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Abstract

Among the extensive collection of Chinese art objects assembled between 1923 and 1951 and donated to The Ohio State University by the Wiant family in the late 1970s, there is one handwritten *Diamond Sutra* scroll on the exterior of which pasted a title slip dating it to the Tang dynasty (618–907) by the early twentieth century collector Jin Cheng (1878–1926). If this is accurate, it will make this sutra the earliest piece in the Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art. Transcribed with the Kumarajiva translation of the *Diamond Sutra*, its brownish-yellow paper, neat copying format, and high-quality calligraphic style lead one to speculate that it could be a Dunhuang manuscript. If so, it will make The Ohio State University one of the relatively few institutions in the United States that are known to own Dunhuang manuscripts.

This study will examine the Wiant sutra manuscript’s textual content, medium, ground, format, calligraphic style, and the collector’s seals, with the aim of settling questions of dating, authenticity, and possible provenance. Chapter One introduces the background of the sutra scroll and the research questions. Chapter Two discusses the discovery of the Library Cave in Dunhuang and traces the Dunhuang manuscripts. Chapter Three outlines preliminary findings on the Wiant sutra scroll in terms of its textual content, medium, ground, format, calligraphic style, and the collector’s seals. The conclusion chapter outlines the study’s results.
By comparing the Wiant sutra in calligraphic style and textual content with eleven authenticated and dated manuscripts of various periods ranging between the sixth and the eleventh century, including a group in the Stein collection that share with the Wiant Diamond Sutra an identical textual variation, a conclusion is reached that the Wiant scroll may be one of the sutras that were transcribed officially in the Tang capital during the late seventh century. It may well have later been taken to Dunhuang, where it was preserved in the Library Cave until rediscovered in the twentieth century.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Listed on a 17-page inventory of the Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art at The Ohio State University, among the “Miscellaneous Works of Art,” is one described as “Buddhist Diamond Sutra woodblock print with calligraphy, 10-12th century.”¹ On November 12, 2015, our seminar examined this object as part of an investigation of previously unstudied works of Chinese art in the collection. When we unrolled this handscroll, we first observed a well-worn tapestry wrapper and elegant jade fastener. As the dark brownish-yellow paper was unrolled before us, we realized, to our great surprise, that the work was not in fact a woodblock print but was a hand-written manuscript in an archaic calligraphy style. Moreover, the title slip on the exterior brocade is signed by a well-known early twentieth century artist-collector, who identifies it as an anonymous Tang 唐 dynasty (618–907) sutra transcription. Its physical characteristics seemed to pull it centuries away from our present age, and like a time capsule drew me into its silent story.

What exactly is this manuscript, and where does it fit in the history of Chinese art? Is it really a work of such antiquity or could it be a modern fabrication? These are some of the fundamental questions the Wiant Diamond Sutra has inspired me to ask in this

¹ The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art (Columbus: The Ohio State University, 1975?), 13.
thesis. Among the factors that have been examined are the material and formal properties of the work in relationship to other well-studied dated calligraphy scrolls, the possible position of such a sutra copy in the history of Tang Buddhism, and as far as it can be documented, its modern provenance.

The *Diamond Sutra* scroll on which this paper will focus was donated to The Ohio State University by the Wiant family in the late 1970s. “Through the bequest of Mr. Wiant, who died in 1975, and the gift of Mrs. Wiant, the University has received the extensive collection of Chinese art objects and other items which they acquired during their 28 years in China.” According to the background information attached to the Wiant Collection inventory, this donation included around 600 Chinese artifacts collected by Dr. and Mrs. Wiant between 1923 and 1951 during their work as Methodist missionaries and educators in China. During their time in China they taught at Yanjing (Yenching) University 燕京大學 in Beijing 北京. The Wiant collection contains items in 25 categories, such as fans, ivories, jades, musical instruments, paintings, calligraphy, seals, and snuff bottles, books, chopsticks, and coins. Although a few articles have been published on parts of the collection, a great deal of art historical research remains to be done. The *Diamond Sutra* scroll, which has never, to my knowledge, been researched, remains something of a mystery.

---

2 Allen Artz Wiant, *A New Song for China* (Victoria, B.C.: Trafford, 2003), 213. “Conversations between the Wiants and OSU began in 1968 relative to such an arrangement, but it was not consummated until 1977, largely because appraisal of the items in the 25 collections became so much more involved and difficult than had been foreseen.”

The university inventory lists this sutra as dateable to the tenth through twelfth centuries. However, its textual content, *The Diamond Sutra*, the title slip pasted on the exterior reading “Tangren xie jingang bore boluomi jing canjuan” 唐人寫金剛般若波羅蜜經殘卷 [Anonymous Tang Transcription of the *Diamond Sutra* Scroll], as well as its archaic calligraphic style and thick, yellowed paper remind one of a Dunhuang manuscript and lead one to ponder the scroll’s provenance. Can it really be a Tang sutra, or even a Tang Dunhuang sutra? If so, this makes it the earliest piece in the Wiant collection, and makes The Ohio State University one of the few institutions in the United States that own Dunhuang manuscripts.

However, after careful observation, one discovers that the paper is dyed yellow, as evidenced by the color seeping through the backing paper of the sutra’s modern mounting. This leads to another problem: is it a forgery that was dyed by unscrupulous modern people to make it look like an authentic early dated manuscript? The question was put to Dunhuang manuscript expert Rong Xinjiang 榮新江 of Peking University who viewed the sutra in San Diego on May 26, 2016. According to Prof. Rong, the material used to dye the paper is called *huangbo* 黃檗, which helps protect paper from insects, and is frequently seen in Dunhuang manuscripts. His preliminary assessment was that this sutra probably comes from the Mogao Grottoes Cave 17 (the Library Cave) in Dunhuang and is of early Tang date. In style and quality he suggests that it may be a sutra transcribed in the Tang capital of Changan and taken to Dunhuang in the course of lively

---

4 All the information related to sutra viewing in San Diego and Prof. Rong’s opinion are provided by Prof. Julia Andrews in her unpublished note on the Wiant sutra.
trade and religious pilgrimages along the Silk Route. This thesis will examine further evidence related to such issues. Is this anonymous inscription of the *Diamond Sutra* really a Tang period sutra? Where was it transcribed? Finally, is it a sutra from the Dunhuang Library Cave?

