Current Status of Research on Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra

Noriyuki Kudo
Trans. by Mary Blaber

Foreword

The Soka Gakkai and the Institute of Oriental Philosophy recently completed the final volume in the Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series (LMS). Since the publication of its first volume in 1997, this series, through its offering of facsimile editions and meticulously romanized texts of manuscripts of the Sanskrit Lotus Sutra, has brought immeasurable value to academia.

In addition to this series, other institutions worldwide in possession of Buddhist manuscripts have also made those texts available online, so that we can now examine a much greater wealth of original material than ever before.

In this article, I would like to sum up the current state of the research on Sanskrit manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra and examine the wide-ranging efforts aimed at preparing a new critical edition of that text. Though originally no expert in Lotus Sutra studies, this writer has been engaged in a small way in the research of Sanskrit manuscripts found in Gilgit, Central Asia, and Nepal. And so I would like to set forth my views on the present state of things surrounding what directions might be taken in research on the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra* (SP) manuscripts going forward.

Modern Lotus Sutra Studies Using Sanskrit Manuscripts

One can say that modern studies of the Sanskrit Lotus Sutra began in 1852 with the publication of Eugène Burnouf's (1801–1852) French translation. For his translation of the text, he relied largely on a paper manuscript preserved at the Société Asiatique in Paris, but he also examined a Sanskrit manuscript in London collected by Brian Houghton Hodgson (1800–1894) and made the finishing touches on his version using a Tibetan translation.[1]

Hendrik Kern (1833–1917), who would later publish the first critical edition of the Sanskrit Lotus Sutra, completed his English translation in 1884. This he based on two Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts (Cambridge University Library, Add. 1682, 1683)[2] that were later used as originals when, together with Bunyiu Nanjio (1849–1947), he published the Sanskrit text of the Lotus Sutra, known as the Kern-Nanjio edition (KN), in St. Petersburg from 1908–12.

Here is how their critical edition came about. Nanjio and Kenjiu Kasawara (1852–1883) copied a paper manuscript (referred to in KN as 'A') held at the Royal Asiatic Society in London and then compared this with the two palm-leaf manuscripts at Cambridge University Library. Later Nanjio, on his own, collated their text with another palm-leaf manuscript preserved at the British Museum (presently at the British Library). After that, he consulted a manuscript collected by Thomas Watters (1840–1901; former British consul of Formosa) and examined a lithographic text in Tibetan script collected by Philippe Édouard Foucaux (1811–1894). Upon returning to Japan, Nanjio checked a paper manuscript that had been collected by Ekai Kawaguchi (1866–1945), temporarily completing the critical edition.[3]

Afterward, however, Kern took the text that Nanjio had made based on Nepalese manuscripts and added readings from the so-called Kashgar manuscript discovered at Khādaliq, sometimes presenting them in the form of notes, but sometimes substituting them with no notes, and thus the edition was published.

The manuscript material forming the basis of the Kern-Nanjio edition is as follows:

A: No. 6, Royal Asiatic Society, London, paper {SMSR: R}[4]
B: Or. 2204, British Museum, London, palm-leaf {SMSR: B}
Ca: Add. 1682 (correctly 1683), Cambridge University Library, palm-leaf {SMSR: C4}
Cb: 1683 (correctly 1684), Cambridge University Library, palm-leaf {SMSR: C5}
K: No. 414, University of Tokyo General Library, collected by Ekai Kawaguchi, paper {SMSR: T8}
W: Ms. formerly in the possession of Thomas Watters
O: SI P/5 (presently SI 1925/1927), Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences (formerly held at the Asiatic Museum of the Imperial Academy of Sciences), St. Petersburg, collected by N.F. Petrovsky at Kashgar, paper {SMSR: O}
P: The lithographic text in Tibetan script published by Foucaux

(*Parabole de l'enfant égaré*, *formant le chapitre IV du Lotus de la bonne loi*, B. Duprat, Paris, 1854).

Because this KN edition was for a long time hard to obtain, Unrai Wogihara (1869–1937) and Katsuya Tsuchida published a romanized text (1934–35) with notes referring to Nepalese palm-leaf manuscript K' (SMSR: K), written about 1069/70 and collected by Ekai Kawaguchi (presently at Toyo Bunko in Tokyo), Tibetan translations (the Derge and Narthang editions), and Chinese translations. The palm-leaf manuscript of Kawaguchi had been published in facsimile form in 1926.[5]

The next revised edition of the Sanskrit Lotus Sutra is one Nalinaksha Dutt (1894–1974) published in 1953 with notes introducing readings from Central Asian manuscript fragments prepared by the Russian scholar N.D. Mironov (1880–1936).

In this revision Dutt, referring to the previously published Wogihara and Tsuchida revision, cites the KN readings as 'B' and the Wogihara and Tsuchida ones as 'J'. Though Dutt had obtained a microfilm copy of the Gilgit manuscript, he was unable to consult it.[6] He writes in his revised edition, "The readings have been given … as footnotes marked by M. without any emendations." But as to what Central Asian manuscripts Mironov based his work on, Dutt merely writes in his preface, "The fragments were mostly obtained from Sir Aurel Stein's collection of Central Asian mss.," offering no further detail.[7] However, in the introduction of Volume 1 (1997) of LMS, Jiang Zhongxin (1942–2002) reveals that one part of them included fragments from the Stein Collection (Khādaliq fragments[8]) and the 39 Otani Collection fragments at the Lüshun Museum.[9]

Parashurama Lakshman Vaidya (1891–1978) published another revised edition in India in 1960 wherein he sifted among the readings in the KN, the Wogihara and Tsuchida, and the Dutt editions to edit his own text, but added no new material.

Problems with KN and New Approaches to Creating a Revised Edition

As mentioned earlier, in KN Kern added readings from a Central Asian manuscript to Nanjio's text, which was collated from six Nepalese manuscripts, so that it became a Gilgit-Nepalese recension readings with Central Asian recension readings mixed in. Because of this, from a fairly early stage after the KN edition was published, this problem was identified and the need to make a new revised edition expressed.

Willy Baruch (1900–1954) was among the earliest to do so. Before publishing his new edition based on 14 Nepalese manuscripts,[10] he published a monograph that was to form its introduction. Therein he compared Kern's notes one by one with the original manuscripts and showed how arbitrary and rife with omissions the notes are. (This, however, refers only to a portion of Chapter 11, 'The Emergence of the Treasure Tower', KN, 239–241.)[11] Sadly his new edition was never published. In 1998, Akira Yuyama (1933–2019) touched on Baruch's unpublished 'manuscript' and wrote that Baruch, taking what he had collated from manuscripts he had reviewed, carefully marked it in red, making necessary comments, inserting the Tibetan translations, and writing so that variant readings were clear at a glance.[12] According to the table of contents, this 'manuscript' ran to 3516 pages. Prof. Yuyama was eager to have the text, which is kept at the Société Asiatique in Paris, published, but this was never realized.[13]

In Japan too, nearly all researchers involved with studying Lotus Sutra manuscripts recognize the problems with KN. For example, let me introduce the criticisms Shoko Watanabe (1907–1977) made (1966). He summarized the defects of the KN edition (he refers to it as 'BB', for Bibliotheca Buddhica) in four points.

