

Further *Mahāpratisarā* fragments from Gilgit

Gergely Hidas¹

Until recently the Gilgit collection was considered to preserve five incomplete manuscripts of the *Mahāpratisarā-Mahāvidyārājñī* (MPMVR), “The Great Amulet, Great Queen of Spells.” Thanks to new inspections, identifications of seven shorter fragments of the same text were communicated in 2014.² The present paper examines the contents of these further pieces and places them within the whole *Mahāpratisarā* corpus from Gilgit and thus serves as an update and supplement to the edition published in HIDAS 2012, where the five manuscripts of the text, registered already decades ago, were published for the first time. It also investigates why so many copies of the same scripture were likely to be kept in one collection and what this could tell about the ritual practices of the Buddhist community in the area around the middle of the first millennium CE.

Introduction

The MPMVR is a magical-ritualistic scripture of Dhāraṇī literature, a genre centred around spells, their benefits, and instructions for use. This text is likely to have emerged in North India between the third and sixth centuries CE,³ and its first chapter (*kalpa*) directly refers to the Mahāyāna as a Bud-

¹ Many thanks to the editors Prof. Vincent Eltschinger, Dr. Marion Rastelli, and Dr. Nina Mirnig for the invitation to write this article and to the Austrian Science Fund FWF VISCOM SFB Project for financial support. I am indebted to Dr. Klaus Wille for his kind help and advice and for comments on a final draft of this paper. I owe Dr. Csaba Kiss thanks for spotting a few inconsistencies.

² VON HINÜBER 2014, KUDO 2014. Three pieces were identified by Dr. Klaus Wille, one simultaneously by Dr. Klaus Wille and Prof. Noriyuki Kudo, two by Prof. Noriyuki Kudo, and one by Prof. Oskar von Hinüber.

³ The dating of this scripture involves a terminus post quem (3rd c. CE), the likely beginning of the appearance of Dīnāra coins mentioned in the text, and a terminus ante quem (early 7th c. CE), the possible date of the Gilgit manuscripts of this scripture based on donors’ names belonging to the Patola Shahi dynasty.

dhist sectarian denomination. As for further classification, the MPMVR contains some *vajra*-vocabulary⁴ as well as further notable links to the Vajrayāna displayed by its elaborate (and most likely reworked) setting that introduces the place of teaching and the audience (*nidāna*). The relation of this scripture to esoteric Buddhism is also strengthened by the mention of *samaya* (vow), *maṇḍala(ka)* (ritual space/circle), *abhiṣeka* (consecration), and *mudrā* (ritual hand gesture) – all characteristic terms of Tantric traditions.⁵

The earliest manuscripts of the MPMVR were found near Gilgit.⁶ This collection was discovered in the 1930s, in the ruins of a building which may have been the residence of a small community of monks and served as a library, scriptorium, or genizah, perhaps simultaneously. On the basis of ruler names in colophons, the collection developed from ca. the sixth to the eighth centuries, and it is important to note that this is the only extant library from ancient South Asia.⁷ The Gilgit finds were deposited in various places, with the New Delhi and Srinagar collections being the most diverse.⁸ A facsimile edition of the Delhi folios, the largest group, was published by Raghu VIRA & Lokesh CHANDRA (1959–1974),⁹ and it is recent good news that a high-quality colour reproduction of the same pieces is being printed in a new book series.¹⁰ Some private photos of the Srinagar folios were taken in the 1980s, but so far only a few pieces have been published.¹¹

⁴ In the formation of Buddhist ritual texts over time, there is a tendency towards an increased appearance of words and phrases elaborated by the term *vajra* (thunderbolt/diamond). On this process of ‘*vajra*-isation,’ see TRIBE 2000: 217–222.

⁵ There are at least two other Tantric texts surviving in the Gilgit collection. GBMFE 1724–1733 preserves parts of the *Mahāmañivipulavimānaviśvasupratīṣṭhitaguhyaparamarahasyakalparājadhārāṇī* with references to *mudrā*, *maṇḍala*, and *abhiṣeka* (SANDERSON 2009: 234–235). GBMFE 3321–3322, 3340–3341 contains portions of the **Devītantrasadbhāvasāra* (SANDERSON 2009: 50–51), an exegesis of the Vāma division of the Vidyāpīṭha.