Keeping these questions in mind, research was conducted on its calligraphic style, textual content, physical features of medium, ground, format, and its collector’s seals. Based upon the preliminary findings to be discussed in the following pages, it is highly possible that this sutra was transcribed in the early Tang, probably around the late seventh century in the Tang capital, and may be one of the manuscripts once hidden in Cave 17 of the Mogao Grottoes, known as the Library Cave, in Dunhuang.
Chapter 2: Dunhuang Manuscripts

Since the Library Cave in the Mogao Caves of Dunhuang was discovered by accident in 1900, an enormous number of manuscripts, rubbings, and other artifacts once hidden in it were brought out into the world. The Dunhuang manuscripts date from the fifth century to the early eleventh century. They include works ranging from religious documents and history to medicine and mathematics. More than ninety percent are Buddhist sutras, thus accounting for the main part of the Dunhuang manuscripts. Since the discovery of the Dunhuang manuscripts, their value was gradually recognized and established by explorers and scholars all over the world due to the multitude and variety of works the collection contains and the broad span of seven centuries they represent. Such evaluations led to theft and plunder. As a result, they were scattered to many countries and have now become part of the collections of various public museums, libraries, or even private collectors. According to the International Dunhuang Project, the largest collections of material from Dunhuang are held in “libraries, museums and research institutes in London, Beijing, Paris, St Petersburg and Berlin, with important

---


holdings in Japan and smaller collections throughout the world.” Among the prominent institutions that hold the Dunhuang manuscripts are the British Library, the National Library of France, the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences, and the National Library of China. There are only a small number of Dunhuang manuscripts collected in the USA. The largest collection is at Princeton University, which comprises around 80 documents; there are also some materials collected in the Freer Gallery in Washington DC, the University of California at Los Angeles, the University of California at Berkeley, and Yale University. The limited number of Dunhuang manuscripts collected in the United States makes the research on the Wiant sutra valuable.

However, the possibility of forgery should also be taken seriously when studying an ancient manuscript such as this. Susan Whitfield points out in the introduction of *Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries*:

> Forgery is a story with all the elements to grip the popular imagination: greed, large sums of money, deceit, sometimes violence, and, not least, the ability of the ordinary man to bamboozle the greatest expert or most lofty institution. The story of Central Asian Dunhuang manuscript forgeries contains all these elements and, despite almost nine decades having passed since the forgeries started to be produced, the story is yet to be concluded.

---


8 Ibid.

9 Ibid.

Therefore, in order to authenticate a Dunhuang manuscript, multiple factors should be taken into consideration. As Dunhuang historian Rong Xinjiang stated some years ago, “The best way to identify whether a manuscript is genuine or not is to dig out its origin and circulation at first; then identify the paper, calligraphy, and the seals on it; finally, make a judgment based on its content by examining the related history and the classical works it references.”

Shi Pingting, another Dunhuang scholar, expresses similar opinions on the authentication of the Dunhuang manuscripts in the introduction to *Gansu cang dunhuang wenxian* 甘肅藏敦煌文獻. According to Shi, the following factors should be considered when identifying the authenticity of a Dunhuang manuscript: its origin, paper, ink tone, calligraphic script, boundary and column (jielan 界欄), mounting, and content. This paper will discuss the authenticity of the Wiant sutra scroll under study by examining several facets, including its textual content, writing material, format, calligraphic style, and the seals impressed upon it.

The Discovery of the Library Cave

The Library Cave is numbered as Cave 17 at Dunhuang and was thus named due to the large quantity of documents that were found in it. It was discovered accidently by a Daoist priest named Wang Yuanlu 王圓箓. Wang went to the Mogao Caves in 1892 and devoted himself to cleaning up the caves in order to remodel them into Daoist temples.

---

11 Rong Xinjiang 榮新江, *Dunhuangxue shiba jiang* 敦煌學十八講 (Beijing: Beijing daxue chubanshe, 2001), 364.

On June 22, 1900, when he was cleaning Cave 16, he uncovered the secret of the Library Cave, which was immortalized rather romantically in his epitaph:

Sand flows out from a hole cracked in the wall, which seems to emit light. [Wang Yuanlu] broke through the wall into a small cave, and everything is revealed. An enormous number of Tang sutras are hidden within, and many ancient artifacts are found as well. People who have seen this consider it a marvel and those who have heard of it spread word that it is a miracle.

Xie Zhiliu 謝稚柳 (1910–1997) has depicted this discovery in detail in Dunhuang yishu xulu 敦煌藝術續錄:

Daoist priest Wang broke the wall with Yang together in the middle of the night and found a door there. The height of the door was so short that it could hardly accommodate a person. The door was blocked with clods. After removing the clods, a small cave appeared with a space of several zhang 丈. There were many packages wrapped with white cloth filling up the space in an orderly fashion. Each package contained ten sutra scrolls.

This accidental discovery brought into the world myriad ancient manuscripts dating from the fourth century to the early eleventh century concerning history, literature, religion, art, medicine, and mathematics, which provide excellent sources for scholars in various areas and gave birth to a new research field called Dunhuang Studies.

---

13 Shen Leping 沈樂平, Dunhuang shufa zonglun 敦煌書法綜論 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang guji chubanshe, 2009), 16.

