An Early Manuscript Fragment of Dharmarakṣa's Translation of the **Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodana*

Jonathan Silk (Leiden University) and
Imre Galambos (University of Cambridge)[1]

I. The Sūtra

Until recently, the Mahāyāna sūtra known as the **Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodana* (AjKV) had been paid scant attention by scholars, most likely because, in contrast to a work like the *Lotus Sūtra*, there was no continuing tradition of its study among modern Buddhist communities. However, the AjKV was one of the first Mahāyāna sūtras—one of the first Buddhist texts of any kind, in fact—translated into Chinese, having been rendered by Lokakṣema (支婁迦讖) in the mid-second century (*Asheshi wang jing* 阿闍世王經, T. 626), a fact which drew it, notably, to the attention of Paul Harrison (1993). In the years since, study of the AjKV has been promoted by the discovery of Sanskrit fragments principally from Afghanistan, published in the first instance in several articles contained in important volumes produced under the general editorship of none other than Jens Erland Braarvig (Harrison and Hartmann 1998, 2000, 2002, and more recently Ye, Li and Kano, 2013: 41–42, Kanō, 2015 [a twelfth century Kashmiri collection of excerpts, a format which raises many interesting questions]). In addition to the translation by Lokakṣema and the still quite fragmentary Sanskrit materials, we have a rendering in Tibetan (D 216), and two other Chinese translations. One of these is credited to Fatian (法天), the *Weicengyou zhengfa jing* (未曾有正法經, T. 628). The other is the focus of the present contribution, namely the *Wenshushili Puchao sanmei jing* (文殊師利普超三昧經, T. 627, hereafter PSJ), translated by Dharmarakṣa (竺法護) in 287 (according to the table in Boucher 2006, 24, published [出] on 28 January in that year).[2]

The manuscript studied here was seen by one of the authors [JAS] in 1997, at which time it was in the possession of Dr. Paul Wang of Kalamazoo, Michigan. He was given to understand that Dr. Wang had purchased it from a book dealer, perhaps in Taiwan or Hong Kong. At that time Silk obtained a photocopy of the manuscript,

---

1 JAS is primarily responsible for the first part of this article and its overall formulation, IG the second. The authors are grateful to Miyazaki Tenshō for his generosity in sharing his materials with us, as well as critically reading several drafts of the present contribution.

2 The source of this dating is evidently the citation of the 27th day, 12th month, 7th year of the Taikang (太康) reign period of the Jin dynasty (晉), found in the *Chu sanzang jiji* (出三藏記集, T. 2145 [LV] 7b25–26).

and three color slides were taken by Bai Qianshen (白謙慎); it is these which form the basis for the present discussion. We consequently express our thanks both to Dr. Wang and to Prof. Bai. Several years ago, we are informed, Dr. Wang sold the manuscript, and unfortunately it has not been possible to determine its present owner or location. For reasons of convenience only, then, we refer to it as the "Kalamazoo manuscript". Since we do not have access to the manuscript itself, a number of questions could not be answered, such as when, how and why the manuscript was backed, as it evidently was, what kind of paper it is written on, and so forth.

Of the manuscript, what remains consists of 62 lines, several of them only very partial, the beginning and end also both being damaged and missing. The extant text corresponds to T. 627 (XV) 408b16–409a28.[3] In the so-far unpublished critical edition of Miyazaki (see below), the extant portion corresponds to sections §24–34 of the first chapter.[4] Almost every line of the manuscript contains a regular count of 19 characters (but for more on this description see the second part of the present article, below). Since the extant portion belongs to the first chapter, and thus first scroll (*juan* [卷]), of the sūtra, we know where the scroll must have started. This in turn allows us to calculate that 160 lines are missing at the beginning. Since the lines are ruled at approximately 1.7cm per column, we can conclude that the missing portion was approximately 255cm long. It is not known if this portion is somewhere extant, though no similar manuscripts have been reported, to the best of our knowledge. Since the manuscript, however, is manifestly old, it is most likely that it was already fragmentary in the medieval period and that no additonal portions ever existed in modern times.[5]

The section to which the fragment belongs is that recounting the discussion between Mañjuśrī and 25 bodhisattvas and 4 gods on the nature of the knowledge of the ominiscient one (*sarvajñajñāna* [not all versions of the sūtra reflect the same technical vocabulary, however]). The Kalamazoo manuscript begins in the midst of the 20th bodhisattva, continuing past the last of the gods.

Before discussing the text further it will be helpful to offer a transcript. This follows the line divisions of the manuscript, but does not attempt to reproduce the form of the characters in the manuscript. Unusual forms are discussed in the second part of this article. When the text differs from the unified reading of all other sources, or corresponds to a particular textual tradition, this is noted. The whole section of

---

3 For the sake of comparison, in the corresponding section of the Derge Kanjur 216, the passage is found at *mdo sde*, *tsha*, 216b3–219a1, although the relation between the two versions is somewhat fluid. No Sanskrit materials corresponding to this section of the text have yet been discovered.

4 That this chapter may have been added after the core composition of the scripture, as suggested by Miyazaki (2012: 88), is of little relevance here.

5 In light of the question of the provenance of the manuscript, however, we cannot rule out that other portions may exist, for instance if the dealer separated into parts an originally larger fragment. However, there is no evidence for this and it does not appear to us a likely scenario.

text which precedes the fragment (the entire section of the 20th bodhisattva, that is), and that which follows, concluding the discussion which ends in our fragment *in media res*, are provided in small characters. In the transcript, missing characters are provided in smaller type and in grey, to distinguish them from attested readings.

