP(V).

\(^{160}\) alpakās, AsP(V).

\(^{161}\) śalamūlaṃ vedyai ..., ms.
sa cet\textsuperscript{162} punaḥ subhūte bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ svapnāntaragato ’pi svapnopamāḥ sarvadharmā iti vyavaloKayati na ca sākṣātkaroti l idam api subhūte ’vinivartanīyasya\textsuperscript{163} bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasyāvinivartanīyalakṣaṇam veditavyam l

punar aparām subhūte bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ svapnāntaragato ’pi (F6v4)šrāvakabhūmānaḥ va pratyekabuddhabhūmānaḥ va traiddhātukāya\textsuperscript{164} ca sprḥāma nuṣāṃsāccitaṃ notpādayati l idam api subhūte ’vinivartanīyasya\textsuperscript{165} bodhisattvasya mahāsattvāna(F6v5)śyāvinivartanīyalakṣaṇanam\textsuperscript{166} veditavyam l

punar aparām subhūte bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ svapnāntaragato ’py anekaṣātāyāh parśado ’nekasahasrāyaḥ yāvad anekakṣaṭniyutātāsahasrāyāḥ parśado madhyagatam maṇḍalamāde\textsuperscript{167} niṣāṇaṃ (F6v6) bhikṣusamghaparivṛtam bodhisattvasamghaparivṛtam\textsuperscript{168} dharmaṃ desayantam tathāgatam arhantam sāmyaksambuddham ātmānam paśyati l idam api subhūte ’vinivartanīyasya\textsuperscript{169} bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasyāvinivartanīyalakṣaṇam\textsuperscript{170} veditavyam l

punar aparām subhūte bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ svapnāntaragato ’pi vaihāyasam abhyudgamyā sattvebhyo dharmaṃ desayatī tāṃ ca vyāmaprabhāṃ samjānte tāṃś ca bhikṣūn abhinirmimēte ye ’nyāsu dikṣū gatvā ’nyēṣu\textsuperscript{171} lokadhātūsu buddhākṛtyaṃ kurvānti dharmaṃ ca desayantī l evam api subhūte svapnāntaragatoa ’vinivartanīyo bodhisattvo mahāsattvaḥ samjānte l idam api subhūte ’vinivarthanīyasya\textsuperscript{172} bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasyāvinivartanīyalakṣaṇam\textsuperscript{173} veditavyam l

\textsuperscript{162} AsP(M).
\textsuperscript{163} avinivartanīyasya, AsP(V).
\textsuperscript{164} AsP(M) notes a variant of traiddhātukāya.
\textsuperscript{165} avinivartanīyasya, AsP(V).
\textsuperscript{166} [syāv]aivertyalakṣaṇam, ms. mahāsattvasya ’vinivartanīyalakṣaṇam, AsP(M).
\textsuperscript{167} maṇḍalamāde, AsP(V).
\textsuperscript{168} /// .. [gha] ṭ [pa]rivṛtam bhikṣusamgha .. ///, ms. The order of words diverges from the three editions here. We may tentatively reconstruct: (bodhisattvasam)gparivṛtam bhikṣusamgha(puraskṛtam), reversing the order of bodhisatva and bhikṣu respectively.
\textsuperscript{169} avinivartanīyasya, AsP(V).
\textsuperscript{170} mahāsattvasya ’vinivartanīyalakṣaṇam, AAA.
\textsuperscript{171} anyeṣu, AsP(V).
\textsuperscript{172} avinivartanīyasya, AsP(V).
\textsuperscript{173} mahāsattvasyāvinivartanīyalakṣaṇam, AAA. mahāsattvasyā avinivartanīyalakṣaṇam, AsP(V).
punar aparāṃ subhūte s(F6v7)vapnāntaragato bodhisattvo mahāsattvo nottrasyati na saṃtrasyati na saṃtrāsam āpadyate | grāmahāte vā naga-
raghāte vā nigamaghāte vā janapadaghāte vā rāṣṭraghāte vā agnidāhe vā vartamāne vyālamṛgān vā tato ’nyān api vā kṣudramṛgajātīn drṣṭvā śiraśchede vā pragyupasthite tato ’nyāny api vā mahābhayabhairavāṇi duhkhaaurmanasyāṇi vā prápya tato ’nyesām api vā sattvānāṃ mahābhaya-
yabhairavāṇi duḥkhāni drṣṭvā nāsyā bhayabhairavam utpadyate nottrasyati na saṃtrasyati na saṃtrāsam āpadyate | tataś ca svapnāntarāt prati-
vibuddhasya samanantaravyutthitasyaivaṃ bhavati | svapnopamam idam sarvaṃ traidhātukaṃ174 | evaṃ ca mayā ’nuttarāṃ175 samyaksambodhīṃ abhisambudhya samyag desayatā dharmo desayitavya iti | idam api subhūte ’vinivartanīyasaya176 bodhisattvasya mahāsattvasyāvinivartani-yalakṣaṇam177 veditavyam ||