14 Xie Zhiliu 謝稚柳, Dunhuang yishu xulu 敦煌藝術續錄 (Shanghai: Shanghai chubangongsi, 1955), 3.
This event was considered by Liang Qichao 梁啟超 (1873–1929) as “an unprecedented discovery of the classics in the world” in his article “Shuo shiliao” 說史料.15

In terms of when and why the Library Cave was sealed, scholars hold different opinions due to lack of reliable primary sources, but, as Prof. Shen Leping 沈樂平, a calligraphy specialist at China Academy of Art summarized in Dunhuang shufa zonglun 敦煌書法綜論, there are a few popular views. The first one was put forward by Paul Pelliot in an article published in 1908. Pelliot held that the cave was sealed in 1036 before the Xixia 西夏 (1038–1227) occupied Dunhuang. Based on the research of Paul Pelliot (1878–1945), Luo Zhenju 羅振玉 (1866–1940), Jiang Liangfu 姜亮夫 (1902–1995), and Aurel Stein (1862–1943), Shen points out that the manuscripts found in the Library Cave are mostly written in Chinese characters and there are also documents written in other languages such as Tibetan and Sanskrit, but nothing has been found written in Xixia characters. However, Xixia people did believe in Buddhism, which leads to speculation that maybe the cave had already been sealed when Xixia occupied that area.16 The second opinion, as articulated by Bai Bin 白濱 in Shilun cangjindong fengbi niandai 試論藏經洞封閉年代 was that “the time when the Library cave was sealed should be during the Xianping 咸平 period (998–1003) of the Northern Song dynasty or

---

15 Liang Qichao 梁啟超, Zhongguo lishi yanjiufa 中國歷史研究法 (Shijiazhuang: Hebei jiaoyu chubanshe, 2003), 53.

16 Shen, Dunhuang shufa zonglun, 13.
later.”

In Bai’s view, the Buddhist sutras, painting scrolls, and other manuscripts were placed and sealed in the Library Cave secretly when a coup took place inside the Cao Army around 1002. A third view emerged in the 1990s, during which time some scholars, such as Fang Guangchang 方廣錩 tended to think that these manuscripts were dumped in the cave as rubbish, instead of considering the sealing to be a measure taken to avoid destruction. This opinion was based on the finding that there was no complete Tripitaka, the venerated Buddhist canon, collected in the cave; most objects were fragments and some were only scribbles. In order to show respect to the Buddhist classics, these manuscripts were collected and deposited in the cave instead of being burned or randomly discarded. The final view that Shen lists in his book is Rong Xinjiang’s theory that the Library Cave was walled off in 1006 when the Yutian 于闐 Kingdom (BC 232–1006 AD) was destroyed by Qara-Khanid Khanate. The evidence on which Rong based his interpretation is the text of a Shiruji 施入記 now collected in Russia, which is the latest known manuscript that was collected in the Library Cave. According to the text, the Dunhuang Lord Cao Zongshou 曹宗壽 commanded his people to write on the scroll and preserve it in the Bao’en 報恩 Temple. The date recorded in the inscription was the fifth year of Xianping (1002). As a result, Rong concluded that the time when the cave

---

17 Ibid.
18 Ibid., 13–14.
20 Shen, Dunhuang shufa zonglun, 15.
was sealed should be after 1002, but before Xixia’s invasion in 1035. During that period, the biggest event was the Yutian Kingdom’s destruction by Qara-Khanid Khanate. Therefore, he considered 1006 as the time the cave was sealed off.\(^\text{21}\)

The problem of dating and explaining the sealing of the Library Cave is still waiting to be solved, which makes the authentication of unstudied Dunhuang manuscripts or artifacts meaningful, for any piece of manuscript or artifact that came from that cave may potentially provide valuable information to solve this problem.

Tracing the Dunhuang Manuscripts

Since the Library Cave was discovered in 1900, it took about ten years for the government to take action to protect the documents in the cave, by which time a great number of manuscripts had already been plundered or purchased, and scattered to multiple foreign countries.

After discovering the Library Cave, Wang Yuanlu made efforts to obtain attention from the local government for what he had found by presenting the manuscripts and paintings collected in the cave to local officials in order to gain some funds for building temples. However, the local government never took the matter seriously. The first person who realized the value of the Library Cave and expressed deep interest in the finds was Ye Changchi 葉昌熾 (1849–1917). He was a scholar and an epigrapher who served as Provincial Education Commissioner for Gansu from 1902 to 1906.\(^\text{22}\) Although Ye never

\(^{21}\) Rong, *Dunhuangxue shiba jiang*, 78–79.

visited Dunhuang himself, he showed great interest in the finds of the Library Cave and obtained Buddhist paintings, manuscripts, and rubbings from the cave through the Magistrate of Dunhuang, Wang Zonghan 汪宗翰, as is recorded in his diary entry for December 30, 1903.\textsuperscript{23} In his diary on January 23, 1910, Ye expressed his deep regret when learning that Pelliot and Stein acquired a large number of documents from Dunhuang:

> Classics, steles and works from the Buddhist canon were all deposited there in the Tang-Song period. The Frenchman Pelliot acquired most of the choice examples to place in the Paris Library, and an Englishman [Stein] also obtained some odd lots. The Chinese officials turned a blind eye … I am ashamed and full of remorse that I dared to blame others.\textsuperscript{24}

As a quite early account, Ye’s diary shows how indifferent the Chinese government was treating the finds of the Library Cave during 1900 to 1910. It was not until 1910, after Pelliot had shown parts of his Dunhuang collection to Chinese scholars in Beijing in September 1909, that the Ministry of Education took action and commanded that all the remaining documents in Dunhuang should be brought to Beijing.\textsuperscript{25}

In 1906, Aurel Stein (1862–1943), a Hungarian Sanskrit scholar, archaeologist, geographer, explorer, and surveyor, heard rumors of the find at Dunhuang when starting his second expedition, and soon he arrived at Dunhuang in May, 1907.\textsuperscript{26} Before this trip to Dunhuang, Stein had made his first Central Asian expedition to the Khotan area in

\textsuperscript{23} Ibid., 2.

\textsuperscript{24} Ibid., 4.


\textsuperscript{26} Dunhuang Manuscript Forgeries, 9.
1900 with the aim of systematically exploring the “ancient remains about Khotan and in the adjoining parts of the great desert of Chinese Turkestan.”

According to Stein, the plan of his second expedition “was based upon the experiences and results of my earlier journey in Chinese Turkestan, during 1900–1901.”

