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1. Introduction

An increasing number of Buddhist texts are being discovered among old manuscript collections extant in Japan—such as the Kongō-ji Manuscript Collection—that bear titles identical to the woodblock printed editions produced in China but that differ significantly in content. The discovery in recent years of such texts is helping to shed light on different aspects of the transmission of Buddhist texts, aspects that we would not have learned from the study of the woodblock editions alone. Such discoveries have prompted the Research Institute for Old Japanese Manuscripts of Buddhist Scriptures to conduct studies of these collections. As a result of these ongoing studies, we have already found a considerable number of texts that differ from their corresponding woodblock printed editions. In this paper I would like to take up one such text, namely the text of the *Puxian pusa xing yuan zan* 普賢菩薩行願讚 (Bhadracaryāpranidhāna or Bhadracari-pranidhāna) in the Kongō-ji Manuscript Collection.

* This article is a revision of a paper presented at the ‘Ancient Japanese Manuscripts’ panel at the 16th Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, held at the Dharma Drum Buddhist College in Taiwan, 23 June, 2011. That paper was, for the most part, an English translation of Hayashidera 2009.

1 The discovery of manuscript versions of the *Maming pusa zhuan* in the Kōshō-ji and Nanatsu-dera Manuscript Collections marked the first such finding (see Ochiai 1994 and 2000). For a review of studies of texts in the Kongō-ji Manuscript Collection, including newly discovered texts, see Ochiai eds. 2004 and 2007.
Collection. This hitherto unknown text is comprised entirely of a phonetic transcription of Sanskrit in Chinese characters. Through an analysis of several characteristics of the text, I will show that it is an incomplete phonetic transcription of a Sanskrit text thought to belong to the same stemma as the one that Amoghavajra used to translate the Bhadracaryā-panidhāna. I will also demonstrate that a record of lectures given by Jiun Onkō 慈雲飲光 (1718–1804), a well-known Edo-era siddham 悉曇 scholar of the Shingon-ritsu Sect 眞言律宗, who was based at the Kōki-ji monastery, suggests that he was familiar with a similar text. The complete text of the Kongō-ji manuscript can be seen on pages 117 through 123.

The Bhadracaryā-panidhāna is an important Mahāyāna encomium that circulated across much of Asia. It describes a vow by bodhisattvas to practice ten kinds of bhadra-caryās, such as taking refuge in, extolling, and making offerings to the Buddhas, and extols the act of taking refuge in Amitābha. The text has the following three Chinese translations, listed in order of year(s) translated:

1) The Wenshushili fayuan jing (文殊師利發願經, Taishō no. 296), tr. by Buddhabhadra in 420 CE.
2) The Puxian pusa xing yuan zan (普賢菩薩行願讚, Taishō no. 297), tr. by Amoghavajra between 746 and 771 CE.
3) The Puxian guangdayuanwang qingjing jie (普賢廣大願王清淨偈) at the end of the Dafangguang fo huayan jing, (大方廣佛華嚴經, Taishō no. 293, Gañḍavyūha-sūtra), tr. by Prajñā between 796 and 798 CE.

2 On the Sanskrit manuscripts of the Bhadracaryāpanidhāna preserved in the Kōki-ji, see Okukaze 2012.
3 In addition to Sanskrit versions, there are translations extant in Chinese, Tibetan, Khotanese, Tangut, and Mongolian. Incidentally, there is a 10th century inscription found at Nālandā, which includes a verse from the Bhadracaryāpanidhāna. See Schopen [1989] 2005.
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The *Wenshushili fayuan jing* is a translation by Buddhabhadra (359–429), who is perhaps best known for his translation of the *Avatamsaka Sūtra*, which is commonly known as the “Sixty-fascicle Huayan jing”. The *Wenshushili fayuan jing* consists of 44 quatrains of five-character lines.

The *Puxian pusa xing yuan zan* is a translation by Amoghavajra (705–774), who brought to China many Vajrayāna texts from Sri Lanka and was a central figure in establishing Chinese Esoteric Buddhism. This translation comprises 62 quatrains of seven-character lines. While “Puxian pusa xing yuan zan” is sometimes used generically to denote to any version of the *Bhadracaryāpranidhāna*, it most often refers eponymously to this Chinese translation.