Translation:

“So, I will act such that each and every of these faults will not appear, will not be conceived in any way at all.” Thus, he focusses his attention upon all beings and so the bodhisattva mahāsattva is one endowed with this mindful, focused attention, with this production of thought. Thus, he is one endowed with skillful means. He is one who has comprehended by the perfection of insight the true nature of these deep dharmas, contemplating in accordance with emptiness, causelessness, aimlessness, non-accumulation [of karma], non-origination, nonbirth, non-becoming. It is an impossibility, Subhūti, and out of the question that such a bodhisattva mahāsattva who is endowed with knowledge of this kind might fall into the non-accumulation [of karma] or associate with the triple universe. This possibility does not exist.

Therefore Subhūti, suppose a bodhisattva mahāsattva were to be questioned by [another] bodhisattva mahāsattva who is desirous of perfectly understanding unparalleled, complete and perfect awakening: “Which of

174 traidhātukam, AsP(V).
175 anuttarāṃ, AsP(V).
176 avinivartanīyasaya, AsP(V).
177 mahāsattvasya ’vinivartanīyalakṣaṇam, AsP(M). mahāsattvasya avinivartani-yalakṣaṇam, AsP(V).
these dharma are to be cultivated? What kind of characteristics and aspirations are to be undertaken [so that] a bodhisattva mahāsattva does not realize emptiness when these aspirations are undertaken, he does not realize causelessness, he does not realize aimlessness, he does not realize non-accumulation [of karma], he does not realize non-origination, he does not realize nonbirth, he does not realize non-becoming, but would cultivate the perfection of insight?"

If, Subhūti, the bodhisattva mahāsattva questioned in this way by [another] bodhisattva mahāsattva [who] declares: “Only emptiness is to be fixed in mind by the bodhisattva mahāsattva, only causelessness, only aimlessness, only non-accumulation [of karma], only non-origination, only nonbirth, only non-becoming are to be fixed in mind by the Bodhisattva Mahāsattva.”

If he does not display the production of the thought of the non-abandonment of all beings, or he should not declare skillful means, [then] it is to be known, Subhūti, that this bodhisattva mahāsattva is not predicted in irreversible unparalleled complete and perfect awakening by previous tathāgatas, arhats, complete and perfect buddhas.

What is the reason for this? The particular dharma of an irreversible bodhisattva mahāsattva, he does not reveal that dharma, he does not recognize it, he does not extol it, he does not display it, he does not claim it, when questioned he does not declare it, he does not answer, he does not enter that stage, which is that stage of the irreversible bodhisattva mahāsattva.

Subhūti said:

Further, Blessed One, [how] should this method be? By which method might a bodhisattva mahāsattva be irreversible?

The Blessed One said:

Subhūti, this method should be [this way]: A bodhisattva mahāsattva should be irreversible by this method. If a bodhisattva mahāsattva, [either] having heard this perfection of insight, or not having heard it were to behave in this way, were to respond in this way, then that bodhisattva mahāsattva is to be considered irreversible.