⁶ As for later witnesses, the MPMVR survives in a few palm-leaf manuscripts from Eastern India dated to the eleventh to thirteenth centuries and in more than 300 palm-leaf and paper codices from Nepal from the period between the eleventh and twentieth centuries.

⁷ For recent overviews of the Gilgit collection, see VON HINÜBER 2014, 2018 and his preface to CLARKE 2014. On the topic of Buddhist genizah, see SALOMON 2009.

⁸ Further collections include the one in Ujjain, the Shah collection acquired by Giuseppe Tucci, and the Stein collection in the British Library. For details and a bibliography, see WILLE 1990 and VON HINÜBER 2014.

⁹ This was reprinted in a compact form in 1995.

¹⁰ For the first two volumes, see CLARKE 2014 and KARASHIMA et al. 2016.

¹¹ See Klaus Wille’s survey in VON HINÜBER 2014: 112–113.

The earlier identified Gilgit *Mahāpratisarā* manuscripts amount to 81 folios. Ms. no. 6. GBMFE 1080-1129 preserves 50 folios, no. 14. GBMFE 1130-1138, no. 15. GBMFE 1139-1156, and no. 17. GBMFE 1157-1165 nine folios each, and finally no. 56. GBMFE 3328-3335 preserves four folios.

The recently identified Gilgit *Mahāpratisarā* fragments add up to nine folios. Ms. no. 47. GBMFE 3119-3120, no. 51. GBMFE 3264, no. 51. GBMFE 3279-3280, no. 52. GBMFE 3320 and 3322 preserve one folio each, while no. 51. GBMFE 3266-3267 and no. 60. GBMFE 3352-3355 preserve two folios respectively.

These nine folios appear to belong to five, six, or seven different manuscripts, one of which is the already published ms. no. 6., GBMFE 1080-1129.¹² Ms. no. 52. GBMFE 3320 may also be a missing part of this manuscript. Ms. no. 51. GBMFE 3264 may be a part of no. 17., GBMFE 1157-1165.¹³ Thus the number of newly identified manuscripts amount to four, five, or six pieces. It should also be noted that ms. A55 of a single folio in the Srinagar collection, identified by Chandrabhal Tripathi as a *Mahāpratisarā* fragment, does not transmit the text of the MPMVR.¹⁴

In light of the above, we can now see a 9% increase of Gilgit folios of the MPMVR. Approximately 50% of the new identifications contain textual parts considered lost beforehand, thus there is a ca. 5% growth of *Mahāpratisarā* sources from Gilgit. It is reassuring that the editorial policies and the list of the Eastern Indian and Nepalese manuscripts which preserve earlier, Gilgit-related variants presented in HIDAS 2012 have been on the whole confirmed.

With these new identifications the ranking of Gilgit texts has also changed. So far manuscripts of the following scriptures were most numerous: *Samghātasūtra* (13 mss.), *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka* (9 mss.), *Prajñāpāramitā* (8 mss.), *Ekottarikāgama* (7 mss.), *Sumāgadhāvadāna* (6 mss.), *Mahāpratisarā* (5 mss.), and *Bhaiṣajyaguru* (5 mss.). Now the *Mahāpratisarā* has become the second highest ranking text in Gilgit with nine, ten, or eleven manuscripts. This positioning, however, is not at all conclusive. It should be remembered that some of the Gilgit manuscripts vanished from sight in the 1930s, so what is currently available is only a part of a part of a collection. A verified listing of the items in the Srinagar group,

¹² Siglum G₁ in HIDAS 2012.

¹³ Siglum G₄ in HIDAS 2012.

¹⁴ I am grateful to Dr. Klaus Wille for sending me his unpublished transcription.

which appears to contain 28 *Mahāmāyūrī* and 47 medical text fragments, will also reveal more.