The *Puxian guangdayuanwang qingjing jie* by Prajña (date of birth and death unknown; 8th to 9th centuries) is the third translation. Unlike the Buddhabhadra and Amoghavajra translations, which were of independent, self-contained texts, this rendering forms a part of the last fascicle of Prajña’s translation of the *Avatamsaka Sūtra*, which is commonly called the “Forty-fascicle Huayan jing”. Traditionally, the Chinese verses most frequently quoted and cited in China and Japan have been from this translation. Like Amoghavajra’s version, Prajña’s translation consists of 62 quatrains of seven-character lines. The two renderings are also largely in

---

4 On the possibility that the title of this work is a translation of "*Mañjuśrīpranidhāna* (-sūtra)", see Izumi 1930, p. 227f.
6 These verses at the end of the *Forty-fascicle Huayan jing* are contained in neither Buddhabhadra’s *Sixty-fascicle Huayan jing* nor Sīkṣānanda’s *Eighty-fascicle Huayan jing*, so we can assume that they were added to the Sanskrit original (s) between the years in which the *Eighty-fascicle Huayan jing* was produced (695–699) and the *Forty-fascicle Huayan jing* (796–798) was produced, i.e. sometime between the beginning to the middle of the 8th century. See Nakamura 1995, p. 851.
agreement content-wise. The order of the stanzas, however, widely differs in places.\(^7\) If we accept the premise that the last two renditions of 62 verses represent the final, completed form of this work, it stands to reason that Buddhahadra’s translation consisting of 44 verses represents a transitional form.

Extant Sanskrit sources can be divided into two categories: the northern branch, as represented by manuscripts from Nepal,\(^8\) and the southern branch, thought to have derived from Sri Lankan sources which Amoghavajra’s translation likely based upon. There are differences in order of position as well as linguistic variances seen between these two branches, but linguistic clues suggest that the southern sources represent the older of the versions.\(^9\)

The Sanskrit versions of *Bhadracaryāprāṇidhāna* transmitted to Japan that were collected and published by Jiun correspond to the southern versions, and are in complete agreement—from the first to the sixty-second verse—with Amoghavajra’s translation.\(^10\)

2. Characteristics of the newly discovered Kongō-ji *Puxian pusa xing yuan zan*

There is a Sanskrit-Chinese version of the pertinent text in Kongō-ji that has already been designated an Important Cultural Property,\(^11\) but our

---

\(^7\) Stanzas 48 to 51 and 52 to 60 of Prajña’s translation correspond to Stanzas 55 to 60 and 46 to 54 of Amoghavajra’s translation, respectively. See Watanabe [1902] 1977, pp. 299–317, especially p. 314f.

\(^8\) The verses at the end of the *Gaṅḍavyūha-sūtra*, itself a part of the larger *Avatamsaka Sūtra*, agree with the Nepalese manuscripts.


\(^11\) A Sanskrit (*bonji* 梵字) manuscript written horizontally to which Prajña’s translation was written in as a side-by-side translation. Dated to the Heian period. Facsimile editions and exegeses are as follows: *Bonji kichō shiryō shūsei: Zuhan-hen*
studies have uncovered two additional texts in the collection of the *Puxian pusa xing yuan zan*. For the sake of convenience I will call these versions “Manuscript A” and “Manuscript B”.12 The content and line breaks of the two texts for the most part coincide. Hence, we are left to conclude that both are based on a common source text, or that either Manuscript A or Manuscript B served as a source text for the other. Both manuscripts are in scroll form and are tentatively dated to the Late Heian period. Manuscript A has been preserved in far better condition. Manuscript B is marked by passages destroyed by insects and such.13

Despite bearing the title *Puxian pusa xing yuan zan*, the newly discovered Kongō-ji text is quite unlike the three translations noted above. The distinctive features of this text can be summarized by the following four characteristics (from A to D).

**Characteristic A: The text is comprised entirely of a phonetic transcription**

Unlike the Chinese versions cited above, which are actual translations

---

12 The physical characteristics and dimensions of the manuscripts are as follows. Manuscript A: total length of 114.6 cm, consisting of a first scroll sheet of 53.3 cm, a second of 55.0 cm, and a third of 6.3 cm. Each sheet of Manuscript A features a height of 25.5 cm, which consists of 19.6 cm of text bordered by a 2.6 cm margin at the top and 3.3 cm margin at the bottom. Line width is 1.9 cm. The three sheets of Manuscript B total 121.6 cm in length, and consist of a first sheet of 31.4 cm, a second sheet of 53.1 cm, and a third sheet of 37.1 cm. The total height of Manuscript B is 26.0 cm, which comprises a top margin of 3.5 cm, a bottom margin of 3.0 cm, and a text portion of 19.5 cm. The line width is 1.8 cm.