1. Notations are inexact and are riddled with error.
2. Instead of choosing the reading most common among manuscripts, editor(s) made subjective choices.
3. Without distinguishing between Central Asian manuscript and Nepalese manuscript readings, choices were made indiscriminately for ease of reading.
4. No examination is made of Tibetan translations (p. 360).

Watanabe also compared (1969) a Nepalese recension (Gilgit manuscript, G) and Central Asian recension (Kashgar manuscript, P), and pointed out that among Nepalese group manuscripts the lineage is undetermined, and that between the Gilgit-Nepalese recension and the various manuscripts from the Central Asian recension, it is difficult to discover an affinity. He concluded:

> Originally Lotus Sutra religious communities carried out energetic activities from northwest India to the Central Asian region, with incessant schisms, and the scriptures they followed were not necessarily always the same. At some point these scriptures were brought to the Ganges River region, the center of Buddhist activity, where the

> various types of text took root and the Gilgit manuscript lineage was established. Later in the same manner the Nepalese manuscript lineage was established. In the period between these the text was translated into Tibetan. In no case was there only one source, rather a variety of readings were transmitted simultaneously.[14]

That is why he suggested a revised edition:

> Nepalese manuscripts have discrepancies, and when one is in doubt about their selection, Gilgit manuscripts and Tibetan translations can be guides. One may gain some reference from manuscripts of the Central Asian region, such as P, but as the lineage is different, it must always be done conditionally. And only then should one make comparisons with the Chinese translations.[15]

Further, Watanabe said (1970) that concerning the Lotus Sutra, from the differences in the many manuscripts and translations (Chinese and Tibetan), we posit various transmissions, and that means assuming that multiple transmissions emerged separately from an original text. However, that assumption itself is incorrect because "from the very first there was no such thing as an original text for the Lotus Sutra. I have concluded that when people became aware of the existence of the Lotus Sutra, there were already many different recensions (or different oral traditions) available." (p. 108) He rejects the idea of a need to search for an original text.

Naoshiro Tsuji (1899–1979), who studied the characteristics of Buddhist Sanskrit, including the irregular vocabulary and grammar found in the SP manuscripts, also wrote (1970) about a critical revision of the Lotus Sutra:

> Even if we were to combine currently existing Nepalese manuscripts and Central Asian manuscripts to make one text, it would be no more than an arbitrary compromise, as impossible as getting scholars of differing views to agree. The differences among the existing manuscripts have obstacles that may not be easily overcome so it cannot be hoped that the original form of the text may be restored all at once.[16]

For that purpose, he proposed that in order to correctly understand the substance of Lotus Sutra language, it is essential to accurately romanize and publish Gilgit manuscripts for the Nepalese recension, to make a romanized text of Kawaguchi manuscript K' (Toyo Bunko, palm-leaf

{SMSR: K}), and to publish a romanization of O, the so-called Kashgar manuscript (pp. 17–18), for the Central Asian recension.

Additionally, he suggested:

> With a Nepalese tradition text composed with Gilgit manuscripts as its basis and missing parts supplemented from K' as the main feature, on the facing page print the Central Asian recension, composed with O as its core, and place wavy lines under variant phrases.... If the variants in the Central Asian manuscripts are to be pointed out in notes, steps must be taken to make them clearly distinguishable from the notes concerning variant readings among the Nepalese manuscripts.[17]

Thus the problems of KN have been remarked on from the outset, and at the same time various proposals have been set forth around the handling of manuscripts of different transmissions. At present, regarding the KN edition that is widely used as the Sanskrit Lotus Sutra text, it is possible for us to examine its basic reference materials for ourselves.[18] All the reference materials used for KN whose whereabouts are known have been published either in facsimile form or as romanized text in the LMS.

A {R}: LMS 7 (Kotsuki 2007) [romanized text][19]
B {B}: LMS 9 (2009) [facsimile];
LMS 11 (Mizufune 2011) [romanized text]
Ca {C4}: LMS 4 (Toda, et al. 2002) [facsimile][20]
Cb {C5}: LMS 10 (Kotsuki 2010) [romanized text][21]
K {T8}: LMS 5 (Kotsuki 2003) [romanized text][22]
O: LMS 13 (Mizufune 2013) [facsimile]

Though not KN material, the Paris manuscript used for Burnouf's French translation has also been published as romanized text (P3: LSM 8 [Kotsuki 2008]).[23]

Additionally, other important materials such as the Lüshun manuscript fragments, the Kashgar manuscript, and the Gilgit manuscripts have also been published.

Central Asian group manuscripts:

LMS 1: *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragment from the Lüshun Museum Collection*, *Facsimile Edition and Romanized Text* (Jiang 1997)
LMS 3: *Fragments of a Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra from Khādaliq* (Wille 2000)

LMS 13: *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscripts from the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences* (*SI P/5*, *etc.*), *Facsimile Edition* (Mizufune 2013)

Gilgit-Nepalese group manuscripts:

LMS 2-1: *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the National Archives of Nepal* (*No. 4-21*), *Facsimile Edition*[24] (Toda, Kotsuki 1998)

LMS 2-2/3: *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the National Archives of Nepal* (*No. 4-21*), *Romanized Text* (Toda 2001, 2004)

LMS 5: *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from University of Tokyo General Library* (*No. 414*), *Romanized Text*[25] (Kotsuki 2003)

LMS 9: *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the British Library* (*Or. 2204*), *Facsimile Edition*[26] (2009)

LMS 12: *Gilgit Lotus Sutra Manuscripts from the National Archives of India*, *Facsimile Edition*[27] (Mizufune 2012)

LMS 14: *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the Asiatic Society*, *Kolkata* (*No. 4079*), *Romanized Text*[28] (Kotsuki 2014)

LMS 15: *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the National Archives of Nepal* (*No. 5-144*), *Romanized Text*[29] (Kotsuki 2017)

Besides these, many other Sanskrit manuscripts have also been digitized by the institutes where they are preserved and are available online.[30] And now, given the KN edition defects that Watanabe (1966) and Tsuji (1970) have pointed out, such as inexact notes with many errors and inconsistent readings, efforts have already begun using the materials listed above to actually reconfirm the KN readings. In order that these attempts maintain the historical nature of and consistency with existing studies using KN until now as the standard text, it has been stated that "this study aims to revise KN text, and to compile a collection of the KN in Roman script, supplemented by the KN's footnotes to the KN text".[31] Certainly as long as KN has been the standard text used in Lotus Sutra studies, this had to be one of the steps taken. But put another way, the result of such efforts would be a 'rerevised KN edition', which must be distinguished from what is needed, that is, a 'new critical edition'. The reason is that the three editions that followed KN each were published in the form of a revision with the KN edition as base. And the greatest problem remarked upon as KN's fault is the mixing of readings from the Gilgit-Nepalese recension and the Central Asian recension, which would in no way be solved. Now that almost all the original material is available, what process should we

follow to create a new revised edition?