喜王菩薩曰假使有人罵詈誹謗輕易毀辱撾捶打撲於菩薩者心不懷恨而加喜悅以善友想待遇對者而能忍辱現于忍力其心欣豫思惟其法何所是罵誰爲罵者信解内空不疑外空自見己身又覩他人則歡喜悅便能惠施身命支體頭眼手足妻子男女國城丘聚財穀珍寶倍復踊躍寧聞一頌恬忽世榮轉輪王位常樂爲人講説經法不羨帝釋思開一人使發道心不僥梵天願見

1 如來不貪三千大千世界滿溢琦珍從生明達不
2 乏諸根信樂愛敬諸道法品如是悅樂所造行者
3 則應大乘諸通慧矣
4 、察无沂菩薩曰假使見一切法度于彼岸不隋貪
5 身淨諸佛土覩諸佛國皆亦淨清亦无想行見一
6 切佛不發色想見衆羣黎想雖有肉眼覩罪福淨
7 具足天眼得无所壞雖得慧眼離諸塵勞信樂佛眼
8 具足成就十八不共諸佛之法已得法眼具足如
9 來十種之力假使菩薩所被德鎧信行如斯則應
10 大乘諸通慧矣
11 、遊无際法行菩薩曰族性子知一切緣菩薩所爲
12 則述隅趣諸通敏慧所以者何觀諸所有一切因緣
13 不住於内不處於外不在口言假使菩薩不住因
14 緣亦不御趣塵勞之礙亦不勸導罪福之礙无報
15 應礙无諸根礙无諸法礙无非慧礙已度罪福塵
16 垢魔界則應大乘諸通慧矣
17 、超魔見菩薩曰唯族姓子已住吾我自見已身
18 則便處于魔之事業已斷吾我不覩所愛已除所
19 見則无諸陰已除諸陰則不見魔已度魔界則尋

20 逮成无礙脫門菩薩已逮无礙脫門則應大乘諸
21 通慧矣
22 、无憂施菩薩曰仁者當知其犯惡者後懷湯火其
23 爲善業後无憂戚是故菩薩當修善業其所作者
24 无能説短所興造者後无所悔无諸礙蓋假使衆
25 生愁憂不樂則爲講説離憂之法菩薩大士如是
26 行者則應大乘諸慧矣
27 諸告誼菩薩曰唯族姓子其有士夫奉禁誡者所
28 願必獲已獲所願獲護立本由无放逸立无逸已
29 具道品法已能具立道品之法則諸通慧戒禁
30 之正也菩薩已住无逸道品則應大乘諸通慧矣
31 普花天子曰譬族姓子樹花盛時多所饒益於一
32 切人菩薩以功德本而自莊嚴猶樹花茂饒益群
33 黎如忉利天上晝度之樹紛葩茂盛忉利諸天莫
34 不樂仰菩薩如是以諸法門而自挍飾諸天龍神
35 揵沓恕世人阿須倫靡不宋戴猶如天上明月之珠
36 无有瑕穢衆德具足開士志姓清淨无瑕德誼顯
37 備則應大乘諸通慧矣
38 、光花天子曰譬族子曰出光明滅除衆冥終始述
39 現菩薩如是具足慧光慧法施世爲諸愚冥无明
40 衆生顯示大光導自然法其幽闇者不能幣暉其
41 光明者則能消冥導示徑路已住徑路菩薩大士
42 其在邪徑示現正路已住正路則應大乘諸通慧矣
43 、心花香天子曰譬族姓子心花之樹其香普薰周
44 卅里其香无想菩薩如是以戒博聞定慧解度知
45 見之香以爲芬薰三千大千世界以法之香靡不

46 周遍一切衆病香即療愈假使菩薩被此法香則
47 應大乘諸通慧矣
48 、常進法行天子曰仁者當知其精進者无懈怠心
49 是故菩薩修諸德本而不懈倦常當遵崇志八法
50 行何等八六度无極四等梵行遊步五通而以四恩
51 救攝群萌志三脫門逮得法忍勸勉佛慧開化衆
52 生令發道意權方便接齊有爲所有諸法是爲
53 遵崇八法之行則應大乘諸通慧矣
54 、於是溥首謂諸正士及天子曰仁者欲知菩薩精
55 進若不精進至諸通慧所以者何其翫習者行在
56 三界若遵修者謂諸往見其翫習者是謂爲内亦
57 不翫習是謂爲外其翫習者謂聲聞地若遵修者
58 謂緣覺地其翫習者謂在衆結所行懃勞若遵修
59 者則謂所著凡夫之法其翫習者謂爲名若遵修
60 者則謂爲色其翫習者謂爲報應若遵修者則謂
61 所見其翫習者謂有所著若遵修者則謂有所得
62 其翫習者即謂我所若遵修者則謂吾身其翫習

者即謂慳貪若遵修者則謂布施而不想慢其翫習者即謂犯戒若修者則謂持戒而不想慢其翫習者謂瞋怒若遵修者則謂忍辱而不想慢其翫習者謂懈怠若遵修者則謂精進而不想慢其翫習者謂亂意若遵修者則謂一心而不想慢其翫習者謂愚癡若遵修者則謂智慧而不想慢其翫習者謂不善本若遵修者謂等善本而不想慢其翫習者謂无福根若遵修者謂殖德本而不想慢其翫習者謂世俗法若遵修者謂度世法而不想慢其翫習者謂有爲法若遵修者謂无爲法而不想慢其翫習者謂爲罪若遵修者謂无罪法而不想慢其翫習者謂諸漏若遵修者則謂无漏而不想慢是謂翫習至於遵修離諸所見不著不斷菩薩指趣則應大乘諸通慧矣

Sources referred to below:
F = Fangshan (房山)
K = Kōshōji (興聖寺)

N = Nanatsudera (七寺)[6]
M = Miyazaki's unpublished critical edition collating all relevant sources
S = Shōgozō (聖語藏)