In Stein’s expedition report, one can find a full account of how he used a made-up story to persuade Wang Yuanlu to give away twenty-four cases of manuscripts and paintings and five chests of other artifacts in exchange for only a small sum of money.

It took Stein around one year to transport these treasures to the British Museum. However, this did not alarm the Chinese government, which explains Wang Yuanlu’s subsequent selling of national treasures to foreign explorers and scholars. In 1908, when Paul Pelliot, a great French sinologist, reached the Mogao Caves, after looking through all the remaining items in the Library Cave by candlelight, he took 6,000 more manuscripts. Due to his deep understanding of sinology and proficiency in Chinese, the items taken by Pelliot were of immense value. These items were later carried to France.

In 1914, when Stein reached the Mogao Caves for the second time, he took around 600 more manuscripts. In addition to Stein and Pelliot, other foreign explorers such as Tachibana Zuicho 橘瑞超 from Japan and Sergey Oldenburg from Russia also took a


30 Shen, Dunhuang shufa zonglun, 18.
significant number of sutras and documents from the Library Cave without any constraint from the Chinese government.\textsuperscript{31}

It was when these foreign buyers exhibited the Dunhuang treasures to the world that the Chinese officials started to understand the value of these manuscripts and artifacts. However, instead of protecting them, they made every attempt to steal the remaining items in the cave and then keep them for themselves. In 1910, the Qing government decided to transport all the remaining items to Beijing for safekeeping. Nevertheless, these manuscripts and artifacts suffered from theft during transportation, a related account of which can be found in Jiang Liangfu’s \textit{Mogaoku nianbiao} 莫高窟年表.\textsuperscript{32}

According to Dunhuang specialists’ estimate and statistics, the total number of the extant Dunhuang manuscripts exceeds 50,000 pieces. Based on the data offered by the International Dunhuang Project, the Dunhuang manuscripts are primarily collected in the following institutions: the National Library of China holds 16,000 manuscripts; the National Library of France holds 7,000 more manuscripts; the British Library holds around 14,000 pieces; the Institute of Oriental Manuscripts of the Russian Academy of Sciences holds around 19,000 manuscripts; 1,000 more pieces are collected in Japan.\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{31} Ibid., 19.

\textsuperscript{32} Jiang Liangfu 姜亮夫, \textit{Mogaoku nianbiao} 莫高窟年表 (Shanghai: Shanghai guji chubanshe, 1985), 622.

Chapter 3: Preliminary Findings on the Sutra Scroll under Study

The sutra scroll from the Wiant Collection is numbered 1978.553 (misc. #10) under the miscellaneous category in the collection inventory. The manuscript is mounted as a Chinese style handscroll, which “has a tapestry external wrapper (with peony arabesque motif), and jade fastener attached by a burgundy and white cloth tape.” The beginning part of the original sutra is incomplete due to the loss of the first panel, and the head title that normally appears before the sutra text is also missing. The title slip pasted on the outside of the scroll, written in seal script, says “Tangren xie jingang bore boluomi jing canjuan,” 唐人寫金剛般若波羅蜜經残卷 [Anonymous Tang Inscription of the Diamond Sutra Scroll] (Figure 1). The sutra is written in ink on brownish-yellow paper. The beginning of the surviving sutra is also damaged and the text is incomplete (Figure 2). In the Taishō genpan Daizōkyō edition of Kumarajiva’s translation of the Diamond Sutra, about 17 characters are arranged per line, which is similar to the layout of the Wiant sutra. The Wiant sutra’s textual content matches Kumarajiva’s translation of the Diamond Sutra, except that it starts from the fifth section, presumably having lost the first four due to wear. These sections are roughly the first 29 lines in Kumarajiva’s translation text in Taishō genpan Daizōkyō. Therefore, it can be known that the missing

34 This description is provided by Prof. Julia Andrews in her notes on the Wiant sutra.
text in the first part of the Wiant sutra also contains about 29 lines, which would roughly occupy a panel. As a result, it is safe to conclude that there is a complete sheet missing from the front of the Wiant sutra. Partial damage to the sutra paper can also be found in the middle and end parts of the scroll, but the main part with text has not been damaged. The surviving sutra consists of 9 panels of paper connected side by side, each of which is divided into 31 columns by marking black lines with an interval of approximately 1.2 cm between each pair of lines. The length of each panel is approximately 46.5 cm; on each panel is written 31 columns with 17 characters per line (Figure 3). In the following paragraphs, I will primarily provide analysis of the scroll in terms of its textual content, medium, ground, format, calligraphic style, and the collector’s seals.

---

35 The measurements of the Wiant sutra scroll are provided by Prof. Julia Andrews.

36 Ibid.
Figure 1. The *Diamond Sutra*, handscroll, rolled-up view, height: 10 5/8 in. (27 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)\(^{37}\)

\(^{37}\) The dimensions of this *Diamond Sutra*: 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm); overall with mounting: 10 5/8 in. × 216 ¾ in. (27 × 550.5 cm)
Figure 2. *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, section 1, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiatt Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 3. The Diamond Sutra, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiart Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
The Buddhist canon is referred to as the Tripitaka, the three Pitakas or baskets, which contains three divisions: Sutra Pitaka consists of the sutras or discourses in five collections or Nikāyas; Vinaya Pitaka is the book of discipline in three divisions; Abhidhamma Pitaka contains the works such as mental elements or processes, subjects of discussion, book of relations, etc.\(^\text{38}\) According to both the title pasted on the outside of the scroll and its textual content, the copied content is the text of the *Diamond Sutra*, which is contained in the *Great Prajñā Sutra* that is itself within the sutra division of the Tripitaka. Among all the authenticated Dunhuang manuscripts, over 1,000 scrolls are inscribed with the text of the *Diamond Sutra*, which supports the possibility of the scroll being a genuine Dunhuang sutra.\(^\text{39}\)

The Sanskrit title for the *Diamond Sutra* is *Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā Sūtra*, which is translated into Chinese as “Jingang bore boluomi jing” 金剛般若波羅蜜經. The *Diamond Sutra* is one of over 600 volumes that comprise the *Great Prajñā Sutra*, which contains what the Buddha said about *prajñā*. According to Hsüan Hua’s 宣化 explanation, vajra (jingang 金剛) is an indestructible substance that is usually represented as diamond, which explains why the title of the sutra is translated into English as The *Diamond Sutra*.\(^{40}\) In *Buddhist Wisdom Books*, Edward Conze explained the term *Prajñāpāramitā*

---


\(^{39}\) Ikeda On 池田溫, *Dunhuang wen shu de shijie* 敦煌文書的世界, trans. Zhang Mingxin 張銘心 and Hao Yijun 郝軼君 (Beijing: Zhonghua shuju, 2007), 44.