Making a New Critical Edition of the *Mahāvastu*

Seishi Karashima (2019, [1957–2019]) explained that the importance of Lotus Sutra manuscript studies lies not simply in lining up manuscript readings, but rather in the necessity of preparing a critical edition that acknowledges the gradual linguistic changes from colloquial Gāndhārī to Sanskrit. The comments in his article on various problems and direction are exceedingly important. Therein, in preparation for making a new critical edition that separates the recensions, particularly concerning a new edition of the Gilgit-Nepalese recension, he proposed new methodology.

This is the method Prof. Karashima and Dr Katarzyna Marciniak (presently professor at Warsaw University) used when they were compiling a new critical edition of the *Mahāvastu*. The *Mahāvastu* is one of the legal texts of the Mahāsāmghika-Lokottaravādins and is a literary work centered on tales of the Buddha, which presents ideas seen in Mahāyāna Buddhism such as the ten stages (*daśabhūmi*) and the idea of other buddhas existing in other worlds. Both scholars saw this text as a link explaining the relationship between Mahāsāṃghika and early Mahāyāna Buddhism. Thus began their project to create a new critical edition.

As is well-known, Émile Senart (1847–1928) published a Sanskrit text of the *Mahāvastu* based on the six manuscripts available to him at the time (3 vols., 1882, 1890, 1897). The manuscripts included A, preserved at the Société Asiatique in Paris; B and N, preserved at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris; L, preserved at the Royal Asiatic Society in London; C, preserved at Cambridge University Library; and M, in the estate of Ivan Pavlovich Minayeff (1840–1890). All are paper manuscripts copied in the 19th century, but like many other Nepalese manuscripts, not all are necessarily suitable to be used for editing the text. Actually from midway through his work, Senart used only B and C, and afterward only the two manuscripts B and M for this purpose.[32] That is, the B manuscript (copied in 1800) ultimately became the base text for Senart's entire edition.

Including the manuscripts used by Senart, at present more than 20 manuscripts (both complete and incomplete) have been verified (seven are complete),[33] and the history of transmission from palm-leaf manuscripts to and among paper manuscripts, as well as the relationship among the copied manuscripts, has been clearly explained.

According to Marciniak (2016), a paleographic study of the manuscripts

reveals that the oldest existing palm-leaf manuscript of the *Mahāvastu* is from roughly around the 12th century.[34] Later the oldest paper manuscript (Na) was copied from it (1657; saṃvat 777);[35] this means that no manuscript has been found dating between these two.[36] In other words, it has been suggested that for over a period of four to five centuries the oldest palm-leaf manuscript was completely forgotten, until its rediscovery by the copyist of the oldest paper manuscript.[37]

And her research has shown that it is from this oldest paper manuscript, Na, that both directly and indirectly almost all other paper manuscripts were copied.[38] The scribe of paper manuscript Na was Jayamuni Vajrācārya. Let us take a quick look at his character and role as clarified by manuscript studies of Avadāna literature, which includes the *Mahāvastu*.

Prof. Kiyoshi Okano, who for many years studied Sanskrit Buddhist narrative literature, reflected (2019) about his own manuscript studies that "my studies owe a lot to the many manuscripts copied by Jayamuni". He outlines the extremely important role played by Jayamuni in any research using Nepalese manuscripts and how manuscripts he copied are evaluated as reference documents. I will introduce below some major points of Okano's detailed comments (2019, 2020, 2021).[39]

Jayamuni, active in the mid-17th century in Patan, Nepal, inherited from his father Mahābauddha Temple, which was built in his great-grandfather's time. At a young age he went to Kashi (Varanasi), where he studied Sanskrit and collected Buddhist manuscripts. After returning to Nepal, he copied various manuscripts to assist in the academic growth of Buddhism.[40] That period just happened to coincide with the transition of manuscript material from palm-leaf to paper. Okano (2019) wrote:

> After he searched out old palm-leaf manuscripts of good heritage, in order that paper manuscripts with the least amount of mistakes would reach the next generations, he would very carefully, while seeking to grasp the meaning of the Sanskrit text, carry out his copying. If he thought it necessary, he was willing to correct the text or even make editorial changes in the work. His paper manuscripts were extremely influential and, in many cases, played a role as the original manuscript from which many newer paper manuscripts made in later ages were derived.[41]

Prof. Okano combined his own research with the research results of Formigatti (2016), Tournier (2017), and Marciniak (2017b), offered a list of the manuscripts (i.e., 16 texts) copied by Jayamuni, and discussed them

in detail.[42] According to him, the 16 manuscripts may be divided into two groups, that is, the A group, or Indian selection of works, and the B group, or Nepalese selection of works. The former were Sanskrit literary works transmitted from India to Nepal that were copied from palm-leaf to paper in order to pass them on to the future. The latter were copies of new works of Sanskrit anecdotal literature created during the same period as their copying.[43] This means that the A group is older literature that already existed in India, while the B group consists of literature newly made in 17th century Nepal.

I would like to mention one manuscript in particular among those. It is a text of the *Sumāgadhāvadāna*, which is included in Okano's A group. It is preserved at Cambridge University Library as manuscript C and was copied by Jayamuni.[44]

When Yutaka Iwamoto (1910–88) conducted his research (1968, 1979) on this avadāna, eight Sanskrit manuscripts were verified and all are Nepalese. Among these, the palm-leaf manuscript called B (preserved at the Asiatic Society, Kolkata) is the oldest, dating to the 13th century. Next is Jayamuni's C manuscript (Cambridge University Library, Add. 1585) from the 17th century, and the remainder (C', at Cambridge University Library; P, at the Bibliothèque Nationale in Paris; T, at Tokyo University Library; K, at Kyoto University; K', at Kyoto University; N, at the National Archives of Nepal) were copied sometime from the 19th to the 20th centuries. Iwamoto believed that the relationship among these manuscripts is that the C' and P manuscripts were copied from the C manuscript, and T and K were copied from N.[45] He sorted out the relationship among these manuscripts, but at that time it was not known that manuscript fragments were included among the Gilgit manuscripts.