1: 琦] With Fuzhou (福州) and Qisha (磧砂), against F, K, N, S, which read 奇; First and Second Koryŏ (高麗) prints read 珂
2: 法品] M: 品法
3: 沂] With S alone
4: 隋] M: 堕
5: 淨清] M: 清淨
6: 衆] with K, N, S and several others, against 諸
7: 所] Added small on the right, therefore the line has 20 characters
11: 族性子] M: 族姓子
12: 述隅] M: 悉歸
12: 所] Added small on the right, therefore the line has 20 characters
15: 礙] Here and below this is written in the manuscript as 导, a well recognized form
17: 唯] Agreeing with F, K, N, S.
17: 已住吾我自見已身] MS written 已住吾我已自見已身 with the second 已 deleted with a mark of ∶ to its right. M: 已住吾我自見己身. The characters 己, 已 and 已 are extremely frequently indistinguishable.
18: 愛] M: 虛, with the variant 處 (N, K). See the discussion below.
23: 戚] M: 感.
23: 業 appears twice in the line, but the forms do not resemble each other. One looks close to 24310 at http://dict.variants.moe.edu.tw/fulu/fu13/biau/bp2431.htm, the other 㝵 earlier in the line.
26: 諸慧] M: 諸通慧
27: {告}] Against 吉 in N, S? Since it is damaged, it is not possible to see whether we have 告 or 吉.
27, 36: 誼] M: 議
27: 唯] With F, K, N, S
27: 禁誡者] M: 禁戒者
28: 獲護] M: 所獲
30: 道品] M: 道法
33: 天上晝] M: 天晝
34: 樂] M: 敬
35: 蒴] M: 和
35: 不 added small in the right margin; therefore this line has 20 characters

6 The Nanatsudera materials were made available to Miyazaki by Prof. Toshinori Ochiai through the photos taken by the Research Institute for Old Japanese Manuscripts of Buddhist Scriptures (日本古写経研究所) at the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies (ICPBS, 国際仏教学大学院大学). As with reference to the other sources cited here, our reference is only to Miyazaki's transcripts.

35: 宋] M: 宗
36: 志姓] M: 志性
38: 族子] M: 族姓子
38, 39 & 41: For 冥 see http://dict.variants.moe.edu.tw/yitia/fra/fra00306.htm
38: 述] M: 光
40, 41, 45: For 導 see the discussion below.
41: For 徑, see the forms at http://dict.variants.moe.edu.tw/yitia/fra/fra01289.htm
42: 矣 written below the bottom line; therefore this line has 20 characters
49: 懈] M: 厭
50: 四 added small in the right margin; therefore this line has 20 characters
52: 齊] with Second Koryŏ print, against other versions with 濟
52: 是爲] M: 是爲八
56: 遵修] Corrected from 修遵 with レ
56: 是謂] Corrected from 謂是 with レ
57: 遵修] Corrected from 修遵 with レ
58: 勲] Agreeing with K, N, S
59: 翫習者謂] agreeing with F, K, N, S; First and Second Koryŏ 翫習者即謂; Fuzhou and Qisha 翫習者則謂
60: 則謂爲] Corrected from 則爲謂 with レ
60: 翫習者謂] Agreeing with F, K, N; First and Second Koryŏ 翫習者即謂; Fuzhou and Qisha 翫習者則謂

As this text is difficult to understand in parts, and moreover as a comprehensive interpretation would require a broader study of the sūtra as a whole, in its various versions, for the moment we prefer not to essay a translation.[7]

The scholar who has devoted the greatest attention to the AjKV, Miyazaki Tenshō (宮崎展昌) (most notably 2012), traces two lineages of the text, one of which is represented by the Tibetan translation and Fatian's version, the other by the Sanskrit materials, Lokakṣema's translation and that of Dharmarakṣa. What is more relevant for our present purposes, however, is his attempt to trace the lineage of the PSJ within China. Toward this end, in his 2016 study he examined virtually all available sources, seeking to determine a lineation. Thanks to the kindness of Dr. Miyazaki, JAS was able to compare the manuscript studied here with Miyazaki's collation of these sources, in an attempt to try to locate the Kalamazoo manuscript—undoubtably the earliest extant source for the PSJ—in the context of other transmitted versions. Miyazaki concludes that the lineage of the Shōgozō (聖語蔵)—that is, the text preserved in the Tōdai-ji (東大寺) and representing Sui-Tang manuscripts—and the two printings of the Koryŏ canon, the Kaibao (開寶) lineage, while sharing a great many readings in the second and third *juan*, are in an indeterminate relation in the case of the first *juan* (to which our fragment belongs). The readings we can verify, as detailed in the notes above, while based on an extremely small sample, indicate if

7 A translation of the corresponding section in Lokakṣema's version can be found in Sadakata 1989: 23–27.

anything a closer connection between the Kalamazoo manuscript and the Fangshan (房山), Kōshōji (興聖寺), Nanatsudera (七寺) and Shōgozō versions of the text. At the same time, when we look to the translation of the name Mañjuśrī, which Miyazaki 2016: 490 (35) points to as indicative, we find that in the Kalamazoo manuscript, line 54, this is rendered 溥首, which, according to Miyazaki's enumeration, is found in the second and third—not the first—*juan* of the Shōgozō, while the first *juan* of the Shōgozō, and Fangshan and later editions (Yuan, Ming), have 濡首, and the first Koryŏ, the Song and the Fuzhou edition read 軟首. A number of other differences in this relatively short span of text also suggest that the lineage of the Kalamazoo manuscript does not correspond in any obvious way to the lines discernible based on the transmitted versions. We gain, therefore, even from this relatively small snippet of text, some important insights into the textual history of the PSJ, and perhaps by extension, a reason to wonder just how far back collations of extant sources of other Chinese translations—in almost all cases significantly more recent than the Kalamazoo manuscript—can really be expected to take us. In other words, if the Kalamazoo manuscript suggests for the PSJ that the transmitted texts preserve some version(s) of the translation at variance with earlier forms, we may legitimately wonder whether the same might not be true for other earlier Chinese translations, and further ask ourselves what implications this might have for our attempts to recover genuinely earlier forms of these texts.

II. Observations on the Manuscript Itself

Although we have been able to study the manuscript only from photographs, it is still possible to make some observations regarding its codicological characteristics. It is written on brownish paper mounted by modern conservators on backing paper, presumably because the verso had no text. The paper is ruled, producing vertical columns and a top and a bottom margins. Both top and bottom margins are quite narrow but the top one is especially so. The columns are of more or less equal width (ca. 1.7 cm), and the written lines lean slightly to the left side. The calligraphy is executed with great care and the individual characters are of equal size and consistent orthography. The ruling is also highly regular. All these traits suggest that the manuscript was an officially commissioned scroll, rather than a copy of a text prepared for personal use or study.