As for social settings, the five earlier identified and longer *Mahāpratisarā* manuscripts all contain donors' names inserted into the *dhāraṇīs*, with two of them being queens of the Patola Shahi dynasty. These five manuscripts are both "ready-made" and "tailor-made" ones as it has been noted,¹⁵ i.e., in the former case empty spaces are left out for the donor's name to be subsequently inserted, whereas in the latter the sponsor's name is written together with the whole text. None of the new fragments, however, contain donors' names since no *dhāraṇī* parts survive. Nevertheless, the high number (nine, ten or eleven) of MPMVR manuscripts, along with the presence of "ready-made" ones, reflects extensive production, and we should not forget the previously mentioned 28 *Mahāmāyūrī* fragments either, which belong to the same type of Rakṣā literature. Drawing on later, better documented practices, it appears that such protective incantation texts were produced for members of the *saṅgha* for donations.¹⁶ These often personalised apotropaic objects, i.e., the manuscripts, were meant to be kept in the donor's home, and it seems that persons of various rank, but especially from more affluent segments of society, took advantage of such monastic services. At the moment it appears that *Dhāraṇī* and *Vidyā* texts constitute the most numerous category in the Gilgit library with ca. 25 pieces (the second one is *Avadāna* with ca. 15 texts), and with the Srinagar collection spells amount to 53, medical texts to 47, and *avadāna* legends to 24 pieces. This reflects marked preferences for protection, healing, and storytelling (and thus proselytising) – activities that most likely served the strengthening of Buddhism from the side of monastics and demonstrate considerable lay receptivity in the area.

¹⁵ SCHOPEN 2009: 202–203, VON HINÜBER 2014: 80–81.

¹⁶ See, e.g., HIDAS 2012: 30–33.

**An edition of the recently identified *Mahāpratisarā*
fragments**

Abbreviations, symbols, paragraphs, sigla, normalisations, and punctuation follow HIDAS 2012:

() – unclear or uncertain reading

[] – restoration of damaged or partly visible *akṣaras*

{...3...} – lacuna with the approximate number of missing *akṣaras*

{...} – a longer lacuna

< > – GBMFE folio numbers after Raghu VIRA & Lokesh CHANDRA 1959-1974

[29] – paragraph numbers as given in the critical edition of the Eastern Indian and Nepalese mss.

corr. – correction

em. – emendation

conj. – conjectural emendation

Silent orthographical normalisations

avagrahas are not used in the mss. and have been supplied.

Consonant geminations before *r* have been normalised.

ri sometimes written as *ṛ* and vice versa have been normalised.

Medial *anusvāras* have been changed to homorganic nasals and homorganic nasals to *anusvāras* when needed. Final *anusvāras* before vowels and at the end of sentences or verses have been changed to *m*.

Punctuation

A single dot used in the original folios has been written as a single *daṇḍa* while a double *daṇḍa* has been preserved in its original form. A single dot and a double *daṇḍa* has been indicated with three *daṇḍas*. In the case of a double dot (*visarga*), a *daṇḍa* has been given in the edition and the double dot has been indicated in the apparatus. All punctuation marks have been placed according to the original folios.

G₁ : Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts Facsimile Edition. *Śata-piṭaka* Vol. 10. Part 10. Ser. no. 52. 3320, 3322. Fragment 3322 is a missing piece of Vol. 10. Part 6. Ser. no. 6. 1109. Fragment 3320 may also be a surviving piece of a missing folio of the same manuscript from between 1104 and 1105.

- Birch bark leaves. Two folios with two or three remaining lines. All sides of the folios are broken off. No reference to the real size of the folios is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving *akṣaras* in a line varies between three and seven. Originally there must have been approximately 20–28 *akṣaras* in a line.
- Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I. Appears to be the same hand.
- Ca. first half of the seventh century
- Incomplete
- Continuous text
- No interlinear or marginal corrections
- Foliation: no foliation survives
- The original folios are kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
- Identification by Noriyuki Kudo
- Listed in VON HINÜBER 2014: 108 (no. 52d.5) and KUDO 2014: 518 (no. 52d). Detailed study and transcription in KUDO 2015: 260–262.

Contains parts of paragraphs [26] = Fifth narrative: merchant Vimalaśaṅkha's ship is saved from seamonsters and a sea-storm; and [29] = Sixth narrative: King Prasāritapāṇi is granted a son.