Later, when the fragments were found among the Gilgit manuscripts, the existence of another transmission than the Nepalese was confirmed. This writer studied the Gilgit manuscripts anew and reached the following conclusion.[46] That is, Iwamoto believed that the Tibetan translation preserved the oldest stage of this avadāna, but the Gilgit version overall agrees with the Tibetan version (ninth century). And considering the period of the Gilgit fragments (script, Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I), they would have been written at the latest from the sixth to the seventh centuries, and therefore the Gilgit version preserves an older stage than ones such as the Tibetan translation or the Nepalese version.[47]

And the text handed down in current Nepalese manuscripts is a more amplified version than the Gilgit one. The oldest text among Nepalese ones is a 13th century palm-leaf manuscript. In the nearly four centuries separating them, Jayamuni copied paper manuscript C

and the manuscripts made afterward were copied from it. Jayamuni's original text has never been found, but judging from the variations with manuscript B, the possibility that there was yet another palm-leaf manuscript is high.

As the Gilgit text nearly perfectly matches the Tibetan translation, the amplification that occurred sometime from the 10th century on perhaps occurred in Nepal, or perhaps was brought there and then handed down from the 13th century on. In any case, Jayamuni's copy of the *Sumāgadhāvadāna* manuscript seems, similarly to the case of the *Mahāvastu*, to have been the link with a transmission from a palm-leaf manuscript separated by several centuries.

Thus as the form of copying changed from the earlier palm-leaf manuscripts to paper manuscripts, the most influential figure was Jayamuni, and this was not only regarding the *Mahāvastu*. As for Profs. Karashima and Marciniak's new revised edition of *Mahāvastu*, surely it was because they placed at the core of their revision work this oldest palm-leaf manuscript and the oldest paper manuscript, which was copied from it and became the prototype for many later paper manuscripts, that they could proceed with their textual revision untroubled by variations in readings in other paper manuscripts. May we not cite this method for the handling of Lotus Sutra manuscripts, that is, for the preparation of a new critical edition?

Toward a New Critical Edition of the Lotus Sutra

The *editio princeps* of the *Mahāvastu* and the Lotus Sutra were published in the 19th and early 20th centuries using a number of Nepalese manuscripts. However, there were problems with the handling of the manuscripts, and new revised editions are anticipated. Fortunately, because clear photographs and romanized texts of the manuscripts used for both texts have been made public, it is possible to reread the texts themselves. So at this point, which plan is better to adopt? Should it be a rereading, or revising, of the edition we have now? Or should we create a new critical edition with a new methodology?

Karashima suggested (2019) that the method of revision for the *Mahāvastu* be referred to for a revised edition of the Lotus Sutra. How is it that such a thing might be possible? First, there is a similarity in the construction of both texts. The *Mahāvastu*, like the Lotus Sutra and the *Samādhirājasūtra*, is characterized by the repetition of verse and prose sections that narrate its stories in an elaborate way. Also, each of these texts contain vernacular or peculiar forms apart from the

standard Sanskrit and are thought to be linguistically close. Accordingly, with the methodology used for the new edition of the *Mahāvastu*, Profs. Karashima and Marciniak had a plan of making a new critical edition of early Mahāyāna scriptures.[48]

As with the suggestions of Profs. Watanabe and Tsuji mentioned above, Karashima emphasized the need to separate the two manuscript recensions and make texts for each one. The original text of the Lotus Sutra, in the beginning transmitted orally in Gāndhārī, over time was Sanskritized and divided into, on the one hand, the Gilgit-Nepalese recension, and on the other, the Central Asian recension. That is why separate editions are essential for each of the manuscript lineages. Though the Gilgit text is certainly not complete, since 80 percent of the text may be recovered, this can be made the basic text, and with the missing portions supplemented by readings from an old palm-leaf manuscript dating to the 11th century that was discovered in Nepal, the revised edition for this group may be prepared. As for the Nepalese paper manuscripts, Karashima was of the opinion (2019) that since in general they are copies made in later years, their readings "are referred to, only when those readings seem significant".[49]

And concerning the Central Asian manuscripts, Karashima proposed the manuscripts be divided into three groups, with a critical edition prepared for each (p. 141).

1. Edition of the Farhād-Bēg manuscripts and fragments (preserved at the British Library, fifth or sixth century)
2. Edition of the Khādaliq manuscript (O, preserved at St. Petersburg and the British Library) and those manuscripts of a similar script (eighth century)
3. Edition of other fragments (fifth–seventh centuries).[50]

Now that we are able to work with many original materials that until recently were difficult to access, it is important to prepare a revised edition that takes into account the relationship among manuscripts of different recensions and the linguistic characteristics of the texts. In addition, a complete set of fundamental materials for each work should be compiled, including a grammar and glossary unique to the language used.[51]

With the Lotus Sutra too, choose manuscripts whose text is at the oldest stage as originals for revision, and after clarifying their relationship with other manuscripts, a new text must be made for each different group. For example, take the manuscript called C3 in LSM 17, the oldest palm-

leaf manuscript among the Nepalese ones, as the original text, as if to make *A Critical Edition of the Lotus Sutra Based on Gilgit-Nepalese Manuscripts* (*C3 Collated Text*).[52] What is to be hoped for in the future is no mere listing up of manuscript readings, but the collating of different readings based on linguistic considerations. And now that we have clear photographs at hand, I hope anew that a precise romanization will be made of all the Gilgit manuscripts that will become the basic text of the Gilgit-Nepalese recension.

Notes

[1] See Yuyama 2000 for more on Burnouf's accomplishments. For his connection with the Lotus Sutra see § VII, pp. 61–77. Also see Kotsuki 2008 (LSM 8), introduction. For a comprehensive bibliography of over 6400 reference items regarding Lotus Sutra studies in Japanese, European languages, Chinese, and Korean published between 1844 and 2020 see Mochizuki-Kim 2020.

[2] Kern 1884, xxxviii. One manuscript bears a colophon giving its date: "The base of my translation has been an old manuscript on palm leaves, belonging to Dr. D. Wright's collection, in the University Library of Cambridge. The manuscript is dated Newar, era 159 (= A.D. 1039)," that is, Add. 1683. The other manuscript has parts missing and bears no date: "A second MS., unfortunately incomplete, from the same collection, is of unknown date," that is, Add. 1682.

[3] KN 1908–1912: I–II (by Nanjio), V (by Kern).

[4] SMSR manuscript abbreviations are used in this publication. However, when different symbols are used in other books, these abbreviations are given in brackets ({ }). Rissho University's Institute for the Comprehensive Study of the Lotus Sutra has collected Sanskrit manuscripts (image data) and published them in *Sanskrit Manuscripts of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka: Collected from Nepal*, *Kashmir and Central Asia* (SMS; 12 Vols., 1977–82). In this publication, facsimiles of 31 manuscripts are placed alongside each other line by line, allowing reference to the texts of, for example, KN, Wogihara-Tsuchida, and Dutt. Later, *Sanskrit Manuscripts of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka: Collected from Nepal*, *Kashmir and Central Asia*, *Romanized Text and Index* (SMSR; 1986–88), the romanized version of this series, was begun and has reached Vol. 2.