One of the common methods of dating is through orthography, as even undated manuscripts and inscriptions often contain variants that can be tied to a particular time period. In the context of Dunhuang and Turfan manuscripts, the most common such time-specific variants are taboo characters (usually associated with a reign of a ruler) and the dozen and a half characters introduced during the reign of Empress

Wu Zetian 武則天 (r. 690–705).[8] The Kalamazoo manuscript, however, seems to have no taboo characters, and dates to a time quite a bit earlier than that of the Empress Wu. Yet it has a considerable number of graphs that are different from their modern equivalents. In this respect, we may call them 'non-standard variants', but this is meaningful only from the perspective of our modern understanding of the standard shape of characters. In reality, the standard forms themselves changed over time and, despite the seemingly vast body of available manuscripts, we may not necessarily know what the standard way of writing a character was at a particular moment in history. Medieval character compendia such as the *Ganlu zishu* 干祿字書 (eighth century), *Longkan shoujing* 龍龕手鏡 (997) or even dictionaries found in Dunhuang do not provide information about the diachronic use of the forms. Thus, instead of trying to find character forms that differ from our modern standard forms or from those used in Tang manuscripts, it is better to identify those few that changed over time and are thus useful for narrowing down the time frame of the manuscript.

No.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Shelfmark	Kalamazoo	DY001	DY257	DY117	DY071	S.6659
Variant						

Table 1. Variant forms of the character 愛 seen in he Kalamazoo manuscript and in Dunhuang manuscripts.

One such example is the character *ai* 愛 ("love") which appears in the manuscript twice (lines 2 and 18), both times with identical structure. The *Dunhuang suzidian* 敦煌俗字典 (Huang 2005), listing variants extracted from Dunhuang manuscripts, offers eleven examples of the character, five of which are shown here in Table 1. None of these matches the variant in the Kalamazoo manuscript, but we can see a closer similarity with forms from early manuscripts (i.e. forms 2–5), in which the top part resembles the component 木. In contrast, form 6 essentially corresponds to the modern simplified form of the character. Unfortunately, the examples come from undated manuscripts, and it is thus difficult to follow the development of the orthographic structure of the character through time.

If we consult the Dunhuang manuscripts, we can see that form 6 was already in use during the second half of the fifth century, as it appears in silk scroll P.4506 with a copy of the *Jin guangming jing* 金光明經 dated to 471. The modern unsimplified

8 On taboo characters in Dunhuang, see Dou 2013; on the use of Empress Wu characters in manuscripts, see Drège 1984. For a recent study of the nature of Empress Wu characters, see Bottéro 2013.

(i.e. traditional) form with the 心 component at the centre of the character appears in manuscript S.81 from the year 506, although form 2 in Table 1 above also bears some similarity. The form in the Kalamazoo manuscript is different from all others in that it has the component 十 in the left bottom part of the graph. The *Longkan shoujing* (552), which records variants from Buddhist manuscripts of the entire medieval period, lists a form the lower half of which consists of 忄 and 史, showing that the component in question ultimately represents the component 忄 (i.e. 心). Similarly, the Qing-dynasty epigraphic dictionary *Libian* 隸辨 (553–554) records a form with 心 and 攴 as its lower part as being used in a Han stele. Nevertheless, as there are only a few dated manuscripts from the fifth century or before, there is insufficient evidence to establish a more precise time frame for the orthographic development of this character; we can only maintain that the form in the Kalamazoo manuscript in general probably comes from before the 470s. Incidentally, the second occurrence of the character in the manuscript (in line 18) corresponds either to the character 虛 or 處 of the transmitted versions, which is possibly a graphic mistake caused by the similarity of variants of 愛 (DY177) with variants of 虛 or of 處 (DY042, S.76). We should note, however, that this type of confusion is more likely to occur with such early forms of these characters, rather those that are used during later periods.

No.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Shelfmark	Kalamazoo	GB001	DY358	DY311	S.236	S.388
Variant form						

Table 2. Variants of the character 導 seen in he Kalamazoo manuscript and in Dunhuang manuscripts.

Another example is the character *dao* 導 ("lead, conduct"), which occurs in the manuscript in lines 40, 41, and 52, with identical structure. It differs from the modern form in that the bottom component is 木 instead of 寸. The *Dunhuang suzidian* lists twelve examples, which can be divided into three main types, depending on whether the bottom component is 木, 口 or 寸. Table 2 shows the form in the Kalamazoo manuscript along with five examples from the *Dunhuang suzidian*.[9] Of these, form 3 with the component 口 at the bottom is unattested elsewhere and may be a hapax graphomenon. This leaves us with the other forms with the components 木 or 寸

9 Form 5 also clearly differs in its top component but since this variation does not seem to be part of other forms, we will not consider it here.

at the bottom. Although the *Shuowen jiezi* 說文解字 (121 – 122) explains the structure of the character as consisting of the phonetic component 道 and the semantic component 寸, in Han and early medieval epigraphic sources it occurs with the lower component written as 木 or 示 (for example, *Libian*: 593). This demonstrates that the variant in the Kalamazoo manuscript predates the Sui-Tang period, when the form with the component 寸 was the standard, but does not allow a more accurate dating.

Yet another interesting variant is the graph 戚 used in the word *youqi* 憂戚 ("anguish") in line 23. The received text in this place has the character 慼, which is the more common way of writing the second part of the same word.[10] Table 3 compares the form in the Kalamazoo manuscript and the one in an early Dunhuang manuscript (form 2) with those listed in Kehong's 可洪 *Xinji zangjing yinyi sui han lu* 新集藏經音義隨函錄, completed in 940.[11] The unusual thing about the variant is that it uses the radical 亻 instead of the leftmost stroke, which is a feature documented in Han and early medieval epigraphic sources (for example, *Libian*: 740–741). The forms shown in Table 6 all point to the fifth century or earlier but, once again, the available data is insufficient to document the chronological progress of the transition.