\(^{40}\) Hsüan Hua, *A General Explanation*, 3.
by dividing it into three parts. According to Conze, *prajñā* means wisdom; *pāram* means beyond; *itā* means she who has gone, so in his opinion, *Prajñāpāramitā* means “this wisdom has gone beyond everything earthly, or sensory, and yet, as we shall see, it has left none of it behind,” or in other word, means “‘transcendental’ wisdom.”41

According to the *Taishō genpan daizōkyō*, the *Diamond Sutra* has been translated into six different versions in Chinese. The earliest translation was completed by Tripitaka Master Kumarajiva in the Yaoqin 姚秦 dynasty (384–417) and is also considered the finest version. He translated the sutra under the title “Jingang bore boluomi jing” 金剛般若波羅蜜經.42 The second version was done by Tripitaka Master Bodhiruci in the Northern Wei 北魏 dynasty (386–534) and he used the same title as Kumarajiva.43 Also under the same title, Tripitaka Master Paramartha produced his translation in the Chen 陳 dynasty (557–589).44 Later, the fourth version was completed by Dharmagupta, a Tripitaka Master in the Sui 隋 dynasty (581–618), who translated the sutra under a different title by adding the word “cutting” (*nengduan* 能斷) making it “Jingang nengduan bore boluomi jing” 金剛能斷般若波羅蜜經.45 In the Tang dynasty, Tripitaka

---


43 Ibid., 752–761.

44 Ibid., 762–766.

Master Xuanzang 玄奘 translated the sutra by slightly reversing the word “cutting” (nengduan 能斷) with the word “diamond” (jingang 金剛) in Dharmagupta’s title. The last version of the translation is believed to have been done by Dharma Tripitaka Yijing 義浄 under the same title as Xuanzang’s. The sutra scroll from the Wiant collection matches Kumarajiva’s translation of the Diamond Sutra. However, it does not comprise the complete text, only starting from the fifth section (pin 品) of the Diamond Sutra, missing the text of the first four sections.

Sutra Copying

Among all the Dunhuang manuscripts, Buddhist sutras account for more than 90 percent, which makes sutra-copying calligraphy a major subject to explore in Dunhuang Studies. Wang Xuezhong 王學仲 has even listed the sutra-copying style (xiejingti 寫經體) as a calligraphic style that is separate from the traditionally acknowledged copybook (tie 帖) style and stele (bei 碑) style. The manuscripts collected in the Library Cave in Dunhuang cover an extended period of time, from the fourth to the early eleventh centuries, which makes them valuable sources for study of the variation in Chinese

46 Taishō Genpan Daizōkyō Vol. 7, 980–985.
47 Taishō Genpan Daizōkyō Vol. 8, 771–776.
48 Mao, Moxiang foyin, 2.
49 Wang Xuezhong 王學仲, “Bei tie jing shufen sanpai lun” 碑帖經書分三派論 in Selected Articles by Contemporary Scholars on Chinese Calligraphy: Calligraphy History 當代中國書法論文選：書史卷, ed. Zhongguo Shufajia Xiehui 中國書法家協會 (Beijing: Rongbaozhai chubanshe, 2010), 76–89.
calligraphic style during different time periods.\(^{50}\) If one tries to locate a sutra scroll as originating in the “Library” in Dunhuang, studying its calligraphic style can be very helpful in conducting research on dating and authentication.

Around the first century BC, Buddhism was introduced from India into Yutian (modern-day Hetian 和田, Xinjiang 新疆) and later into the Dunhuang area and the Central Plain. The original Buddhist canon was written in Sanskrit and most Chinese translations were made from Sanskrit. Buddhism’s introduction mainly relied on the spread of sutras, which made sutra translation the primary Buddhist practice during that time. In its early stage, the translation of a sutra is thought to have been completed by a high priest reading the Sanskrit sutra out loud in Chinese and his disciple writing it down, thus the phrase “writing down with a brush” (bishou 笔受) appears in the preface of the sutra.\(^{51}\) In addition, during this time the zhengshu 正書 script was normally used when copying the sutra in order to show the writer’s sincerity during copying and also to avoid, as much as possible, mistakes made through later transmission and copying. The zhengshu script here is different from the standard script (kaishu 楷書) of the Sui (581–618) and Tang (618–907) dynasty, for it still retained a strong sense of clerical script (lishu 隸書) in terms of the structure of character and the use of brush.\(^{52}\) This primary stage of Buddhist sutras’ translation from Sanskrit into Chinese falls between the

\(^{50}\) Shen, *Dunhuang shufa zonglun*, 7.


\(^{52}\) Ibid., 87.
Eastern Han 東漢 (25–220) dynasty and the Eastern Jin 東晉 (317–420) dynasty, during which time Chinese calligraphic scripts were experiencing a series of changes including the rise of new scripts and the mixing of multiple scripts.\textsuperscript{53} Under these conditions, the sutra-copying style came into being. Hua Rende 華人德 has given description to this style in “Lun liuchao xiejingti–jianji lanting lunbian” 論六朝寫經體—兼及蘭亭論辯:

When copying the sutra, one has to write each character carefully and neatly; on the other hand, he also needs to keep the copying fast and efficient. As a result, the heng 橫 stroke was written by starting with the tip of the brush without keeping the brush tip backward and pressing hard at the end of the stroke; at the turning point of the stroke, instead of lifting the tip of the brush and then shifting it, the writer tended to pause slightly and then shift the brush tip in order to make the stroke strong and fast.