[26] <G₁ 3320a> *miṅgilaiḥ pota*{...13...}[ś](a)*bdaṃ kartum ārabdhā*
<G₁ 3320b> [*ahaṃ*] v[o] *mo*{...12...} [*t*]*ato dhīrama*[n]{...}

[29] <G₁ 3322b> *kim iti* {...16...}*gadhavi*[śa] <G₁ 3322a> *k*[o] *babhūva*
{...16...}[*ena*]*rā*[jñā]{...}

G₆ : Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts Facsimile Edition. *Śata-piṭaka* Vol. 10. Part 10. Ser. no. 47. 3119-3120

- Birch bark leaf. A single folio with eight lines. All sides of the folio are broken off in different degrees. No reference to the real size of

the folio is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving *akṣaras* in a line varies between 5 and 18. Originally there must have been approximately 22–28 *akṣaras* in a line.

- Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I.¹⁷
- Ca. first half of the seventh century
- Incomplete
- Continuous text
- No interlinear or marginal corrections
- Foliation: no foliation survives¹⁸
- The original folio is kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
- Identification by Klaus Wille, Noriyuki Kudo
- Listed in VON HINÜBER 2014: 106 (no. 47b) and KUDO 2014: 517 (no. 47). Transcribed in Raghu VIRA & Lokesh CHANDRA 1995: I. 45–46.¹⁹ Detailed study and transcription in KUDO 2015: 258–260.

Contains parts of paragraph [13] = Various benefits of this protection.
Enumeration of the deities who safeguard its user.

[13] <G₆ 3120> *śayaḥ*
*śakraś*²⁰ *ca tridaśaiḥ sāv[rdham]*{...10...}
kayaṃ ca mahākālaṃ nandikeśvaraṃ kāv[...9...]
[ndi]keśvaraṃ
sarve mātṛgaṇā tasya tathānye mārakā{...9...}
jā devā caiva mahardhikā
te sarve rakṣāṃ kari{...10...} *vai* |²¹
*buddhā*²² *caiva mahātmāno vidyādevyo mahā*{...3...}
[kī bhṛkuṭ](ī) tārāṅkuṣṭi |
vajrasaṃkalā [śve]{...9...}
supāśī vajrapā{...21...}
takuṇḍalī
[a]{...26...}
 <G₆ 3119>*kuṇḍalī* |

¹⁷ KUDO 2014: 517 and 2015: 258 classify the script as Type II.

¹⁸ VON HINÜBER 2014: 106 remarks that this is folio no. 114. I have been unable to trace this foliation.

¹⁹ The text is not identified here.

²⁰ *śakraś* corr.; *śaklaś* G₆

²¹ *vai* | corr.; *vaiḥ* G₆

²² *buddhā* conj.; *bauddhā* G₆

puṣpa {...16...}
[ā]t[e]jā tathā dhanyā vidyumā {...12...}
tathā buddhā kṣitikanāmnā ca
kāpālinī va {...12...}
(pi) bahuvidhās tathā |
te sarve tasya rakṣa[nṭi] {...9...} gatā bhavet
hārītī pāñcikaś caiva śaṅ[kh] {...12...}
sarasvatī nityānubaddhā rakṣārthe
pratisarā {...15...}
[dy]ārājā mahābalā ²³
sarvasiddhi sadā {...13...}
[r]bhāṇi vardhante sukhaṃ prasū[ya] {...}

G₇ : Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts Facsimile Edition. *Śata-piṭaka* Vol. 10. Part 10. Ser. no. 51. 3264.²⁴

- Birch bark leaf. A single folio with six and seven lines. The sides of the folio are somewhat broken off. No reference to the real size of the folio is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving *akṣaras* in a line varies between 15 and 17. Originally there must have been approximately 25–27 *akṣaras* in a line.
- Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I.
- Ca. first half of the seventh century
- Incomplete
- Continuous text
- No interlinear or marginal corrections
- Foliation: no foliation survives
- The original folio is kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
- Identification by Klaus Wille
- Listed in VON HINÜBER 2014: 107 (no. 51b.2)

²³ *mahābalā* [] corr.; *mahābalāḥ* G₆

²⁴ This leaf may be a missing folio of Vol. 10. Part 6. Ser. no. 17 (siglum G₄ in HIDAS 2012) as the sequence of the text and the size of the lacuna suggest between GBMFE 3264 and 1157. Paleographically, however, it appears that this leaf and those of no. 17. are written by a different hand (cf. especially the punctuation marks) and the shape of the folios are dissimilar, too.