No.	1	2	3	4	5	6
Shelfmark	Kalamazoo	GB001				
Variant form						

Table 3. Variants of the character 戚 the Kalamazoo manuscript, a Dunhuang manuscript, and the *Xinji zangjing yinyi sui han lu* in the Koryŏ Canon.

Finally, an interesting phenomenon is the use of the graph 恕 in line 35, used in the transliteration of the word *gandharva* (*jiantahe* 揵沓恕). Graphically this is essentially the character 和 written with the component 心 underneath. The *Longkan shoujing* (19b) lists this graph and cites the *Yiqiejing yinyi* 一切經音義, a Buddhist dictionary compiled by Huilin 慧琳 in the early ninth-century:

> The character 恕 has two pronunciations: *he* 和 and *huo* 禍; Master Lin says that it is a rare form; today it is written as the character 和.
> 恕：和、禍二音，琳法師云：僻字也；今作和字。

10 In the Buddhist Canon the form 憂慼 is used about ten times more frequently than 憂戚. Note that the same word is attested in historical sources as being written with both characters, but this does not mean that the two characters are interchangeable.

11 The variants listed here are adapted from the *Koryŏ Taejanggyŏng ich'e jajŏn* 高麗大藏經異體字典; see Yi et al. 2000: 329.

However, if we check the extant editions of the *Yiqiejing yinyi*, we find that the words *pizi ye* 僻字也 are not at all connected with 愁 but instead are used to explain the character 躃 (T. 2128 [LIV] 397b22). The misattribution is most likely the result of textual corruption in the *Longkan shoujing*. Nevertheless, the character 愁 occurs in the *Yiqiejing yinyi* in several words transliterated from Indic sources, including the word *gandharva* 揵沓愁. Since the character is used exclusively in transliteration, Huilin offers no clues to its meaning, only noting that its pronunciation matches that of the character 和 or, in other cases, the character 禾. Interestingly, the character 愁 is not attested in other dictionaries before the *Yiqiejing yinyi* and the influential Ming mega-dictionary *Zhengzitong* 正字通 (1672; 31) considers it a non-standard variant (*suzi* 俗字) of the character 和. This explanation is then reiterated in the *Kangxi zidian* 康熙字典 (1716; 335) and eventually by the editors of modern *Yitizi zidian* 異體字字典 (http://dict2.variants. moe.edu.tw/variants/rbt/word_attribute.rbt?quote_code=QTAwNTU2LTAwMg).

However, categorizing 愁 as a *suzi* is problematic on at least two grounds. First, instead of being an abbreviated or cursive form, as *suzi* typically are, it differs from its alleged standard character (i.e. 和) by the addition of a four-stroke component (i.e. 心). More importantly, however, it is consistently used in transliterating several foreign words of Indic origin, which is an indication that it should be considered a different character, not just a variant. Note that the *Yiqiejing yinyi*, the first dictionary in which it is explained, does not equate it with the character 和 but merely says that it is pronounced as are the characters 和 or 禾. Similarly, the *Longkan shoujing* only says that it is today written as the character 和, which does not necessarily mean that it is the same character, only that by the late tenth century, when the *Longkan shoujing* was compiled, the words that had originally used 愁 to transliterate Indic terminology were already written with the character 和. Therefore, it would be more appropriate to consider the graph 愁 as a separate character used solely for transliterating Buddhist terminology, similar to other characters with only a phonetic but no attested semantic value (other examples include 囉, 嘍).[12] With time, even in words that had been initially transcribed with it, 愁 was systematically changed to 和 and thus went out of use. Whether this was related to a streamlining of Buddhist transcriptions or part of a standardization project that eliminated characters that did not conform to the standard of the *Shuowen*, we do not know. The character is commonly used in the works of early translators such as Lokakṣema 支婁迦讖, Dharmarakṣa 竺法護, Mokṣala 無羅叉 and Saṁghadeva 僧伽提婆 but, once again, there are not enough clearly dated sources to determine when the character went out of use.

12 This seems to be also how Huang Zheng 黃征 understands the character in question, listing it as a separate entry in his *Dunhuang suzidian*.

The Kalamazoo manuscript contains quite a few other characters that have similar diachronic patterns (e.g. 礙, 以, 能, 跟, 眼, 亦) but unfortunately these variants too only allow a very rough dating. This is partly because there are not enough dated manuscripts for a statistically reliable analysis of orthographic patterns. The orthographic structure of variants in the Kalamazoo manuscript fits well with other manuscripts and epigraphic sources from the fifth century and earlier. The character 愛, for example, occurs in a form that is neither attested in manuscripts and inscriptions available to us, nor recorded in character dictionaries. Yet in its structure it is similar to other known variants of the character from the early medieval period.

Even though we do not have access to the physical manuscript, which might serve to raise some doubts about its authenticity, observations such as those offered above make it unlikely that the manuscript is a modern forgery, especially since some of the details discussed here have not been documented before. (Additionally, as noted above, the text itself is not particularly well known, and it is hard to imagine upon what any putative forgery might have been based, since the forgers would of course have had to copy some source.) With regard to the date of the manuscript, the variants show that the manuscript was most likely copied before the 470s, but do permit us a more accurate dating. For this, we will have to turn to other codicological features, such as line length and punctuation marks.

The surviving portion of the manuscript contains three sheets of paper, of which only the second is complete, consisting of 29 lines of text. Considering the regularity of the scroll, it is safe to assume that the other sheets were of the same size and thus, judging from the transmitted text in the Taishō Tripiṭaka, the portion missing from the beginning would fill about 155 lines of text, as noted above. As in its current state the first sheet of the manuscript has 15 lines, the first 14 lines of that sheet are missing. This means that originally the beginning of the manuscript had 5 sheets that are now lost, plus the 14 missing lines from the current first sheet. Based on this, we can in turn calculate that the missing portion contained exactly 160 lines, including the title, chapter title and the name of the translator that normally come at the beginning of the scroll. The reason why this number is slightly higher than the estimate of 155 lines is that the manuscript segments the text into sections or paragraphs by leaving lines unfinished and starting the next section on a new line. Taking such sections into account we arrive at a calculation of exactly 160 missing lines.