抄寫佛經既要工整以示虔誠，同時抄寫的速度又要快以求效率，因而寫橫畫都是尖鋒起筆，不用逆鋒，收筆處重按，轉折處多不是提筆轉換筆鋒，而是略作頓駐后再調峰，以取勁疾。\textsuperscript{54}

The practice of Buddhist sutra copying follows a fixed rule since its very early stage. Among the extant Buddhist manuscripts, most of them are written on paper and some are written on silk. The warlord Huanxuan 桓玄 (369–404), who briefly ruled as emperor, ordered people to replace bamboo and wooden strips with paper, which is said to have made paper the major writing material.\textsuperscript{55} Rong Xinjiang has made a summary of the practice of sutra copying in Dunhuangxue shiba jiang 敦煌學十八講:

\textsuperscript{53} Ibid., 179.

\textsuperscript{54} Hua Rende 華人德, “Lun liuchao xiejingti–jianji lanting lunbian” 論六朝寫經體—兼及蘭亭論辯 in Lanting lunji 蘭亭論集, ed. Hua Rende 華人德 and Bai Qianshen 白謙慎 (Suzhou: Suzhou daxue chubanshe, 2000), 286.

\textsuperscript{55} Ibid., 181.
A good kind of paper for sutra copying was made from hemp … Although paper was substituted for wooden slips as writing material, the format of sutra copying on paper was transformed from that on wooden slips … The black line or red line on the sutra paper was marked as a design in order to divide the panel into multiple columns just like wooden slips, which explains the reason why ancient texts were written downward from the top of each column … For manuscripts that were important, the paper had to be dyed yellow by soaking in a huangbo solution before writing on it, which helped protect manuscripts from insects … Two lines should be marked on the standard paper that is used to copy the sutra, one above and one below with a distance of 18–19 cm in between. In addition, each panel should be divided into multiple columns by marking with vertical grid lines leaving an interval of 1.5–1.8 cm between any two lines … The number of lines on each panel varies between 20 to 31 depending on the width of the panel … Commonly in each column will be written 17 characters and there will be 28 columns on each panel, which makes it easy to count the approximate number of characters of the sutra and the number of used panels of paper. When doing the sutra copying, the title, writer, or translator should be inscribed ahead of the text. The title here is called head title (shouti 首題) or inner title (neiti 内題), which is normally put under the full title and sometimes along with the chapter title (pinming 品名). At the end of the scroll there will be a title called end title (weiti 尾題), which is normally put under the abbreviated title … Additionally, if there is remaining space at the end of the scroll, it would usually be used for a colophon (tiji 题記). The inscription tends to be included in the standard sutra copying. Even if there is no remaining space, the copyist would be asked to add another panel of paper to finish the colophon. It normally includes the date, the names of the copyist and donor, and a vow (yuamen 願文) … The scroll was unrolled often for people to read, so the front part of the scroll would easily fall off, becoming incomplete, while the end title rolled inside mostly remains complete.
Following Rong’s summary of sutra copying quoted above, several relevant findings about the paper and the layout of the *Diamond Sutra* scroll under study may be noted. The paper of the Wiant sutra scroll has been dyed yellow, which is commonly seen among the high-quality sutra scrolls of medieval China. According to Rong, the material used to dye the paper is called *huangbo* which helps protect paper from insects.

This information also appears in the catalogue published by Getty Museum in 2016, *Cave Temples of Dunhuang: Buddhist Art on China’s Silk Road*:

> Along with sizing and waxing, staining or dyeing was a common step in the medieval Chinese papermaking process, serving insecticidal and water-repellent, as well as decorative, purposes. According to experimental analysis, most paper at Dunhuang seems to have been dyed a yellow color derived from the Amur cork tree (*Phellodendron amurense*), known in Chinese as *huangbo*.

The *Diamond Sutra* scroll (cat. No. 20) that is collected in the Getty exhibition catalogue is also written on dyed paper. It is dated by the curators between 600 to 900

---

56 Rong, *Dunhuangxue shiba jiang*, 340–343; this book also has an English version which I found after I did the translation: Rong Xinjiang, *Eighteen Lectures on Dunhuang*, trans. Imre Galambos (Leiden; Boston: Brill, 2013).

57 Ibid., 341.

58 Ibid.

59 *Cave Temples of Dunhuang: Buddhist Art on China’s Silk Road*, ed. Neville Agnew, Marcia Reed, and Tevvy Ball (Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 2016), 228.

60 Ibid., “Particularly rare among Library Cave materials is the use of a range of paper colors for a single manuscript…Its twelve surviving sheets of paper, each dyed a blue, yellow, or green hue, were joined together in an alternating color sequence.”
and was found in Mogao Grottoes, Cave 17, the Library Cave, and is now collected by The British Library (Figure 4). Similar to the Wiant sutra, the Getty sutra is transcribed in standard script (kaishu) using Kumarajiva’s translation of the Diamond Sutra and it also has 17 characters arranged per line.

Following the standard sutra paper layout quoted by Rong above, there are black grid lines marked on the paper of the Wiant sutra. Each column is 19.7 cm high and 1.2 cm wide, with subtle differences from the most common measurements. But in other facets, it remains consistent with the standard sutra copying format. Seventeen characters are arranged per line; each panel is roughly 48.3 cm wide and divided into 31 columns.