Contains parts of paragraph [13] = Various benefits of this protection.
Enumeration of the deities who safeguard its user.

[13] <G₇ 3264a>śaḥ ||
 yaḥ kaścid dhārayate vidyā kaṇṭhe [b]{...10...}
 kāryāṇi siddhyante nātra saṁśayaḥ |
 nityaṁ rakṣanti de[ve]{...10...}
 dhisatvā mahāvīryā buddhā pratyekā nāyakāḥ
 {...10...} devyo mahardhikā
 rakṣāṁ kurvanti satataṁ prati {...8...}
 pāṇiś ca yakṣendra rājānaś caturas tathā |
 taś[ya] {...9...} śayaḥ
 śa[kra]ś ca tri[daśai]ḥ sārdhaṁ brahmā vi {...5...}
 <G₇ 3264b> key(a) ca {...5...} ndikeśvaraṁ
 sarve mātṛga {...10...} kā |
 ṛṣayaś ca mahātejā devā²⁵ caiva mahardhikā
 {...10...} [ti]sarādhārakāya vai²⁶
 buddhā²⁷ caiva mahātmāno vi {...9...} [I](a) parākramā |
 māmakī bhrkuṭī tārāṅkuṣī {...10...}
 mahākālī eva ca | dūtyā vajradūtyā²⁸ ca
 s[u] {...10...} āṇir mahābalā
 vajramālā mahāvidyā ta {...10...}
 mahādevī kālakarṇī mahāvīrya
 tathā dha {...}

G₈ : Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts Facsimile Edition. *Śata-piṭaka* Vol. 10.
 Part 10. Ser. no. 51. 3266-3267

- Birch bark leaves. Two folios with six lines. All sides of folio 3266 and the left side of 3267 are broken off. No reference to the real size of the folios is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving *akṣaras* in a line varies between 9 and 19. Originally there must have been approximately 22–26 *akṣaras* in a line.

²⁵ devā] corr.; tevā G₇

²⁶ vai] corr.; vaiḥ G₇

²⁷ buddhā] em.; boddhā G₇

²⁸ vajradūtyā] corr.; vajradūpyā G₇

- Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I. Appears to be the same hand.
- Ca. first half of the seventh century
- Incomplete
- Continuous text
- No interlinear or marginal corrections
- Foliation: no foliation survives
- The original folios are kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
- Identification by Klaus Wille
- Listed in VON HINÜBER 2014: 107 (no. 51b.4)

Contains parts of paragraphs [42] = Ritual instructions: how to prepare the amulet; and [44] = Various benefits of this protection. Enumeration of the deities who safeguard its user.

[42] <G₈ 3266a> [*sukhi*]to bhonti mucyante karma[ś]{...9...}
 [kṣārthaṃ] strīṇāṃ garbhasamudbhavaṃ |
 bha[vi]{...8...}[dr]yavraṇarohana |
 upavāsoṣito bhū[tv]{...7...}te
 buddhapūjāpareṇa ca | bodhicittaṃ {...8...}
 [ce]tasā |
 snātvā candana²⁹ karpūrakāstūryo {...10...}
 vṛtya mahādhūpanadhūpitā |
 [tā] {...4...} <G₈ 3266b> {...5...} samanvitam |
 pūrṇakumbhātra ca [tvā]{...7...}
 [pa]dhūpāṃś ca gandhāś ca dātavyātra mahā {...7...}
 sprkkāṃ ca turuṣkā pañcaśarkarā |
 dātavy {...7...} kālaṃ yathārtum³⁰ |
 sarvaṇṣapapha[l]{...8...}
 [ta]mākṣikadugdhābhyāṃ pāyasādibhiḥ
 {...12...}[ṇāḍhyāṃ] praśasyante
 supūritaṃ {...}