Subhūti said:

By this then, Blessed One, there are many who travel toward awakening. However, few are able to answer correctly.
The Blessed One said:

Indeed, Subhūti, these few bodhisattvas mahāsattvas, they are those who have been predicted into the stage of knowledge in irreversibility. Further, they who are those that will be predicted, they will answer in this way. Those very bodhisattvas mahāsattvas are known to be those whose wholesome roots have been planted and purified. Those very bodhisattvas mahāsattvas are incorruptible by the world with its gods, men, and asuras.

Further, Subhūti, if a bodhisattva mahāsattva even in a dream beholds: “all dharmas are like a dream” and does not realize [it upon waking], this also, Subhūti, is to be considered the mark of irreversibility of an irreversible bodhisattva mahāsattva.

Moreover, Subhūti, if a bodhisattva mahāsattva even in a dream does not produce the intention of profit or take delight in the śrāvakabhūmi, or the pratyekabuddhabhūmi, or the triple universe [of kāma, rūpa, and arūpa], this also, Subhūti, is to be considered the irreversible mark of an irreversible bodhisattva mahāsattva.

Moreover, Subhūti, if a bodhisattva mahāsattva even in a dream sees himself as a tathāgata, an arhat, a complete and perfect buddha teaching dharma honored by a community of bodhisattvas, surrounded by a community of monks, seated in a circular hall, in the middle of an assembly spanning many hundreds, many thousands, up to many hundreds of thousands of millions of tens of millions [of people], this also, Subhūti, is to be considered the irreversible mark of an irreversible bodhisattva mahāsattva.

Moreover, Subhūti, if a bodhisattva mahāsattva even in a dream, having risen in the air teaches dharma to beings, and [if] he recognizes a halo extending a fathom [around himself], and creates monks who, having gone in the other directions, make the actions of a buddha in other world-systems, and they teach dharma [in those places]. Subhūti, even in a dream an irreversible bodhisattva mahāsattva recognizes [such things], this also, Subhūti, is to be considered the irreversible mark of an irreversible bodhisattva mahāsattva.

Moreover, Subhūti, if a bodhisattva mahāsattva in a dream, will not tremble, will not be afraid, does not fall into fear. When he has seen a village, town, city, nation, or kingdom plundered, or a firestorm spread,
or fierce animals and other aggressive wild beasts; when he has had his head about to be cut off, or other terrifying dread and despairing pain; or, when he has even seen the terrifying dread and pain of other beings: no terrifying dread appears for him. He will not tremble, will not be afraid, does not fall into fear. And immediately upon emerging and awakening from the dream he reflects: “The entirety of the triple universe is like a dream and thus, having realized complete, unparalleled, perfect awakening, teaching properly I should teach dharma.” This also, Subhūti, is to be considered the irreversible mark of an irreversible bodhisattva mahāsattva.

Fig. 9: Fragment 6 recto.\textsuperscript{178} 
Courtesy the Archaeological Institute of Afghanistan

\textsuperscript{178} Note that the right-hand side of the recto is folded over the verso. Therefore, some portions of recto lines 5–7 are covering the verso side as can be seen in fig. 10.
Fig. 10: Fragment 6 verso (with the latter portions of recto lines 5–7). Courtesy the Archaeological Institute of Afghanistan

Fig. 11: Fragment 6a. Courtesy the Archaeological Institute of Afghanistan

Fig. 12: Fragment 6b. Courtesy the Archaeological Institute of Afghanistan
Fragment 7a–c: Unidentified

There is presently little to say about Fragment 7a–7c until images taken after further excavation or restoration are available. These were photographed *in situ* at Mes Aynak site 117 in a jumble of tangled folios and dirt, a common sight with much of the manuscript material discovered at the site. All three fragments are small due to being obscured by earth, with only between 2 and 4 lines per fragment visible. The true size of these fragments is unclear. It is probable that the great portion of the folios these fragments belong to are present but mostly buried in the earth. Fragment 7a, in the center of the image, is the largest visible portion at 4 lines. This is the most extant fragment with three *akṣaras* legible. Based on the reading of line 2, it is possible Fragment 7a corresponds to the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* preserved in Fragments 6–6b. However, this is in no way certain. Fragment 7b is directly below 7a. It runs 3 lines. Fragment 7c is directly to the left of 7b. I have only found a single ligature to be legible on both Fragments 7b and 7c.