[5] Also found in Rissho University's Database (2003; Vol. I, No. 4), in pictures based on microfilm. The Institute for the Comprehensive Study of the Lotus Sutra prepared digitized images of the manuscripts mentioned above and made them available in four CD-ROMs in 2003. Among important manuscripts only the Kashgar manuscript is not included, otherwise they are comprehensive. Though the images come from microfilm, they still offer tremendous advantages to researchers.

[6] Though the Gilgit manuscripts have not been used in their entirety, they are referred to in the introduction (Chap. 11, xiii–xiv; Dutt, 165–66; KN, 250–52), and footnotes with readings from Gilgit manuscript No. 47, identified as "G", have been added from the start of Chap. 13 to mid-Chap. 14 (Dutt, 180–94; KN, 275–99).

[7] Dutt 1953: preface. "The fragments were obtained from Sir Aurel Stein's collection of Central Asia."

[8] They are: Kha.i.24 (2 folios) = Dutt pp. 265–8; Kha.i.185.c (1 frag.) = p. 276; Kha.i.186 (1 frag.) = p. 276; Kha.i.215.a (1 frag.) = pp. 275–6; Kha.i.177 (2 frags.) = pp. 274–5, totaling 7 fragments.

[9] See LSM 1 (Jiang 1997): introduction.

[10] Taking the palm-leaf manuscript collected by Ekai Kawaguchi, K (presently preserved at Toyo Bunko), as his original text, Baruch referred to the following manuscripts, including those used by Nanjio and Kern for KN: Cambridge University Library: Add. 1682: Ca {C3}, Add. 1683: Cb {C4}, Add. 1684: Cc {C5}, Add. 1023 [correctly 1032]: Cd {C1}, Add. 1324: Ce {C2}, Add. 2197: Cf {C6}; British Library: B; Royal Asiatic Society: No. 6: R; Asiatic Society of Bengal (presently Asiatic Society, Kolkata): No. B7: Aa {A3}, No. 4079: Ab {A1}, No. 4199: Ac{A2}; and Bibliothèque nationale, Paris: Nos. 138–139: Pa {P1}, Nos. 140–141: Pb {P2}. He also used a small portion of a Gilgit manuscript (Or. 11878B–G, presently preserved at the British Library, it is a part of Gilgit manuscript No. 48 [Group C] at the National Archives of India).

[11] Baruch 1938: 7–12. Kanakura 1970: 503–28 presents a rough outline of Sanskrit text publications; for Baruch 1938 see especially 518–23.

[12] Yuyama 1998: 43.

[13] Ibid.: fn. 45: "Willy Baruch (1900–1954):- 'Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra collationné par Dr. Willy Baruch', conservé à la Bibliothèque de la Société Asiatique de Paris. 'Le Président remercie M^{me} BARUCH d'avoir fait don à la Société d'un manuscrit de son mari (édition critique de *Lotus de la Bonne Loi*)', *Journal Asiatique* CCXLVIII (1960) fasc. 4, p. 548 [Séance du 18 novembre 1960]." In the introduction to LSM 4 (2002), R.C. Jamieson, the Keeper of Sanskrit Manuscripts at the University of Cambridge Library, touches on this matter (xix–xx).

[14] Watanabe 1969: 77.

[15] Ibid., 77–78.

[16] Tsuji 1970: 7.

[17] Ibid., 19. I will refer to this later, but Karashima (2019) also proposes the idea of using the Gilgit manuscripts as the base, and supplementing missing parts with older Nepalese manuscripts.

[18] Regarding W, its whereabouts are currently unknown.

[19] Black and white (B/W) images based on microfilm are also available at the Rissho University Database (2003), Vol. I, No. 8.

[20] B/W images are also available at the Rissho University Database (2003), Vol. I, No. 6 [Add. 1683]; No. 8 [Add. 1682]. Also published on the Cambridge University Library website: Add. 1682. https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01682/1; Add. 1683. https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01683/1.

[21] B/W images are also available at the Rissho University Database (2003), Vol. I, No. 8 [Add. 1684]; No. 12 [Add. 1684]. Also published on the Cambridge University Library website: https://cudl.lib.cam.ac.uk/view/MS-ADD-01684-00001/1.

[22] B/W images are also available at the Rissho University Database (2003), Vol. III, No. 15. Also published on the University of Tokyo Library website: https://picservice.ioc.u-tokyo.ac.jp/03_150219~UT-library_sanskrit_ms/MF13_49_004~MF13_49_004/

[23] B/W images are also available at the Rissho University Database (2003), Vol. III, No. 17.

[24] B/W images are also available at the Rissho University Database (2003), Vol. I, No. 1.

[25] B/W images are also available at the Rissho University Database (2003), Vol. III, No. 15.

[26] B/W images are also available at the Rissho University Database (2003), Vol. I, No. 7.

[27] B/W images are also available at the Rissho University Database (2003), Vol. II, Nos. 9–10. Watanabe 1972–75 also has a B/W facsimile version and romanized text.

[28] B/W images are also available at the Rissho University Database (2003), Vol. I, No. 2.

[29] B/W images are also available at the Rissho University Database (2003), Vol. I, No. 1.

[30] For the British Library's materials, for example, see (https://idp.bl.uk), and for Bibliothèque nationale de France's materials (Nos. 138–139: https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc969291, Nos. 140-141: https://archivesetmanuscrits.bnf.fr/ark:/12148/cc969302).

[31] Nishi 2022: iv. For text with supplementary notes see Nishi 2022 [= KN Chaps. 1–3], 2023 [= KN Chaps. 4–7], 2024 [= KN Chaps. 8–13]. In these notes, readings from almost all manuscripts are mentioned in addition to the original KN notes.

[32] For *Mahāvastu* I.193.13–III.47.9, B and C were used, while for III.47.10 onward, B and M were used. Up to I.193.12, six manuscripts were used.

[33] Tournier 2012: 196. Though he notes that the number is uncertain, he settles on 28: "Most of the twenty-eight manuscripts that have been recovered so far from Nepal are copies dating from 18th or 19th century."

[34] Marciniak 2016 is the English translation of the revised first and second chapters of Marciniak 2014, research presented first as her doctoral thesis and then published in Polish. The facsimile version, rendered from microfilm, of this oldest palm-leaf manuscript is found in Yuyama 2001. The catalog of the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, which photographed the manuscript, dates it as "approximately 14th century". Yuyama 2001: xlviii, however, puts it between the 12th and 13th centuries. This matches Marciniak's dating.