The Kalamazoo manuscript has 19 characters per line, even though there are also occasional lines with 18 or 20 characters. Although generally the spacing of characters is highly uniform, towards the bottom of the lines sometimes the characters are written together more tightly, in order to be able to be able to squeeze a section of text within a single line, rather than leaving a single character which would occupy the whole next line. Lines 30 and 42 provide examples of this. This is probably an indication that the copy was made from another scroll that similarly had a 19 characters per line layout, which is of course to be expected in the case of an official sutra-copying project. It is well known that formal copies of Buddhist texts during

the Sui-Tang period had 17 characters per line. The same format was already common by the beginning of the sixth century. Although it is hard to point to a specific time when this feature became part of Buddhist manuscript culture, we can see a gradual progression from about the last quarter of the fifth century towards this standard. Initially merely one of several possible formats, over the following two~three decades the 17 character line becomes the dominant form. In order to document this transition, let us look at manuscripts with dated colophons between 454 and 515.[13] Table 4 below shows the number of characters per line in twenty manuscripts from this 61 year interval.[14]

No.	Shelfmark	Title of text	Date	No. of chars.
1	DY007	*Daci rulai shiyue siri gaoshu* 大慈如來十月四日告疏	454	16–18
2	DY113	*Weimojie suoshuo jing* 維摩詰所說經	467	15–19
3	P.4506	*Jin guangming jing* 金光明經 (on silk)	471	19
4	S.996	*Za apitan xin jing* 雜阿毘曇心經	479	17
5	DY009	*Foshuo guanding zhangju bachu guozui shengsi dedu jing* 佛說灌頂章句拔除過罪生死得度經	487	15
6	S.2106	*Weimo yiji* 維摩義記	500	26–30
7	S.2766	*Daban niepan jing* 大般涅槃經	502	17
8	S.2660	*Shengman yiji* 勝鬘義記	504	26–31
9	S.81	*Daban niepan jing* 大般涅槃經	506	17
10	S.2733	*Fahua jing* 法華經	508	32–37
11	S.1427	*Chengshi lun* 誠實論	511	17
12	P.2907	*Daban niepan jing* 大般涅槃經	512	17
13	S.1547	*Chengshi lun* 誠實論	512	17

13 The current selection is from Ikeda On's 池田温 (1990: 87–106) inventory of Chinese colophons.

14 The table features a relatively high concentration of manuscripts for the 510s, which is not an accident but the result of a manuscript-copying project commissioned by the Northern Wei 北魏 (386 – 535) court during the period 511 – 521. A relatively large number of scrolls survive from this project, of which more than twenty name Linghu Chongzhe 令狐崇哲 as the supervisor of the copying enterprise (*dianjing shuai* 典經帥). In addition, the colophons testify that there were also members of the Linghu clan among the copyists (*jingsheng* 經生), including Linghu Chongzhe himself. See the list of manuscripts in Kong and Du 2010: 102. In his study of the formation of the Buddhist Canon, Fang Guangchang 方廣錩 (2006: 17) lists fifteen Dunhuang manuscripts with colophons dating to the period of 511–514, all of which must have been produced as part of the same project, as is evidenced by the identical seal imprint on them.

14	P.2110	*Huayan jing* 華嚴經	513	17
15	S.341	*Dalou tan jing* 大樓炭經	513	17
16	S.2067	*Huayan jing* 華嚴經	513	17
17	S.9141	*Huayan jing* 華嚴經	513	17
18	S.6727	*Dafang deng tuoluoni jing* 大方等陀羅尼經	514	17
19	P.2179	*Chengshi lun* 誠實論	514	17
20	S.524	*Shengman shu* 勝鬘疏	515	25–30

Table 4. The number of characters per line in Buddhist manuscripts from Dunhuang dating between 454 and 515.

Table 4 shows that the 17-character lines appear already in 479 in manuscript S.996, a copy of the *Za apitan xin jing* 雜阿毘曇心經. Yet at this time the format did not seem to be standardized, as similar manuscripts could have longer or shorter lines. For example, manuscript DY009 from 8 years later (i.e. 487) was written with 15 characters per line. Four manuscripts that stand out in the table are S.2106, S.2660, S.2733 and S.524, all with around 30 characters per line. It is obvious that these manuscripts are of a different type, written in a semi-cursive hand with less attention paid to the visual aspects of the final product. Manuscript S.2106, for example, completely disregards the carefully delineated top and bottom margins, simply writing over them in both directions. Naturally, the similarities between these four manuscripts, and their contrast with other manuscripts from the same period, cannot be coincidental, and we must see them as examples of a different format used concurrently with the more formal style. If anything, these manuscripts show that the typical sūtra-copying calligraphy and layout seen in the other manuscripts was a matter of choice and aesthetic preference, rather than an inevitable feature of contemporary scribal culture.

If we take out the four manuscripts written in semi-cursive hand, we can see that starting from the beginning of the sixth century the 17 character line format was standard. The same format was occasionally in use a couple of decades earlier, but at that time the line length was not uniform, attesting to the lack of an official standard. The variability of line length within the same manuscript seen in the first two items in the table is an indication that up to about 470 the line length was more likely the result of a scribal routine or tradition than of a standard imposed by a religious or secular authority. It is quite likely that the 17-character standard for Buddhist texts was initially formed in the course of official sūtra-copying projects. With regard to the 19-character format of the Kalamazoo manuscript, it must have been written before the time when 17 characters become the standard line length for Buddhist texts. This narrows down the potential time frame of the manuscript, though for a more precise dating we must turn to yet other codicological features.