13 The existence of the two manuscript copies makes it possible to emend portions of the text that have been damaged in either.
of Sanskrit originals, the newly-discovered Kongō-ji version is merely a phonetic transcription of the Sanskrit text using a Chinese pronunciation scheme. This is evident, for example, from the opening line “曩謨三滿多跋㮈囉也,” which is an obvious transcription of the Sanskrit “namah Samantabhadrāya.” In fact, aside from the title, which reads *Puxian pusa xing yuan zan* 普賢菩薩行願讚, the entire Kongō-ji text is comprised of a transcription in Chinese characters (See photograph 1 on the page 124).

**Characteristic B: Each quarter-verse is numbered, and the text ends at the 14th stanza**

Each quarter-verse in this Kongō-ji version is serially numbered with Chinese numerals, the last being “57.” Though not part of a verse, the initial salutation “namah Samantabhadrāya” mentioned above is numbered in the text. Not counting this salutation, the text comprises 56 transcribed quarter-verses, and as Sanskrit stanzas typically consist of four *pādas*, we have in the text a total of 14 transcribed stanzas.

Again, the Prajña and Amoghavajra translations of the *Bhadracaryā-pranidhāna* both comprise 62 stanzas, but the Kongō-ji manuscript ends abruptly after the 14th stanza. It should be noted that the 14th stanza does not represent any kind of breakpoint in terms of content, and there is no apparent logic for concluding the text here. The reason for this abrupt termination remains unclear. While it is possible that the original copy text (i.e. the source text upon which the Kongō-ji text was based) consisted of 62 stanzas yet the portion after the 14th stanza was intentionally or unintentionally omitted when transcribed at Kongō-ji, such a scenario is unlikely. The reason is that both manuscripts have several lines worth of space at the end as well as oblique slits at the top and bottom of the paper. These features mark where the scroll rods were originally located. This suggests that the Kongō-ji text has always consisted of only these 14 stanzas (see photograph 2 on page 124).
Characteristic C: The text agrees with the Sanskrit (southern sources) upon which Amoghavajra’s translation was probably based

As I stated in the introduction, extant Sanskrit sources can be divided into northern and southern branches, and the Chinese translation that most closely follows the Sanskrit texts collected in Japan by Jiun (southern branch) is the one by Amoghavajra. Furthermore, a comparison of the verse order shows that the Kongō-ji transcription corresponds to the southern Sanskrit sources. The excerpt shown in the following is a good example of how the Kongō-ji text conforms to both the southern Sanskrit sources and Amoghavajra’s translation. For the purposes of comparison I have also given the corresponding passage in Prajñā’s translation, which also consists of 62 stanzas. The excerpt is the latter half of the 14th stanza. I chose it because the Sanskrit sources upon which Amoghavajra and Prajñā were respectively based clearly diverge here, making it easy to see the concordance among the Kongō-ji transcription, the southern Sanskrit, and Amoghavajra’s translation. The four versions are as follows:

---

14 The northern and southern Sanskrit sources are largely the same up until the 14th stanza, though there are differences in the way the verses are arranged. For example, the latter halves of the fifth and sixth stanzas are reversed, and the 14th stanza of the southern stemma corresponds to the latter half of the 13th stanza and the first half of the 14th stanza in the northern stemma. See Watanabe [1902] 1977, p. 309f. In terms of these differences, the Kongō-ji transliteration is in agreement with the southern stemma.

15 The Sanskrit reading cited is from Shiraishi’s critical editions of Sanskrit texts in Japan collected by Jiun (southern sources). See Shiraishi [1962] 1988. As far as this verse is concerned, Ashikaga’s critical edition (1958) is the same. On the other hand, Watanabe’s critical edition is based on northern sources, namely Nepalese manuscripts, so is not cited here. Cf. Watanabe [1912] 1977. There is also a Sanskrit edition with a corresponding English translation by Izumi Hōkei (Izumi 1929).
The Kongō-ji text cited above is a faithful phonetic transcription of the Sanskrit given. The Sanskrit (“May all of the fields [lands] in the ten directions be pure and vast”) also maps well to Amoghavajra’s translation (所有十方諸刹土 願皆广大咸清淨), but does not correspond Prajña’s translation (我願普随三世學 速得成就大菩提) of the same. We can infer from this agreement that it is probably not a coincidence that the Kongō-ji text bears the same title as Amoghavajra’s translation of the Bhadra-caryāpranidhāna.