Its head title and the first sheet of paper are lost, but the end title inscribed following the body text is preserved. The missing first panel does not affect its authenticity, for following the explanation in Rong’s book, the end title rolled inside remains mostly complete, while the front part including the head title or chapter title is easily damaged or lost due to the fact that the scroll was rolled frequently for people to read the sutra text. Therefore the front of the scroll became the most vulnerable part. The following colophon is not present in this sutra either, but Rong Xinjiang has given a possible explanation while he was viewing the Wiant sutra. According to Rong, the last line of text (the sutra title) is very close to the edge of the paper; therefore, it is highly possible that some additional text to the left of this scroll has been cut off. One possible

---

61 The measurements of the Wiant sutra scroll are provided by Prof. Julia Andrews.

62 Ibid.
reason is that people cut up high-quality Dunhuang manuscripts like this one in order to sell the parts separately for a higher price than they would fetch as a single object.\textsuperscript{63}

\textsuperscript{63} All the information related to sutra viewing in San Diego and Prof. Rong’s opinion are provided by Prof. Julia Andrews in her note on the Wiant sutra.
Figure 4. The Diamond Sutra, detail, handscroll, ca. 600–900, ink on paper, 10 1/8 in. × 11 in. (25.7 × 28 cm). The British Library, London (photograph from Cave Temples of Dunhuang: Buddhist Art on China’s Silk Road, ed. Neville Agnew, Marcia Reed, and Tevvy Ball, Los Angeles: Getty Conservation Institute, 2016, 228)
Calligraphic Style

The practitioners of sutra copying can be divided into three groups: Buddhist priests and nuns, Buddhist believers, and sutra copiers. The former two groups do sutra copying as a practice of praying for blessings or earning merits and virtues, while the third group takes it as an occupation and does sutra copying to earn money. Due to the difference of social status and cultural background among sutra copying practitioners, the writing styles of the sutras may vary from one another. However, the calligraphic styles of the sutras from the same period are generally similar.

The practice of sutra copying started during the period from the Eastern Han (25–220) dynasty to the Western Jin (265–316) dynasty, during which time Chinese calligraphic scripts were experiencing a series of variations including the rise of new scripts and the mixing of multiple different scripts. In its early stage, which is during the Western Jin 西晉 (265–316) and Eastern Jin (317–420) dynasties, sutra-copying calligraphy still retained a strong sense of clerical script (lishu), which is reflected in both the structure and the strokes of the character. For example, na 掙 (the right descending diagonal stroke) is usually written with a movement that presses the brush heavily and it is commonly seen that certain strokes in a character are made visibly bold. This feature is consistent with the Six Dynasties sutra copying style (liuchao xiejing ti 六朝寫經體). This style has been pointed out and described by Hua Rende in his article “Lun liuchao

---

64 Mao, Moxiang foyin, 176.
65 Ibid., 178.
xiejingti–jianji lanting lunbian”, which is quoted in the former section (Sutra Copying) of this chapter.

In addition, most characters are written in a horizontally oriented rectangle.

Later in the Northern and Southern dynasties 南北朝 (420–589) and the Sui (581–618) dynasty, although the imaginary square that each character was put in was still vertically squeezed, the structure of each character can be found slightly elongated in height compared to that of the early period.

During the Tang dynasty and the Five Dynasties 五代 (907–960), due to the development of standard script (kaishu), this script increasingly became widely used in sutra copying. Fu Shen 傅申 has given a summary of the rise of standard script in the Tang dynasty as being the last of the formal script types in the evolutionary sequence:

It developed from clerical script around the end of the Han dynasty, but it was not until the Sui (581–618) and early Tang periods (618–906) that the various generically related types stabilized into the configuration known as “standard” script … Technically, standard script combined the most advanced brush techniques of the different script types which had developed in the intervening years … Utilizing the newest methods, standard script was also the most legible and convenient form of writing. Therefore, after the Tang, it did not undergo radical changes.

Dunhuang manuscripts reached a peak when entering the Tang dynasty in terms of both quantity and the artistic quality. Among all the sutra scrolls from the Library Cave in Dunhuang, Tang manuscripts have occupied a large proportion. According to Zheng Ruzhong 鄭汝中, “[Tang manuscripts] roughly account for over seventy percent

---

66 See note 45.

of the whole Dunhuang sutra collection.”\textsuperscript{68} The same results can be found in Ikeda On’s research: “Among all the Dunhuang manuscripts, the ninth century manuscripts take up the largest proportion; the manuscripts of the eighth and tenth century occupy the second largest proportion; those dated before the seventh century only take up around one tenth in total.”\textsuperscript{69}

Sutra copying in Dunhuang stepped into its late stage when China entered the Five Dynasties (907–960) and the Northern Song dynasty (960–1127). During this period, the structure of each character was further elongated vertically. In addition, although most of the copying still followed the Tang calligraphic style by writing in standard script, a sense of running script (\textit{xingshu} 行書) style started to appear in certain copying works, which conveys a freer quality than the Tang sutra style. The use of running script and cursive script (\textit{caoshu} 草書) in copying gradually increased during this period of time; so did the use of both heavy and light ink in one work for a striking contrast.\textsuperscript{70}

From the chart that Shen has provided in his book, which roughly shows the stylistic transformation of sutra copying calligraphy, one could find great resemblance of the calligraphic style between the Wiant Diamond Sutra and the characters in the fifth

\begin{itemize}
\item[69] Ikeda On, 池田溫 “Zhongguo gudai xieben shiyu jilu jieshuo shang,” 中國古代寫本識語集録解說（上）Beijing tushuguan guankan 北京圖書館館刊, no. 3 (1994): 89.
\item[70] Shen, Dunhuang shufa zonglun, 56.
\end{itemize}
and the sixth column, which are the typical styles of standard script in its mature period—Tang dynasty (Figure 5).

Starting from Sui (581–618) dynasty, Japanese missions were sent to China with the aim of learning Chinese Buddhism and culture.71 During the Asuka 飛鳥 (538–710) and Nara 奈良 period (710–794), hand copying of sutras became increasingly prevalent in Japan due to the multiple Japanese missions to China with the aim of learning Buddhism and the Japanese rulers’ enthusiasm of Buddhism. During Emperor Shomu’s 聖武天皇 reign (724–749), people were organized to copy the given sutras and a well-staffed bureau of sutra copying was set up to supervise the copying activities as well as giving necessary tests to sutra copiers.72 As a result, Japanese sutra copying during this time shares similar calligraphic styles with Chinese sutra copying of the same time, which makes Japanese sutras transcribed during this period good examples to help date the Wiant sutra.