One such feature is punctuation used in the manuscript for two purposes: (i) corrections and (ii) segmentation of text.[15] The most common way of making corrections in the manuscript is inserting an accidentally omitted character on the right side at the position where it is missing. This is done in small script so that it does not draw attention to the mistake. An example is in line 7, where the missing character 所 is inserted between the characters 无壞, but also in line 12 between the characters 諸有. Other additions are in lines 35 and 50, where the characters 不 and 四 are inserted, respectively. The additions seem to be in a different ink and may have been done not during the process of copying but later, possibly by a different person. As for specific marks, there are several examples of the reversal mark in the form of a very small check レ, designated to correct accidentally inverted characters. In line 56 there are two instances of this mark, one to correct 修遵 (>遵修) and one to correct 謂是 (>是謂). Interestingly, the two characters of the word *zunxiu* 遵修 ("to observe, adhere to") are also inverted in the following line but, once again, the mistake is corrected with insertion of a reversal mark. Finally there is an instance in line 60, correcting 爲謂 (>謂爲). In all cases the mark is placed in a decidedly non-intrusive way, so that it is not visible to a superficial observer. The manuscript also has a single instance of a deletion, in line 17 where the first 已 is deleted from the string 我已自見已身. Deletion marks can take a variety of forms, but in this particular case it is three small vertical dots placed to the right of the character, ⋮. All of these methods of corrections are attested in medieval Chinese manuscript culture, although due to the nature of available material the examples typically come from later manuscripts. Their use in the Kalamazoo manuscript attests to the continuity of the technical aspects of scribal tradition across many centuries.

More important than these marks from the point of view of dating the manuscript are the section marks placed on the top margin to indicate the beginning of a new section in the text. These take the form of a slanted comma (、), similar to the *dunhao* 頓號 used today to separate items in lists. In the manuscript, this mark appears above the first line of the new section, providing a convenient way to navigate through the text. In a way, the mark is redundant because the last line of the previous section is normally left unfinished, and the resulting empty space already signals the end of the previous section. Yet in one case (line 42) the previous section ends at the end of the line, and thus the dot at the top of the next line is the only way the beginning of the new section is marked visually.[16] Similar section marks can be found on numerous

15 For punctuation marks in Dunhuang manuscripts, see Galambos 2014; more specifically on correction marks, see Galambos 2013.

16 In fact, the last character of the previous line did not fit there and had to be squeezed in as the 20th character, thereby violating the 19 character per line format, no doubt in order to avoid having it by itself in a new line. In the case of lines 26 – 27 and 30–31, the expected mark at the top of lines 27 and 31, beginning a new section, is missing because of physical damage to the manuscript at precisely this spot.

early manuscripts, but unfortunately most of these are undated. Among those which do carry dates, manuscript Shangbo 001 (Shanghai Museum) with the beginning part of the *Foshuo Weimojie jing* 佛說維摩詰經, dated by the colophon to 393, has the same type of section mark on a similarly narrow top margin, even though the manuscript in general is less formal and has a different line length. Another example is manuscript Shohaku 009 (Nakamura Museum of Calligraphy, Kyoto), a copy of the *Foshuo pusazang jing* 佛說菩薩藏經 with a colophon dating to the 15th year of the Chengping 承平 reign (453) of the Northern Liang 北涼 dynasty. But similar marks can also seen in manuscript DY113 (Dunhuang Academy) from 467, attesting that this notation was also used until at least the last third of the fifth century. Finally we should also mention manuscript Shohaku 003 (Nakamura Museum of Calligraphy) with the *Faju piyu jing* 法句譬喻經 and a colophon dated to the 1st year of the Ganlu 甘露 reign. This date had been assumed to refer to 359 during the reign of king Fu Jian 苻堅 (r. 357–385) of the Former Qin 前秦 dynasty (350–394) but it is possible that it denotes the year 460 during the reign of Kan Bozhou 闞伯周 (r. 460–477), the king of Gaochang 高昌.[17] Besides the section marks on the top margin, all of these manuscripts are similar to the Kalamazoo manuscript in several other aspects, including the calligraphy with a strong influence of the clerical script (*lishu* 隸書), the use of the three-dot deletion mark, the discreet insertions of missing characters, and the orthography of some characters.

In conclusion, then, based on these parallel manuscripts and all the features discussed above, we can tentatively date the Kalamazoo manuscript to between 390 and 470.

Conclusion

The remarks above strongly suggest that the Kalamazoo manuscript fragment of PSJ, one of the Chinese translations of the AjKV, dates to something like 150~200 years after the translation of the text itelf. It is a pity that it does not overlap at all with any of the so-far known Sanskrit fragments, but even as we have it the materials are of very deep interest both for the history of the AjKV in general, the PSJ in particular, and the history of Chinese calligraphic and manuscript practices in the early medieval period. A number of new features are identified in writing conventions, and the readings preserved in even the small portion of text extant raise serious questions about the fidelity or rather unanimity of the transmission of Chinese Buddhist translations dating from this early period. It is to be hoped that further studies of both known and so-far undiscovered materials will continue to add to our growing knowledge of this period and its Buddhist and manuscript culture. In other

17 Wu 1995; see also Rong 2012: 342–343.

words, while there still remains at least one Hole in the Wall, future research will certainly contribute to strengthening the underlying structures of our understanding.

References

A. Primary Sources

Ganlu zishu 干祿字書. By Yan Yuansun 顏元孫 (Beijing: Guojia tushuguan chubanshe 國家圖書館出版社, 2011).

Kangxi zidian 康熙字典. By Zhang Yushu 張玉書 et al. Hanyu dacidian bianzuan chu 漢語大詞典編纂處, ed., *Biaodian zhengli ben Kangxi zidian* 標點整理本康熙字典 (Shanghai: Hanyu dacidian chubanshe 漢語大詞典出版社, 2002).

Libian 隸辨. By Gu Aiji 顧藹吉. Gu Nanyuan 顧南原, Libian: Lishu zidian 隸辨：隸書字典 (Beijing: Zhongguo shudian 中國書店, 1982). 2 vols.

Longkan shoujing 龍龕手鏡. By Xingjun 行均 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju 中華書局, 1985).

Shuowen jiezi 說文解字. By Xu Shen 許慎, commentary by Duan Yucai 段玉裁. Shuowen jiezi zhu 說文解字注 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社, 1981).

Xinji zangjing yinyi sui han lu 新集藏經音義隨函錄. By Kehong 可洪. In the *Koryŏ Taejanggyŏng* 高麗大藏經, K. 1257.