[35] No mention of this manuscript, Na, in Yuyama 2001. But in Marciniak 2017a: 103, fn. 1, it is said that its existence was known in 1970 (Roth 1970). Also similarly aware of the oldest palm-leaf manuscript and the oldest paper manuscript, Tournier called Marciniak's Na "Ta". See Tournier 2017: 389–93.

[36] Yuyama 2001 refers to manuscript Sb as the oldest paper one, which is dated 1695 = saṃvat 815. However, the characters where the date is copied are extremely hard to read, and researchers have different opinions. For details see Marciniak 2017a: 105,

fn. 7. In her opinion, the date in its colophon is not the one which Sb was copied, but was taken from the original manuscript that predated the copying of Sb.

[37] Tournier 2012: 96 ("My impression is that manuscript Sa was re-discovered by the copyist of Ta himself, named Jayamuni.")

[38] In Chapter 4 of Marciniak 2014 there is a detailed analysis of the relationship among the paper manuscripts (107–47).

[39] Okano 2020: 140–52, 2021: 52–86, especially 52–68. There is also a brief biography of Jayamuni in Formigatti 2016: 114, fn. 31.

[40] See Okano 2019: 2–3.

[41] Ibid., 3.

[42] Okano 2019: 17, 2020: 149–50, 2021: 60–68. For example, A includes ten works such as *Avadānaśataka*, *Divyāvadāna*(*mālā*), *Bodhicaryāvatāra*, *Mahāvastu*, *Rāṣṭrapālaparipṛcchā*, *Sumāgadhāvadāna*, and *Sphuṭārtha Abhidharmakoṣavyākhyā*, and B has six works with *-avadānamālā* at the end of the title, such as *Kalpadrumāvadānamālā*, *Mahajjātakamālā*, and *Subhāṣitamahāratnāvadānamālā*.

[43] See Okano 2021: 60, fn. 21.

[44] See Formigatti 2016: 112; Okano 2019: 5, fn. 6; 2021: 62.

[45] Iwamoto 1968 (1979): 6–7.

[46] Kudo 2016: 321–23, especially 322.

[47] For more on distinctions between the Gilgit manuscripts and other versions, and on the agreement and differences with the Tibetan translation see Kudo 2014, especially 355–353.

[48] Karashima 2019: 139–41. They conducted joint research titled 'A New Edition of the *Mahāvastu* — In Search of the Source of Mahāyāna Buddhism'. Their aim, after completing a new edition of the *Mahāvastu*, was to use their methodology to prepare new revised editions of Mahāyāna sūtras. At present, Prof. Marciniak is continuing her work completing all the volumes of the *Mahāvastu* (so far two volumes have been published).

[49] Karashima 2019: 139.

[50] See Karashima 2019: 141–42. These Central Asian manuscripts and fragments have already been romanized by several scholars and published.

[51] Karashima 2012 is a good example. The *Abhisamacārikā Dharmāḥ*, a legal work of the Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādins, is written in Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit and he published a critical edition along with an independent vocabulary and grammar of the text.

[52] LSM 17 (Kotsuki 2019) is a critical edition of the Lotus Sutra based on C3, which is the oldest among the Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts (most of them are 11th–12th century manuscripts like C4). This manuscript C3, according to Kotsuki, "can be designated as most valuable document from the intermediate period between two groups, i.e., the Gilgit manuscripts and the Nepalese palm-leaf manuscripts" (introduction: xvi). As he points out (LSM 17: xvii), the dating of C3 is based on Hirofumi Toda's view that, "It may be estimated that the manuscript was copied in approximately the tenth century" (LSM 4 [2002]: xxix, notes by Toda). However,

no reason is given for why no earlier Gilgit manuscripts (late 7th century) were used as the core text.

Another attempt is also proceeding. A research group is working on new romanized texts from each recension, namely the Central Asian manuscripts and the Gilgit manuscripts [Ikuma, et al. 2023, 2024]. In their work, notes are given only on readings from Sanskrit manuscripts, not on the Tibetan translation (Derge edition) or the Chinese translations (*Zhengfahua jing* and *Miaofa lianhua jing*). Their first step toward a new revised edition seems to be to provide a diplomatic transliteration of the Sanskrit manuscripts. The revision policy that this research group follows is found in Karashima 2003–06, 'A Trilingual Edition of the Lotus Sutra—New Editions of the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese Versions'. Here Prof. Karashima refers to the Gilgit manuscripts, the Kashgar manuscript (O), the Farhād-Bēg manuscript (F), and the Lüshun manuscript fragments for the Sanskrit text, to a collating of more than ten Kangyur, both in block-print and manuscript, for the Tibetan translation, to *Zhengfahua jing* and *Miaofa lianhua jing* for the Chinese translation, and adds a huge amount of notes.

Bibliography

Baruch, Willy. 1938. *Beiträge zum Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.

Burnouf, Eugène. 1852 (²1925). *Le Lotus de la Bonne Loi. Traduit du sanskrit, accompagné d'un commentaire et de vingt et un mémoires relatifs au Bouddhisme*, tome 1. Traduction et notes; tome 2. Appendice (Mémoires annexes). Paris: Imprimerie nationale; repr. 1973.

Dutt, Nalinaksa. 1953. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtram: with N.D. Mironov's readings from Central Asian Mss*. Calcutta: The Asiatic Society (*Bibliotheca India. A Collection of Oriental Works No. 276*); repr. 1986.

Formigatti, Camillo A. 2016. 'Walking the Deckle Edge: Scribe or Author? Jayamuni and the Creation of Nepalese Avadānamālā Literature'. *Buddhist Studies Review* 33, 1-2: 101–40.

Ikuma, Hiromitsu, Kasamatsu Sunao, Shoji Fumio, Suzuki Kenta, Tamai Tatsushi, Zhang Meiqiao, Miyazaki Tensho (伊久間洋光, 笠松直, 庄司史生, 鈴木健太, 玉井達士, 張美僑, 宮崎展昌). 2023. 'A New Transliteration of the Gilgit, Kashgar, and Farhāg-Bēg Manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra: Chapter XV "Tathāgatāyuṣpramāṇa-parivartaḥ"'. *Hokke bunka kenkyū* (*Journal of Institute for the Comprehensive Study of Lotus Sutra*) 49: 1–23 [in Japanese].

_____. 2024. 'A New Transliteration of the Gilgit, Kashgar, and Farhāg-Bēg Manuscripts of the Lotus Sutra: Chapter XIV "Bodhisattvapṛthivīsamudgama-parivartaḥ (KN. 297.12-300.4)"'. *Hokke bunka kenkyū* (*Journal of Institute for the Comprehensive Study of Lotus Sutra*) 50: 57–78 [in Japanese].