Characteristic D: The Kongō-ji text features notes for pronunciation and includes the character 打 (“to strike”)

The Kongō-ji transcription features notes on pronunciation inserted into the text and makes frequent use of fanqie 反切, i.e. the traditional two-character Chinese phonetic annotation scheme using one character to indicate a consonant and another to signify the following vowel (and terminal consonant when present). In the 14th stanza shown above, for example:

16 Amoghavajra’s translation of the latter half of the 14th stanza (所有十方諸刹土 願皆广大咸清淨) and the Sanskrit on which it is based correspond to the first half of the 15th stanza in Prajña’s translation (所有十方一切刹 廣大清淨妙莊嚴).
example, the character 柿 used to represent *van* in *bhavantu* is followed by 無幹反, meaning that the initial consonant is the same as 無 and the sound that follows “rhymes” with 幹 (where 反 is simply an indicator that *fanqie* is being used here). In addition, the text uses other devices to specify pronunciation, such as the character 引 to denote a long vowel, the words 二合 and 三合 for conjunct consonants, 去 for *anusvāra* (ṁ), and 入 for *visarga* (ḥ). This use of pronunciation keys itself is not unique to the Kongō-ji text, as they are not uncommon in Chinese translations of *stotra* that retain some Sanskrit, dhāraṇī, and similar texts, but because the Kongō-ji text is comprised entirely of transcribed Sanskrit and uses *fanqie* and other devices to show how it is to be pronounced, it is possible that the text was primarily meant to be recited in rituals or rites, and that understanding the meaning of the text was of secondary importance.

There may be other evidence in the text supporting this possibility. The character 打, which is not part of the transliterated Sanskrit, appears three times throughout the text. In terms of the Chinese numerals that accompany each quarter-verse, 打 appears after quarter-verse no. 25 (the end of the sixth verse in Sanskrit), quarter-verse no. 41 (the end of the 10th verse in Sanskrit), and quarter-verse no. 57 (the end of the 14th verse in Sanskrit). The first instance of 打 corresponds to the sixth Sanskrit stanza, but it then occurs after the 10th and 14th, i.e. it appears at even intervals that are four stanzas long. I suspect that this 打 (meaning “to strike” or “to hit”) is a cue to strike a percussion instrument or make some kind of striking motion, but without further information I cannot say for sure. I would be grateful for any insight on the matter.

3. Historical traces of a transcription belonging to the same stemma as the Kongō-ji text

So far I have described the aspects of this newly found text that make it unlike any of the Chinese translations of the *Bhadracaryāpranidhāna*. 
Now I would like to note that a transcription belonging to the same stemma as the Kongō-ji text has actually left verifiable traces on the history of Japanese Buddhism. Specifically, those traces are found in a record of lectures given by Jiun Onkō, a learned monk who collected and studied Sanskrit manuscripts of the Bhadracaryāprāṇidhāna that transmitted to Japan (southern sources that correspond to Amoghavajra’s translation). The record, titled Fugengyōgansan bonpon kikigaki 普賢行願梵本聞書, consists of notes taken by Jiun’s disciple Hōgo法護 for Jiun’s lectures on the Bhadracaryāprāṇidhāna that began in 1767.17 The lecture notes first present a Sanskrit text of the Bhadracaryāprāṇidhāna in siddham script, which is followed by a transcription in Chinese, and then by explanations of the individual words and phrases. What is of great interest here is that the Chinese transcription given is almost identical to the Kongō-ji text. Even more interesting is that, just as the Kongō-ji text, the transcription ends with the 14th stanza. After the phonetic rendering of the verse, the notes record Jiun as stating: “The transcription ends with this stanza. The verse from the 15th stanza onward has yet to be located. In the future you should search for these [stanzas] far and wide to fill in [the missing portion].”18

We can therefore infer that the manuscript Jiun was using belonged to the same textual lineage as the Kongō-ji text. Unfortunately, the lecture notes make no mention of the nature of the provenance of the text Jiun was describing, the temple in which the manuscript was stored, or other useful information about this text. Jiun merely describes the work as an “exposition of phonetic transcription”, and given his exhortation to his students to look for the remaining stanzas, we may assume that Jiun himself lacked detailed information on the text.

17 This record is contained in the Bongaku-shinryō 梵學津梁, a compilation of Sanskrit texts and studies thereof by Jiun. See Jiun Sonja Zenshū [1926] 1977, Vol. 9 No. 2 慈雲尊者全集第九卷下, pp. 1–246.
18 Ibid., p. 92 f.
4. Conclusion

In the above I have analysed key characteristics of a newly discovered text of the *Puxian pusa xing yuan zan* from the Kongō-ji Manuscript Collection. This text comprises a phonetic transcription in Chinese of Sanskrit verse corresponding to the first 14 stanzas of the southern Sanskrit sources of the *Bhadracaryāprāṇidhāna*, i.e. the same manuscript tradition likely used as the basis for Amoghavajra’s Chinese translation. It is unclear why the text abruptly ends after the 14th stanza, but the evidence suggests that it was not because of scribal errors that occurred during the transcription of the Kongō-ji text, but rather because the source manuscript upon which the Kongō-ji text was based likewise extended only to the 14th stanza. Given the use of *fanqie* and similar devices designed to convey the proper pronunciation, in addition to the inclusion of the character 打, which is not part of any transcription or pronunciation scheme, it is possible that the text was used for recitation purposes at rites or rituals of some sort. Furthermore, because we find a nearly identical Chinese transcription in a work recording lectures by Jiun, we know that he had access to a manuscript belonging to the same stemma as the Kongō-ji text. This is the only evidence I have been able to locate in literature documenting the history of Japanese Buddhism that corroborates the existence of a text of the same lineage as the Kongō-ji text.