Transliteration:

7a

1 /// + + + + .. ///
2 /// .. [buddhabhe]179 .. .. ///
3 /// .. .. ///
4 /// .. ///

7b

1 /// .[y]. .. ///
2 /// .. .. .. .. ///
3 /// .. .. .. .. ///

179 Perhaps we might reconstruct this line in the fragment to *ja*(ge)*buddha bhe*(syati) corresponding to verse 24.26 of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. 
7c

1 /// .. [e] .. ///
2 /// .. .. .. ///

Sigla

[ ] square brackets

1. damaged aksaras or uncertain readings (transliteration)
2. text that is not present in Sanskrit witness (translation)

/// three oblique dashes

○ circle

break in folio or fragment (transliteration)
punch or string hole in ms. (transliteration)

double circle symbol in ms. (transliteration)

diamond gap between aksaras in ms. (transliteration)
white florette floral embellishment/disk in ms. (transliteration)
( ) parenthesis restoration in ms. (reconstruction)
⟨⟩ pointed brackets addition by editor (reconstruction)
{ } curly brackets deletion by editor (reconstruction)
{{ }} double curly brackets deletion in ms. (transliteration)
underline 1. emendation of individual \( \text{akṣara} \) by editor (reconstruction)
2. signification of Mes Aynak fragment present in corresponding witness testimony
+ cross unreconstructed, missing \( \text{akṣara} \)
.. two dots unreconstructed, illegible or damaged \( \text{akṣara} \)
. one dot unreconstructed, illegible or damaged inherent vowel, diacritic, or ligature of an \( \text{akṣara} \)
* asterisk \( \text{virāma} \)
• higher dot dot like punctuation in ms.
; semicolon punctuation added by editor where \( \text{sandhi} \) would make a \( \text{daṇḍa} \) impossible
| vertical bar \( \text{daṇḍa} \)
|| double vertical bar double \( \text{daṇḍa} \)
‘a avagraha

Abbreviations

AAA * Abhisamayālaṃkār'āloka Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā (containing the Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā). See Wogihara 1932–1935.
ARIRIAB Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University
AsP(M) Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā. See Mitra 1888.
AsP(V) Aṣṭasāhasrikāprajñāpāramitā. See Vaidya 1960a.
D Derge edition of the Tibetan Tripiṭaka.
Maitr-vyāk(LN) Maitreyavyākaraṇa. See Li and Nagashima 2013.
MP I Facsimile of the Mahāprajñāpāramitā manuscript found at Gilgit number 1. See Karashima et al. 2016.
MP II Facsimile of the Mahāprajñāpāramitā manuscript found at Gilgit number 2. See Karashima and Tamai 2019.
ms. manuscript.
Saddhp(D) Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra. See Dutt 1953.
Saddhp(KN) Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. See Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912.
Saddhp(J1) Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. See Jiang 2006a.
Saddhp(J2) Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. See Jiang 2006b.
Saddhp(J3) Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. See Jiang 2006c.
Saddhp(V) Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. See Vaidya 1960b.
Saddhp(W1) Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra (Gilgit Manuscript Group A). See Watanabe 1975.
Saddhp(W2) Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra (Gilgit Manuscript Group B). See Watanabe 1975.
Saddhp(WT) Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. See Wogihara and Tsuchida 1934.
SHT Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfan-Funden. See Wille and Bechert 2004.
T Taishō Shinshō Daizōkyō or Taishō Issaikyō. See Takakusu and Watanabe 1924ff.
Upāyikā Śamathadeva, Abhidharmakośopāyikā-ṭīkā, Derge 4094.
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