Ishida, Chikō. 2016. 'A Historical Overview of the Discovery and Study of Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra Manuscripts'. In *'Guiding Lights' for the 'Perfect': Studies on the Nature and the Development of Abhidharma Buddhism: A Commemorative*

Volume in Honor of Prof. Dr. Kenyo Mitomo for his 70th Birthday. Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin, 469–507.

Iwamoto, Yutaka (岩本裕). 1968. *Sumāgadhā-avadāna kenkyū* (*A Study of the Sumāgadhāvadāna*). Kyoto: Hōzōkan (1979, Kaimeishoin) [in Japanese].

Kanakura, Ensho (金倉圓照). 1970. 'Indogaku yori mitaru Hokekyō' (Publications of the Sanskrit Texts of the Lotus Sūtra). In *Hokekyō no seiritsu to tenkai* (*The Lotus Sūtra and the Development of Buddhist Thought*). Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 503–28 [in Japanese].

Karashima, Seishi. 2003-06. 'A Trilingual Edition of the Lotus Sutra — New Editions of the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese Versions'. *ARIRIAB* VI: 85–182; (2), VII, 2004: 33–104; (3) VIII, 2005: 105–189; (4) IX, 2006: 79–88.

_____. 2012. Die *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der *Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins*. Band I, Band II, Band III (Grammatik und Glossar). Tokyo: IRIAB (*Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica* XIII.1–3).

_____. 2019. 'The Importance of the Study of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Manuscripts'. *The Journal of Oriental Studies* 29: 128–46.

Kudo, Noriyuki (工藤順之). 2014. 'Girugitto hon Sumāgadhāvadāna ni tsuite' (Gilgit Version of the *Sumāgadhā-avadāna*). *Indogaku bukkyogaku kenkyū* (*Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies*), 63-1: 357–351 [in Japanese].

_____. 2016. 'Sumāgadhāvadāna Girugitto shahon (1): Shahon A' (Gilgit Manuscripts of the *Sumāgadhā-avadāna* (1): Manuscript A). *ARIRIAB* XIX: 319–44 [in Japanese].

Kawaguchi, Ekai (河口慧海) and Ikeda Chotatsu (池田澄達). 1926. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkam nāma [Ma]hāyānasūtram*. 東京: 佛教宣揚會 (Tokyo: The Society for Propagating Buddhism) (repr. 1956; 2001).

Kern, Hendrik. 1884. *The Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, *or The Lotus of the True Law*. Oxford: Clarendon Press (*Sacred Books of East* 21); repr.: Varanasi, Delhi, Patna 1965: Motilal Banarsidass.

Kern, Hendrik and Bunyiu Nanjo. 1908–1912. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*. St. Petersbourg: Académie Impériale des Sciences (*Bibliotheca Buddhica* X); repr.: Tokyo 1977: Meicho-Fukyū-kai.

LSM (Lotus Sutra Manuscript Series)

LSM 1 (1997) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lüshun Museum Collection*, *Facsimile Edition and Romanized Text*. Edited by Jiang Zhongxin.

LSM 2-1 (1998) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the National Archives of Nepal* (*No. 4-21*), *Facsimile Edition*. Supervised by H. Toda and H. Kotsuki.

LSM 2-2 (2001) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the National Archives of Nepal* (*No. 4-21*), *Romanized Text 1*. Edited by Hirofumi Toda.

LSM 2-3 (2004) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the National Archives of Nepal* (*No. 4-21*), *Romanized Text 2*. Edited by Hirofumi Toda.

LSM 3 (2000) *Fragments of a Manuscript of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra from Khādaliq*. Edited by Klaus Wille.

LSM 4 (2002) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscripts from Cambridge University Library* (*Add. 1682 and Add. 1683*), *Facsimile Edition*. Supervised by H. Toda, et al.

LSM 5 (2003) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from University of Tokyo General Library* (*No. 414*), *Romanized Text*. Edited by Haruaki Kotsuki.

LSM 7 (2007) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (*No. 6*), *Romanized Text.* Edited by Haruaki Kotsuki.

LSM 8 (2008) *Manuscrit sanscrit du Sûtra du Lotus de la Société asiatique* (*N° 2*), *Texte romanisé* [*Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the Société Asiatique* (*No. 2*), *Romanized Text*]. Edited by Haruaki Kotsuki.

LSM 9 (2009) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the British Library* (*Or. 2204*), *Facsimile Edition*.

LSM 10 (2010) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from Cambridge University Library* (*Add. 1684*), *Romanized Text.* Edited by Haruaki Kotsuki.

LSM 11 (2011) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the British Library* (*Or. 2204*), *Romanized Text*. Edited by Noriyoshi Mizufune.

LSM 12 (2012) *Gilgit Lotus Sutra Manuscripts from the National Archives of India*, *Facsimile Edition*. Edited by Noriyoshi Mizufune.

LSM 13 (2013) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscripts from the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences* (*SI P/5*, *etc.*), *Facsimile Edition*. Edited by Noriyoshi Mizufune.

LSM 14 (2014) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the Asiatic Society*, *Kolkata* (*No. 4079*), *Romanized Text.* Edited by Haruaki Kotsuki.

LSM 15 (2017) *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the National Archives of Nepal* (*No. 5-144*), *Romanized Text.* Edited by Haruaki Kotsuki.

LSM 17 (2019) *A Critical Edition of the Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Based on Gilgit-Nepalese Manuscripts* (*C3 Collated Text*) [Sanskrit Lotus Sutra manuscript from Cambridge University Library (Add. 1682), romanized text]. Edited by Haruaki Kotsuki.

LSM 18 (2023) *A Critical Edition of Sanskrit Lotus Sutra C4 with Comparison Readings from Nepalese*, *Gilgit and Central Asian Manuscripts* [Sanskrit Lotus Sutra manuscript from Cambridge University Library (Add. 1683), romanized text]. Edited by Haruaki Kotsuki.

Marciniak, Katarzyna. 2014. *Studia nad Mahāvastu*, *sanskryckim tekstem buddyjskiej szkoły mahasanghików-lokottarawadinów. Studia Buddhica* 3. Research Centre of Buddhist Studies, Warsaw.

_____. 2016. 'The Oldest Palm-Leaf Manuscript of the *Mahāvastu* (MS Sa): A Paleographic Description'. *ARIRIAB* XIX: 125–48.

_____. 2017a. 'The Oldest Paper Manuscript of the *Mahāvastu*'. *ARIRIAB* XX: 103–21.

_____. 2017b. 'A Manuscript of Gopadatta's Jātakamālā Copied by Jayamuni Vajrācārya'. *ARIRIAB* XX: 123–28.

_____. 2019. *The Mahāvastu. A New Edition. Volume III*. Tokyo: IRIAB (*Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica* XIV.1).