One obvious question is whether the phonetic transcription was composed by a scholarly monk in Japan using a Sanskrit manuscript of the *Bhadracaryāprāṇidhāna* that had made its way to Japan, or was composed in China and then transmitted to Japan. At present, I believe the latter scenario to be more likely.

Among Sanskrit materials preserved in Japan is a manuscript titled 普賢菩薩所行行願讚. This text features Chinese transcriptions alongside

---

19 Inokuchi ed. 1984, pp. 100-120 (reproduction) and p. 754 (commentary).
The Sanskrit text. The postscript says that it was produced in the year 810 by Huilin 惠琳 (737–820) at Da Xing Shan-si 大興善寺. This manuscript gives phonetic readings for 62 stanzas. Although the Chinese characters used for the transcription differ slightly from those of the Kongō-ji text, we should note that Huilin not only was extremely proficient in Sanskrit—he authored the hundred-fascicle Yin-yi 音義 dictionary—but was also a direct disciple of Amoghavajra. Moreover, when we consider the fact that Amoghavajra urged his students to develop the ability to recite the Bhadracaryāprāṇidhāna from memory,20 and that although the Kongō-ji text encompasses only the first 14 stanzas it is nevertheless in perfect concordance with the Sanskrit used by Amoghavajra to produce to the Puxian pusa xing yuan zan, it is quite possible that the transcribed text has roots in a text either used by or not far removed from Amoghavajra. In point of fact, the transcribed Chinese text of the Sanskrit Prajñāpāramitā Hṛdaya discovered among the Dunhuang manuscripts is now thought to have been authored by Amoghavajra,21 a finding which may prove to be a useful clue in discussions of the transcribed Bhadracaryāprāṇidhāna. Many details of the newly found Kongō-ji manuscripts remain unclear. Nevertheless, this text, together with the Chinese transcription of the Bhadracaryāprāṇidhāna attributed to Huilin, deserves further study.

5. A Collation of the Kongō-ji Text with the Main Textual Versions

○ There are two manuscripts in Kongō-ji (which I term Ms. A and Ms. B). Ms. A, however, has suffered extensive insect damage, so the following text is based on Ms. B. Accordingly, the manuscript designation “Kj-m” below in fact refers to Ms. B.
○ Damaged characters are indicated with a box enclosure (□). In places where I

manuscript was copied in 1084 by a monk called Ryōyū 良祐, but there is no information available as to where the manuscript was stored.

21 Fukui 2000, pp. 91–168.
have used Ms. A to emend such passages, I have placed the emended characters inside those enclosures.

- In places where I have corrected readings in Ms. B using Ms. A, I have indicated so in the notes.
- The line breaks used here are not the same as those in the manuscripts. I have based the line breaks here on the Chinese numerals shown in the text, which are assigned to each Sanskrit *pāda*.
- Below the Kongō-ji Ms. I show the corresponding lines in the “Exposition of phonetic transcription” from *Fugengyōgansan bonpon kikigaki* 普賢行願梵本聞書 (abbreviated as “Jiun”) as well as the critical edition by Shiraishi Shindō (abbreviated as “Skt”). Wherever characters in the Kongō-ji Ms. and the *siddham* version (Jiun) differ, I have underlined them.
- I have added in square brackets those characters that are not present in either manuscript but that should be there from an editorial standpoint.