[44] <G₈ 3267a> [*dha*]naṃ
 rakṣāyaṃ tasya yāvaj jīvaṃ bhaviṣyati |
 puruṣā {...5...}ṃ [yu]ddhasaṃgrāmahairave |

²⁹ *candana*] corr.; *dandana* G₈

³⁰ Note the lack of *sandhi* here.

anena varadā yā{...7...}[ni]ścitāḥ
atha pāpavināśārthaṃ likhita{...8...}
gatā vilokenti bodhisatvās tathaiva{...9...}
m āyus ca vardhate |
dhanadhānyasa{...10...}
khaṃ svapati medhāvī sukhaṃ
 <G₈ 3267b> {...15...}ṇāṃ sarvabhūtagaṇair api
 {...13...}[ni]tyaśaḥ
vidyāyā sādhyamā{...12...}
khaṃ vā sādhye vidyā avighne nā{...9...}
sarvakalpāsya praviṣṭā sarvamaṇḍale |
 {...7...} bhavet sarvatra jātiṣu |
vaiśvāsiko bhavet ta{...5...}[hya]dhāraṇe |
sarvamaṇḍalasampūrṇa sarvāśāsyā ma{...}

G₉ : Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts Facsimile Edition. *Śata-piṭaka* Vol. 10. Part 10. Ser. no. 51. 3279-3280

- Birch bark leaf. A single folio with five and six lines. The right side of the folio is somewhat broken off. No reference to the real size of the folio is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving *akṣaras* in a line varies between 28 and 34. Originally there must have been approximately 32–36 *akṣaras* in a line.
- Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I.
- Ca. first half of the seventh century
- Incomplete
- Continuous text
- No interlinear or marginal corrections
- Foliation: numeral on the mid-left margin of recto side: GBMFE 3279-3280 equalling folio 21³¹
- The original folio is kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
- Identification by Oskar von Hinüber
- Listed in VON HINÜBER 2014: 108 (no. 51d)

³¹ This folio number fits well the proposal put forward in HIDAS 2012: 14 that originally there had been an earlier and shorter *nidāna* which later on was transformed into a longer, more detailed one.

Contains parts of paragraphs [30]–[31] = Sub-narrative: merchant Dharmamati and his poor servant. Sixth narrative ends.

[30] <G₉ 3279>*ṣṭhino-m-idam abravīt aham āryasya niveśane bhr[ti]{...2...}[karmaṃ kariṣyā]mi | dharmam[ṃ] ca [śr]{...1...}mi | yadā mat kiṃcid bhaviṣyati | tadāhaṃ dharmam pūjayiṣyāmi | tasya ḡhavyā-pāraṃ³² kurvata dha{...2...} śṛṇvata | apareṇa samayena tena śreṣṭhinā tasya puruṣasya³³-m-ekaṃ dīnā{...3...} tena sarvasatvapariṭrāṇārthaṃ bodhicittam utpādy sarvasatvasādhāraṇaṃ kṛtvā ma{...3...}saratatne niryātita | evaṃ ca praṇidhānaṃ kṛtam anena dānamahāphalena mama {...2...} <G₉ 3280>satvānāṃ ca dāridrya³⁴samuccheda syāt tena kāraṇena tad³⁵dānaṃ parikṣayaṃ³⁶ na gacchati |*
 [31] *e[vaṃ] {...1...}huvidham anekavidham api puṇyābhisamskāraṃ³⁷ kṛta | devatāni ca pūjita vandana yā{...4...}gavantaḥ pūjitāḥ tadā śuddhāvāsakābhir devatābhiḥ³⁸ svapnadarśanaṃ dattam | e{...2...}cābhihitam | bho mahārāja samantajvālāmālā³⁹viśuddhisphuritacintā-{...2...}mudrāhrdayāparājitā mahādhāraṇi vidyārājñā mahāpratisarā nāma yathā{...2...}dhinālikhya yathāvidhi kalpābhihitam upavāsoṣitā{...}*

G₁₀ : Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts Facsimile Edition. *Śata-piṭaka* Vol. 10. Part 10. Ser. no. 60. 3352-3355

- Birch bark leaves. Two folios with six lines. The upper and lower sides of the folios are somewhat broken off. No reference to the real size of the folios is given in the GBMFE. The number of surviving *akṣaras* in a line varies between 8 and 24. Originally there must have been approximately 22–24 *akṣaras* in a line.