_____. 2020. *The Mahāvastu. A New Edition. Volume II*. Tokyo: IRIAB (*Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica* XIV.2).

Mochizuki, Kaie and Kim Byungkon. 2020. *Bibliography of the Studies on the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* (*1844-2020*) (Lotus Sutra Studies I). Minobu:

International Institute for Nichiren Buddhism of Minobusan University.

Nishi, Yasutomo. 2022-4. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, *Kern-Nanjio's Edition in Roman Script with Complementary Footnotes*. Kern-Nanjio's edition, romanized text I. Tokyo: Chuo Academic Research Institute; Text II, 2023; Text III, 2024.

Okano, Kiyoshi (岡野潔). 2019. 'Kalpalatā to Avadānamālā no kenkyū (8): Jayamuni, TJAM Chap. 14 (I), SMRAM Chap. 21, Avadānakalpalatā Chap. 84' (*Avadānakalpalatā* and the *Avadānamālā* (8): Jayamuni, TJAM Chap. 14 (I), SMRAM Chap. 21 and *Avadānakalpalatā* Chap. 84). *Minami ajia kotengaku* (South Asian Classical Studies) 14: 1–123 [in Japanese].

_____. 2020. 'Kalpalatā to Avadānamālā no kenkyū (9): Devātiśayastotra, SMRAM Chap. 20, TJAM Chap. 14 (II)' (*Avadānakalpalatā* and the *Avadānamālā* (9): *Devātiśayastotra*, SMRAM Chap. 20 and TJAM Chap. 14 (II)). *Minami ajia kotengaku* (South Asian Classical Studies) 15: 89–227 [in Japanese].

_____. 2021. 'Kalpalatā to Avadānamālā no kenkyū (10): Jayamuni no shigoto to TJAM Chapter 15' (A Study of the *Avadānakalpalatā* and the *Avadānamālā* (10) — Works of Jayamuni and Chapter 15 of TJAM). *Minami ajia kotengaku* (South Asian Classical Studies) 16: 51–138 [in Japanese].

Risshō Database, Institute for the Comprehensive Study of the Lotus Sutra. 2003. *Date-base of Valuable Lotus Sūtra Manuscripts.* Microfilm materials held at the Institute for the Comprehensive Study of the Lotus Sutra, Rissho University (Vol. I, 2000; II, 2001; III, 2001; IV, 2002) [CD-ROM].

Roth, Gustav ed. 1970. *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, *including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*. Patna: K.P. Jayaswal Research Institute (*Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series* 12).

SMS: Nakamura, Z., et al. 1977–1982. *Sanskrit Manuscripts of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, *Collected from Nepal*, *Kashmir and Central Asia. Vol. I-XII.* Tokyo: Publishing Association of Saddharmapundarika Manuscripts.

SMSR: Tsukamoto, K., Taga, R., Mitomo, R., Yamazaki, M., and Kawazoe, Y. 1986–1988. *Sanskrit Manuscripts of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, *Collected from Nepal*, *Kashmir and Central Asia*, *Romanized Text and Index.* Tokyo: Publishing Association of Saddharmapundarika Manuscripts.

Toda, Hirofumi. 1981. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, *Central Asian Manuscripts*, *Romanized Text*. Tokushima: Kyoiku Shuppan Center.

Tournier, Vincent. 2012. 'The *Mahāvastu* and the *Vinayapiṭaka* Collection of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin'. *ARIRIAB* XV: 87–104.

_____. 2017. *La formation du Mahāvastu et la mise en place des conceptions relatives à la carrière du bodhisattva*. Paris: École française d'Extrême-Orient (Monographies, no. 195).

Tsuji, Naoshiro (辻直四郎). 1970. 'Hokekyō no gengo' (The Languages Used in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*). In *Hokekyō no seiritsu to tenkai* (*The Lotus Sūtra and the Development of Buddhist Thought*). Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 3–21 [in Japanese].

Vaidya, Parasurama Lakshmana. 1960. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*. Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning

(*Buddhist Sanskrit Texts*, no. 6).

Watanabe, Shoko (渡辺照宏). 1966. 'Hokekyō bongo shohon no hikaku kenkyū jyosetsu — Jikken sanrei' (A Comparative Study of Various Sanskrit Manuscripts of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*). In *Kanakura hakushi koki kinen ronbunshū* (Studies in Indology and Buddhology: Dedicated to Dr. Ensho Kanakura in Commemoration of His Seventy Birthday). Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 359–89 [in Japanese].

_____. 1969. 'Hokekyō bongo shohon no keitou ni tsuite — Johon kara inyō shite' (A Genealogical Survey of Various Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra). In *Fukuki hakushi shōju kinen tōyō bunka ronshū* (Oriental Culture: A Collection of Articles in Honor of the Seventieth Anniversary of Dr. Kojun Fukui). Tokyo: Waseda Daigaku Shuppanbu, 59–78 [in Japanese].

_____. 1970. 'Hokekyō no genten no seiritsu ni kansuru ichi kōsatsu' (The Original Text of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra). In *Hokekyō no seiritsu to tenkai* (*The Lotus Sūtra and the Development of Buddhist Thought*). Kyoto: Heirakuji Shoten, 77–110 [in Japanese].

_____. 1972–75. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka Manuscripts Found in Gilgit*, ed. and annotated, part one: photographic reproduction, part two: romanized text. Tokyo: Reiyukai.

Wogihara, U. and Tsuchida, C. 1934–1935. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtram*, *Romanized and Revised Text of the Bibliotheca Buddhica Publication by Consulting a Sanskrit MS. and Tibetan and Chinese Translations*. Tokyo: Sankibo Busshorin.

Yuyama, Akira (湯山明). 1998. 'Hokekyō no bunkengaku teki kenkyū kadai' (Philological Problems in the Lotus Sutra). *ARIRIAB* I: 29–47 [in Japanese].

_____. 2001. *The Mahāvastu-Avadāna in Old Palm-Leaf and Paper Manuscripts*. Vol. I. *Palm-Leaf Manuscripts*. Tokyo: The Centre for East Asian Cultural Studies for UNESCO (*Bibliotheca Codicum Asiaticorum* XV).

About the Author and Translator

Noriyuki Kudo is a professor at The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University. He specializes in the study of Sanskrit grammar and Indian Buddhism. Prof. Kudo has published *The Karmavibhaṅga: Transliterations and Annotations of the Original Sanskrit Manuscripts from Nepal* (2004) and edited *Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India*, *Facsimile Edition*, vols. II.3 (2018), II.4 (2017), II.5 (2022), III (2017), and *Śāntamatiḥ: Manuscripts for Life — Essays in Memory of Seishi Karashima* (2023).

Mary Blaber is a former radio and magazine writer and editor who has spent several decades translating and editing works about Nichiren Buddhism.