【Fascicle Title】普賢菩薩行願讃

[Kj-m] 曇謨三去聲手 滿多跋捺囉也 [一]
[Jiun] 曇謨三滿多跋捺羅也
[Skt] Namah Samantabhadraya

【V.1 a】[Kj-m] 夜引 縛多計引 爾娜設僧泥以反 始路引 計引 二
[Jiun] 夜縛多。計即。娜設僧即。路計
[Skt] yāvata keci daśad-diśi loke

【V.1 b】[Kj-m] 薩縛底哩二合 拽特二合 誕跋迴囉僧思孕反去聲 賀二合 [三]
[Jiun] 薩奪。底哩 拽特縛。誔跋。囉。僧賀
[Skt] sarva-triyadhva-gatā nara-simhāḥ /

【V.1 c】[Kj-m] 佇蔵護滿娜弭薩尾阿勢引 釵引 四
[Jiun] 佇蔵護。滿娜弭。薩尾。阿勢釵
[Skt] tān ahu vandami sarvi aśeṣāṁ

---

22 This phrase is missing in Ashikaga’s edition.
迦引也覩。齋左。麼寧。鉢羅散諾入。五

迦也覩。齋左。

[Skts] kāyatvā ca manana prasannaḥ  //1//

迦引也覩。羅祖玻。迦也覩。鉢羅散諾

[Skts] kṣetra-rajopama-kāya-pramāṇaiḥ

薩爾而反。薩羅祖。跛。迦。鉢羅拏。𤚥。

[Skts] sarva-jina karomi pranāmam /

薩爾而前。薩羅。鼻穆契。薩塊

[Skts] sarva-jīnābhīmukhenama nena

薩爾羅。薩羅。鼻穆契。薩

[Skts] sarva-jināna karomi pranāmam

薩爾而反。薩爾

[Skts] eka-rajāgri rajopama-buddham

薩爾而反。薩爾

[Skts] buddha-sutāna niṣaṇṇaku madhye /

薩爾而反。薩爾

[Skts] evam āśeṣata dharmata-dhātum

薩爾而反。薩爾

[Skts] sarva'dhimucyami puṇaṁ jīnebhīḥ  //3//

薩爾而反。薩爾

[Skts] teṣu ca āksaya-varṇa-samudrāṁ
【V.4 b】[Kj-m] 薩曇併合 婆曇引 該娑母捺囉併合 娑引、剖入 十五
   [Jiun] 娑曇。婆曇誐。娑母捺羅。婆帝剖
   [Skt] sarva-svarāṅga-samudra-rutebhīḥ /

【V.4 c】[Kj-m] 薩曇爾准上 娑曇捺[仌音]婆曇引 柒入 十六
   [Jiun] 娑曇。爾婆曇。婆曇引、婆母捺羅。
   [Skt] sarva-jīnāna guṇām bhanamānas

【V.4 d】[Kj-m] 娑曇併去引 素誐旦引 娑跋引 婆弭引 阿護薩מעונ 十七
   [Jiun] 娑曇。素誐旦。娑跋引、婆弭引、婆母捺羅。
   [Skt] tām Sugatām stavām ahu sarvām //4//

【V.5 a】[Kj-m] 補滋波合 婆曇引 鼻左獻引 里使合 婆曇引 摧入 十八
   [Jiun] *No transcription of this sentence
   [Skt] puṣpa-varebhī ca mālya-varebhīh

【V.5 b】[Kj-m] 摧引 俪也合引 尾黎引 跛曩栓合 婆曇引 摧入 十九
   [Jiun] *No transcription of this sentence
   [Skt] vādyā-vilepana-cchatra-varebhīh /

【V.5 c】[Kj-m] 娑曇尾始婆吒合引 尾兪引 賀曇隷引 鼻 二十
   [Jiun] 娑曇。尾始婆吒。尾兪賀。婆隷鼻
   [Skt] sarva-viśiṣṭa-viyūha-varebhīḥ

【V.5 d】[Kj-m] 布引 荷准上後引 曄帝引 數上 耳娜引 曄迦廬引 引廿一
   [Jiun] 布引。荷仌准上。爾娜引、暻迦廬引、引
   [Skt] pūjana teṣu jīnāna karomi //5//

【V.6 a】[Kj-m] 婆無鈴反 娑恒囉合 婆隷引 鼻左獻駮婆隷引 鼻 廿二
   [Jiun] 婆恒囉。婆隷鼻左。獻駮。婆隷鼻
   [Skt] vastra-varebhī ca gandha-varebhīḥ24

【V.6 b】[Kj-m] 室注合引 羅拏合 補隈鼻左[仌音] 娑隷銘引 摧入 廿三
   [Jiun] 室注羅拏。補隈鼻左銘。娑隷銘
   [Skt] cūrṇa-puṭebhi ca Meru-samebhīḥ /