³² °vyāpāraṃ] corr.; °vyāvāraṃ G₉

³³ puruṣasya] conj.; puruṣya G₉

³⁴ dāridrya°] em.; daridryā° G₉

³⁵ tad] corr.; ta G₉

³⁶ parikṣayaṃ] corr.; parikṣayaṃn G₉

³⁷ puṇyābhisamskāraṃ] conj.; puṇyābhiskāraṃ G₉

³⁸ devatābhiḥ] corr.; devātābhiḥ G₉

³⁹ °mālā°] corr.; °māla° G₉

- Round, earlier Gilgit-script. Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I. Appears to be the same hand.
- Ca. first half of the seventh century
- Incomplete
- Continuous text
- No interlinear or marginal corrections
- Foliation: numeral on the mid-left margin of recto side: GBMFE 3352-3353 equalling folio 18 and GBMFE 3354-3355 equalling folio 56
- The original folios are kept in the National Archives, New Delhi
- Identification by Klaus Wille
- Listed in VON HINÜBER 2014: 111 (no. 60a)

Contains parts of paragraphs [26] = Fifth narrative: merchant Vimalaśaṅkha's ship is saved from seamonsters and a sea-storm and [49]–[50] = Ritual instructions: how to perform a healing and protecting rite. Enumeration of benefits.

[26] <G₁₀ 3352> *vidyolkām tām ca vajrāśiniṃ taiś ca timingilaiḥ potam
avastabdhām dṛ[ṣ]tvā mahāntam utkrośanāśabdam kartum ārabdhāḥ⁴⁰
te devatāviśeṣām āyācayanti na ca kaścit teṣām paritrāṇam bhavati |
tato sārthavā[ha]syopagamya te karuṇakaruṇam idaṃ vacanam
abruvantah
paritrāyasva mahāsatva mocayāsmān mahābhayāt ||
a{...3...} sa mahāsārthavāho dṛḍhacitto mahā[ma]{...6...}
<G₁₀ 3353>{...4...}[dam] vacanam [abruvan
mā bhair mā bhair va]{...8...}vrajaḥ
aḥam vo mocayiṣyāmi ito duḥkhamahārṇavā |
tato [dhī]ramanā bhūtvā vaṇijā idaṃ abruvan
kim etan mahāsatva brūhi⁴¹ śīghram avighnataḥ
yāvaj jīvitam asmākaṃ tvatprabhāvān mahāmateḥ
kathyatām⁴² jñānamāhātmyaṃ paścā tvam bhūyo kiṃ kariṣyasi ||
{...1...}[yo] sārthapatis teṣām iyaṃ vidyā udāharīt
asti me mahā{...}*

[49] <G₁₀ 3354> *hy ayaṃ vidyā sarvarogopaśāntaye |*

⁴⁰ *ārabdhāḥ*] em.; *ābdhāḥ* G₁₀

⁴¹ *brūhi*] corr.; *brūhi brūhi* G₁₀

⁴² *kathyatām*] corr.; *katthyatām* G₁₀

bhūyo sapta vārā vai ⁴³ *balikuṃbhaṃ sumantritam |*
paścā nivedayen mantra balipuṣpaṃ yathālābhaṃ yathāvidhim |
sūtrakaṃ vāṇisaktavāṃ padumamiśritā ⁴⁴
ity eva dakṣiṇe pārsve kṣipeta sapta-m-eva tu |
paścimāyāṃ ca saptaiva uttarāyāṃ diśi s-tathā |
ūrdhvaṃ paṭhitamātreṇa kṛtā rakṣā a{...13...}
[duḥkhā]t pramucyate |
eṣa ra<G₁₀ 3355> {...13...}
[nā]sty asya [para]to kaści ra[kṣā]vidyā tribhave vidyate kvaci[t]