Yiqiejing yinyi 一切經音義. By Huilin 慧琳. In the Taishō shinshū Daizōkyō 大正新修大藏經, T. 2128.

Zhengzitong 正字通. By Zhang Zilie 張自烈. 1678 printing by Liu Bing 劉炳, Special Collections of Library of National Taiwan University.

B. Secondary Sources

Bottéro, Françoise. 2013. “Les graphies énigmatiques de l'impératrice Wu Zetian.” *Études chinoises* 32/2: 67–99.

Boucher, Daniel. 2006. “Dharmarakṣa and the Transmission of Buddhism to China.” *Asia Major*, Third series, 19/1–2: 13–37.

Dou Huaiyong 竇懷永. 2013. *Dunhuang wenxian bihui yanjiu* 敦煌文獻避違研究 (Lanzhou: Gansu jiaoyu chubanshe 甘肅教育出版社).

Drège, Jean-Pierre. 1984. “Les caractères de l'impératrice Wu Zetian dans les manuscrits de Dunhuang et Turfan.” *Bulletin de l’École française d’Extrême-Orient* 73: 339–354.

Fang Guangchang 方廣錩. 2006. *Zhongguo xieben Dazangjing yanjiu* 中國寫本大藏經研究 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe 上海古籍出版社).

Galambos, Imre. 2013. “Correction marks in the Dunhuang manuscripts.” In: Imre Galambos, ed., *Studies in Chinese Manuscripts: From the Warring States Period to the 20th Century* (Budapest: ELTE Institute of East Asian Studies): 191–210.

Galambos, Imre. 2014. “Punctuation marks in medieval Chinese manuscripts.” In: Jörg Quenzer and Jan-Ulrich Sobisch, eds., *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field* (Berlin, New York: de Gruyter): 341–357.

Harrison, Paul. 1993. “The Earliest Chinese Translations of Mahāyāna Sūtras: Some Notes on the Works of Lokakṣema.” *Buddhist Studies Review* 10/ 2: 135–177.

Harrison, Paul, and Jens-Uwe Hartmann. 1998. “A Sanskrit Fragment of the Ajātaśatru-kaukṛtya-vinodanā-sūtra.” In: Paul Harrison and Gregory Schopen, eds., *Sūrya-candrāya: Essays in Honour of Akira Yuyama On the Occasion of His 65th Birthday* (Indica et Tibetica 35). (Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag): 67–86.

— 2000. “Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodanāsūtra.” In: Jens Braarvig, ed., *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection I: Buddhist Manuscripts, Volume I* (Oslo: Hermes Publishing): 167–216. With “Addendum: Two additional fragments of the Ajātaśatrukaukṛtya-vinodanāsūtra,” pp. 301–302.

— 2002. “Another Fragment of the Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodanā-sūtra.” In: Jens Braarvig, ed., *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection III: Buddhist Manuscripts, Volume II* (Oslo: Hermes Publishing): 45–49.

Huang Zheng 黃征. 2005. *Dunhuang suzidian* 敦煌俗字典 (Shanghai: Shanghai jiaoyu chubanshe 上海教育出版社).

Ikeda On 池田温. 1990. *Chūgoku kodai shahon shikigo shūroku* 中国古代写本識語集録 (Tokyo: Tōkyō daigaku Tōyō bunka kenkyūjo 東京大学東洋文化研究所).

Kanō Kazuo 加納和雄. 2015. “Ajaseōkyō shōhon no bonbun shahon”『阿闍世王経』抄本の梵文写本 [A Sanskrit Manuscript of a Smaller Version of the Ajātaśatrukau-kṛtya-vinodanāsūtra]. *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 64/1: 355–349 (170–176).

Kong Lingmei 孔令梅 and Du Doucheng 杜斗城. 2010. “Shiliuguo Beichao shiqi Dunhuang Linghu shi yu fojiao guanxi tanjiu” 十六國北朝時期敦煌令狐氏與佛教關係探究. *Dunhuang yanjiu* 敦煌研究 5: 99–104.

Miyazaki Tenshō 宮崎展昌. 2012. *Ajaseōkyō no kenkyū: sono hensan katei no kaimei o chūshin to shite* 阿闍世王経の研究──その編纂過程の解明を中心として── [A Study of the *Ajātaśatrukaukṛtyavinodana*: Focusing on the Compilation Process]. (Tokyo: Sankibō Press).

— 2016. “Kōrai daizōkyō shochōbon shoshū no Fuchō sanmai kyō ni tsuite” 高麗大蔵経初雕本所収の『普超三昧経』について (The Puchao sanmei jing in the First Edition of the Korean Canon). *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 印度學佛教學研究 65/1: 492–488 (33–37).

Sadakata Akira 定方晟. 1989. *Ajase no satori: hotoke to Monju no kū no oshie* 阿闍世のさとり: 仏と文殊の空のおしえ (Kyoto: Jinbun Shoin 人文書院).

Rong, Xinjiang. 2013. *Eighteen Lectures on Dunhuang*. Trans. Imre Galambos. (Leiden/Boston: Brill).

Wu Zhen 吳震.1995. “Dunhuang Tulufan xiejing tiji zhong ‘Ganlu’ nianhao kaobian” 敦煌吐魯番寫經題記中“甘露”年號考辨. *Xiyu yanjiu* 西域研究 1: 17–27.

Yi Kyu-kap 李圭甲 et al. 2000. *Koryŏ Taejanggyŏng ich’e jajŏn* 高麗大藏經異體字典 (Seoul: Koryŏ Taejanggyŏng yŏn'guso 高麗大藏經研究所).

Ye Shaoyong, Li Xuezhu and Kano Kazuo. 2013. “Further Folios from the Set of Miscellaneous Texts in Śāradā Palm-leaves from Zha lu Ri phug: A Preliminary Report Based on Photographs Preserved in the CTRC, CEL and IsIAO.” *China Tibetology* 20: 30–47.

Reading Slowly

A Festschrift
for
Jens E. Braarvig

Edited by

Lutz Edzard, Jens W. Borgland and Ute Hüsken

Harrassowitz Verlag

Table of Contents