---

23 廿一 Missing in Ms. B; supplied from Ms. A.
24 Kongō-ji Mss and Jiun read ś.
【V.6 c】[Kj-m] 嬘泥以反引 跛嚩耶引 鼻左度引 跛嚩耶引 鼻入聲仍 卅四
[Jiu] 嬘跛。縛聵鼻。左度跛。聵聵聵
[Skt] dipa-varebhi ca dhūpa-varebhih
【V.6 d】[Kj-m] 布引 惹囊帝引 數上 爾娜引 膨迦廬引 弭 卅五 打
[Jiu] 布惹囊。帝數。爾娜囊。膨迦廬弭
[Skt] pūjana teṣu jināna karomā //6//
【V.7 a】[Kj-m] 夜引 左引 阿拏va 跌嚩布引 惹嘗25娜引 嘌引 卅六
[Jiu] 夜左。阿拏跏羅。布惹。嘗娜羅
[Skt] yā ca anuttara pūja udāra
【V.7 b】[Kj-m] 跋地没呰也二合 弭薩聵爾囊引 南引 卅七
[Jiu] 跋囊。地没呰也弭。薩聵爾囊南
[Skt] tān adhimucyami sarva-jinānām /
【V.7 c】[Kj-m] 跋捺羅 引 阿地穆底二合 秉黎引 曩 卅八
[Jiu] 跋捺羅。左哩。阿地穆底。秉黎曩
[Skt] bhadracarī-adhimukti-balena
【V.7 d】[Kj-m] 滿娜弭布引 惹也弭引 爾囊薩鐸引 卅九
[Jiu] 滿娜弭。布惹也弭。爾囊薩鐸
[Skt] vandami pūjayami jina sarvām //7//
【V.8 a】[Kj-m] 拚左詒哩二合 擔平 懌以懸引 補婆呵引 夜引 三十
[Jiu] 拚左。詒哩擔。懌以。補婆。婆呴夜
[Skt] yac ca kṛtam mayi pāpu bhaveyyā
【V.8 b】[Kj-m] 嘌引 談親聵呰二合 弭 瀚親茅引 賀聵勢引 曩 三十一
[Jiu] 羅詣聵。親呴灝都。莽賀。聵勢曩
[Skt] rāgatu dveṣatu moha-vaśena /
【V.8 c】[Kj-m] 薩呢也親聵引 左麼寧引 柱多貨引 嘌 三十二
[Jiu] 薩呢都。親左。麼個搃。多貨聵
[Skt] kāyatu vāca manena tathaiva

25嘗 Ms. B reads 唱; corrected using Ms. A.
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【V.8 d】[Kj-m] 搏平 聰囉二合 底丁以反 祂引 拾也弭引 阿護薩鎭引 三十三
[Jiu] 搏。聰羅底聰拾也弭。阿護薩鎭
[Skt] tam pratideśayamī ahu sarvam //8//

【V.9 a】[Kj-m] 拽左娜設毘佨上 始奔捏也二合 惹熅寫 三十四
[Jiu] 拽左。娜設毘佨。始奔捏也。惹熅寫
[Skt] yac ca daśad-diśi punya jagasya

【V.9 b】[Kj-m] 势引乞灑二合 阿勢引 乞灑二合 帝曳二合 迦爾曩引 喃引 三十五
[Jiu] 势乞灑。阿勢乞灑。帝曳迦。爾曩
[Skt] śekṣa-aśekṣa-pratyekajinānām /

【V.9 c】[Kj-m] 没欸素騃引 轮他薩殞爾曩引 喃引 三十六
[Jiu] 没欸素騃他。薩殞爾曩南
[Skt] buddha-sutā'na'tha sarva-jinānām

【V.9 d】[Kj-m] 且阿弩鼻謨引 娶也弭阿護薩鎭 三十七
[Jiu] 且。阿弩鼻那也。弭。阿護薩鎭
[Skt] tam anumodayami ahu sarvam //9//

【V.10 a】[Kj-m] 曳引左娜設毘同上 始迦鉢囉二合 毘前反 播引 三十八
[Jiu] 曳左。娜設毘佨。路迦鉢羅毘播
[Skt] ye ca daśad-diśi loka-pradipā

【V.10 b】[Kj-m] 昌引 地尾没地也二合 阿囉去 譏多鉢羅二合 梳跋二合引 三十九
[Jiu] 昌地。尾没地也。阿僧證多。鉢羅 MULTI
[Skt] bodhi vibudhya asaṅgata-prāptāh /

【V.10 c】[Kj-m] 棋引 囉護薩尾阿弟引 瀝弭曩引 枪 去引 四十
[Jiu] 棋曩護。薩尾。阿弟瀝弭。曩探
[Skt] tān ahu sarvi adhyeṣami nāthām

【V.10 d】[Kj-m] 研訶噜合引 阿弩鼻音 跨嚕韻 轉舌平 恒曩路引 譯引引 四十一 打
[Jiu] 研訶噜。阿弩跨嚕。韻恒曩。路譯
[Skt] cakru anuttaru vartanatāyai //10//