[50] *[na ta]sya mṛtyur na jarā na rogo*
na cāpriyaṃ nāpi ca viprayoga |
yadvasya vidyaṃ hi subhāvitātmā
bhaviṣyate mṛtyugaṇena pūjitaḥ
yamo 'pi tasya varadharmarājā
kariṣyate mṛtyugaṇena pūjita ⁴⁵
kathayīṣyati devapuraṃ hi gaccha
kṣaṇikaṃ mameha ⁴⁶ *narakapuraṃ kariṣyasi |*
tato vimānehi bahuprakā{...}

Conclusion

As we have seen, these recently identified fragments of the *Mahāpratisarā* from Gilgit contain various parts of this scripture. This shows that the entire text was copied in considerable numbers, being much valued in the local Buddhist community. This esteem stems from the belief that such apotropaic works were supposed to provide protection for manuscript owners from practically any sort of danger and illness and were trusted to grant everything good and auspicious unceasingly.

⁴³ *vai* [] corr.; *vaiḥ* G₁₀

⁴⁴ Note that this line is not transmitted in the later Eastern Indian and Nepalese manuscripts edited in HIDAS 2012.

⁴⁵ *mṛtyugaṇena pūjita* seems to be mistakenly repeated and written instead of a likely *pūjāṃ sagauraveṇa*, the reading attested in all the Eastern Indian and Nepalese manuscripts

⁴⁶ *mameha*] conj.; *maheha* G₁₀

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- CLARKE, S. 2014. *Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India, Facsimile Edition vol. I. Vinaya Texts*. New Delhi: The National Archives of India; Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- HIDAS, G. 2012. *Mahāpratisarā-Mahāvidyārājñī, The Great Amulet, Great Queen of Spells. Introduction, Critical Editions and Annotated Translation*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture and Aditya Prakashan.
- HINÜBER, O. v. 2014. The Gilgit Manuscripts: An Ancient Buddhist Library in Modern Research. In: P. Harrison & J.-U. Hartmann (eds.), *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research. Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: The State of the Field, Stanford, June 15-19, 2009*. Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, pp. 79–135.
- HINÜBER, O. v. 2018. Magic Protection in the Palola Śāhi Kingdom: History and Context of Rakṣā Texts and Dhāraṇīs in 7th Century Gilgit. In: C. Cicuzza (ed.), *Katā me rakkhā, katā me parittā. Protecting the protective texts and manuscripts. Proceedings of the Second International Pali Studies Week Paris 2016*. Bangkok and Lumbini: Fragile Palm Leaves Foundation and Lumbini International Research Institute, pp. 217–237.
- KARASHIMA, S. et al. 2016. *Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India, Facsimile Edition vol. II. Mahāyāna texts: Prajñāpāramitā texts*. New Delhi: The National Archives of India; Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- KUDO, N. 2014. Newly Identified Folios in the Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology* 17, pp. 517–518.
2015. Newly Identified Manuscripts in the Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts: Avadānas and Dhāraṇīs. *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology* 18, pp. 253–262.
- SALOMON, R. 2009. Why did the Gandhāran Buddhists bury their manuscripts? In: S. Berkwitz et al. (eds.), *Buddhist Manuscript Cultures: Knowledge, Ritual and Art*. London: Routledge, pp. 19–34.
- SANDERSON, A. 2009. The Śaiva Age. The Rise and Dominance of Śaivism during the Early Medieval Period. In: S. Eino (ed.), *Genesis and Development of Tantrism*. Tokyo: Institute of Oriental Culture, University of Tokyo, pp. 41–349.

- SCHOPEN, G. 2009. On the Absence of Urtexts and Otiose Ācāryas: Buildings, Books, and Lay Buddhist Ritual at Gilgit. In: G. Colas & G. Gerschheimer (eds.), *Écrire et transmettre en Inde classique*. Paris: EFEO, pp. 189–219.
- TRIBE, A. 2000. Mantranaya/Vajrayāna – Tantric Buddhism in India. In: P. Williams (ed.), *Buddhist Thought*. London: Routledge, pp. 192–244.
- VIRA, Raghu. & CHANDRA, Lokesh. 1959-1974. *Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts Facsimile Edition*. New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture. [Revised and Enlarged Compact Facsimile Edition. Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1995.]
- WILLE, K. 1990. *Die Handschriftliche Überlieferung der Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.