【V.11 a】[Kj-m] 曳比左僧 逸反 物□二合 底同上 桜囉二合 始覩迦引 譯引引 四十二
[Jiu] 曳比左。僧物 嘴底。桜羅始都。迦譯
[Skt] ye pi ca nirvṛti darśatu-kāmās
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【V.11 b】[Kj-m] 娑埜鼻夜引 左弭陂蘭合 惱哩歩引 踦都各反入 四十三
[Jiun] 娑埜鼻。夜左弭。陂蘭惹哩。歩弭
[Skt] tān abhiyācamī prāṃjali-bhūtaḥ /

【V.11 c】[Kj-m] 乞差合 拜囉祖准上 陂摩羯臘波合 志體合地反 昼覩 四十四
[Jiun] 乞差拜囉祖。陂摩。羯臘婆悉志體昼都
[Skt] kṣetra-rajopama-kalpa sthihantu

【V.11 d】[Kj-m] 薩嚩惹逢冩呬娃引 也 素佉引 也 四十五
[Jiun] 薩縛惹冩。茜娃也。素佉也
[Skt] sarva-jagasya hitāya sukhāya //11//

【V.12 a】[Kj-m] 満那曩。布惹曩。禰捨曩。娃夜 四十六
[Jiun] 満那曩。布惹曩。禰捨曩。娃夜
[Skt] vandana-pūjana-deśanatāya

【V.12 b】[Kj-m] 阿弩鼻謨引 隣引弟引 潟拏夜引 左囊遍及 夜引 四十七
[Jiun] 阿弩謨隣引。弟灑拏夜。左囊。遍及夜
[Skt] [anu]26modanadhyes an a-yācanatāya /

【V.12 c】[Kj-m] 牥左秫詩聿 反 瀡反 也 選詣散呰緊去 茅 四十八
[Jiun] 牭左。秫婆。海南。選詣散呰。緊即
[Skt] yac ca śubham mayi samcitu kimci

【V.12 d】[Kj-m] 昌引 代以囊引 也 也 阿護薩鐸 四十九
[Jiun] 昌代以。囊也敬也。阿護薩鐸
[Skt] bodhayi nāmayāmī ahu sarvam //12//

【V.13 a】[Kj-m] 薩嚩爾娜引 織兮鼻音 始乞瀨合 也 也 弁引 弁引 五十
[Jiun] 薩嚩。爾娜引。禰始乞瀨也。麼弩
[Skt] sarva-jināna’nuśikṣayamāṇo

【V.13 b】[Kj-m] 鎮播囉合左潑27漣哩布引 羅也拏引 拏入 五十
[Jiun] 鎮拏羅左隣。潑里布羅也。麼拏
[Skt] bhadracarim pariṇārayamāṇah /

26 anu- Missing in both Shiraishi’s and Ashikaga’s editions.
27 潑 Ms. A reads 隣.
【V.13 c】[Kj-m] 布引爾多坌引觀阿底多迦没馱引五十□
[Jiun] 布爾多。坌都。阿底多迦。没馱
[Skt] pūjita bhontu aśītaka buddhā

【V.13 d】[Kj-m] 曳左地哩合模底娜設個泥以反始路引計引五十三
[Jiun] 曳左。地里拽底。那設個始。路計
[Skt] ye ca dhriyanti daśad-diśi loke /13//

【V.14 a】[Kj-m] 曳引比阿囊引伐哆帝引룸二合具坌觀五十四
[Jiun] 曳比。阿囊誐多。帝攞具。坌都
[Skt] ye pi anāgata te laghu bhontu

【V.14 b】[Kj-m] 布羅挐麼努引蝦他昌引地尾沒馱引五十五
[Jiun] 布羅挐。麼挐羅他。昌地。尾沒馱
[Skt] pūrna-manoratha bodhi-vibuddhāḥ /

【V.14 c】[Kj-m] 夜引嚼多計引卽娜設個同上始乞差二合引怛囉引二合五十六
[Jiun] 夜縊多。計茹。那設個始。乞差怛囉
[Skt] yāvata keci daśad-diśi kṣetrās

【V.14 d】[Kj-m] 娑帝二合引跛里种准馱婆挽無幹反覩蝦廿娜咯入引五十七打
[Jiun] 娑帝。跛里种馱。婆挽都。舎那洛
[Skt] te pariśuddha bhavantu udārāḥ /14//

---

28 三 Corrected from 五 using Ms. A.
29 唱 Corrected from 唱 using Ms. A.
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Photograph 1: The Beginning of the Kongō-ji manuscript B

Photograph 2: The End of the Kongō-ji manuscript B
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