Eleven manuscripts in total of various dates will be used to compare with the Wiant Diamond Sutra in terms of their copying format, calligraphic style, and measurements in the following paragraphs. Among all these examples, seven of them are authenticated Dunhuang manuscripts, the others are not from Dunhuang; eight of them


were transcribed in China, the other three were written in Japan; three Tang sutras dated the late seventh century are authenticated sutras transcribed in the Tang capital.

Compared with the eight authenticated and dated Dunhuang manuscripts and the three Buddhist sutras collected in Japan, the calligraphic style of the Wiant *Diamond Sutra* scroll under study shows great similarity to the style of the early Tang Dunhuang manuscripts. A chart listing all the manuscripts used in comparison has been placed in Appendix B.

When comparing the Wiant *Diamond Sutra* to the *Daban niepan jing* 大般涅槃經 of the Northern and Southern dynasties (Figure 6), the *Laozi bianhua jing* 老子變化經 of the Sui dynasty (Figure 7), the Tang *Diamond Sutra* dated 672 (Figure 8), the *Yujia shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論 of the Tang dynasty (Figure 9), a Northern Song dynasty *Samyutagama Sutra* (Figure 10), one can find more resemblance on the stroke writing style between the Wiant *Diamond Sutra* (Figure 3) and the two Tang dynasty manuscripts than the others. In both the *Daban niepan jing* and the *Laozi bianhua jing*, *na*, compared with other strokes, is visibly emphasized (Figure 11, Figure 12 & Figure 13); most of *heng* 横 and *na* start with a sharp head and end with a thick tail. However, in the Tang *Diamond Sutra* dated 672, the *Yujia shidi lun*, and the Wiant *Diamond Sutra*, these two features hardly exist. The stroke *na* is not dramatically emphasized compared with other strokes, such as the *da* 大 in Tang *Diamond Sutra* dated 672 (Figure 14) and the *ren* 人 in the Wiant sutra (Figure 15). In addition, massive contrast in the variation of thickness or the way of starting with a small tip and ending by pressing the brush heavily when writing the *heng* and *na* stroke do not appear as commonly in these three manuscripts as that in the former
two manuscripts, such as the *ren* in Tang *Diamond Sutra* dated 672 (Figure 16), the *yi* in the *Yujia shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論 (Figure 17), and the *yi* in the Wiant *Diamond Sutra* (Figure 18). When comparing the Wiant sutra with the *Samyutagama Sutra* of the Northern Song dynasty, one could find that the *Samyutagama Sutra* is written with large characters in very bold strokes which conveys a strong quality, while the characters in the Wiant sutra give a smoother and softer quality. Additionally, in the *Samyutagama Sutra*, one can feel a visible pause of the brush at the end of most of the *heng* 横 strokes, however, this feature cannot be found in the Wiant sutra (Figure 10). According to the findings from the observation and comparison above, it is quite safe to date the Wiant sutra under study as a Tang dynasty manuscript.

Then, when the Wiant sutra scroll is compared together with the *Lotus Sutra* of 672 (Figure 19), the Tang *Diamond Sutra* dated 672 (Figure 8), the Nara Period *Hōjū-kyō sutra* (法集經) dated 740 (Figure 20), the Nara period *Hōon-kyō sutra* (報恩經) of 752 (Figure 21), the Nara period *Daihannyaaharamita-kyō sutra* dated the eighth century (Figure 22), and the *Yujia shidi lun* 瑜伽師地論 of 855 (Figure 9), and the *Ming zhong ji* 鳴鐘記 [“Gaatha” on the Ringing Bell] of 873 (Figure 23), it can easily be seen that the copying style of the Wiant sutra is relatively close to the early Tang copying style.

Comparing the Wiant sutra with the three Nara period sutras of the eighth century (Figure 20, 21, 22), one could find that they share some similarities to one another, such as that most of the characters are framed in a tall rectangular structure; that the strokes are written with relatively even pressure with little emphasis on certain strokes. However, the
*heng* in the three Nara period sutras is frequently written with a visible pause at the end of the stroke, which can hardly be seen in the Wiant sutra or in any other sutras of the early Tang dynasty listed above (Figure 20, 21, 22, 23). When comparing the Wiant sutra with the two late seventh century Tang sutras (Figure 8 & 19), various resemblances can be discovered: they are all written in the most normative standard script with few connecting strokes; each character is framed in a tall rectangular structure; the whole text is arranged in an orderly and neat manner along with the black grid line on the scroll paper. By contrast, the *Yujia shidi lun* and the *Ming zhong ji* are copied in a rather free and relaxed style with less formal or compact character structure and copying format. Especially for the *Ming zhong ji*, one can hardly even see any drawn black grid lines on the scroll paper. Additionally, there are a few common characters in both the *Lotus Sutra* and the Wiant sutra that very much resembling one another, such as the characters *fo* 佛, *luo* 羅, and *a* 阿, which are chosen randomly in the *Lotus Sutra* dated 672 (Figure 24) and the Wiant sutra scroll (Figure 25). The character *fo* in these two sutras is written with the right vertical stroke of *fu* 弗 slightly longer than the left vertical stroke and visible pauses at the points where the brushstroke begins a shift in direction of movement from rightward to downward (Figure 26 & Figure 27); the central stroke of *luo* is visibly elongated (Figure 28 & Figure 29); and *a* is placed in a relatively squeezed imaginary square (Figure 30 & Figure 31). As a result, it is highly possible that the Wiant sutra was transcribed during early Tang dynasty, probably around the late seventh century or the eighth century.

In *Dunhuangxue shiba jiang*, Prof. Rong states that:
The Library Cave also preserved a few official sutra scrolls copied in the Tang capital. They were proofread repeatedly by the eminent monks from various Buddhist temples in the capital. Therefore, these sutra scrolls are in rigorous, regular form and contain no character mistakes, which makes them highly reliable rare documents.

敦煌藏经洞還保存了一些唐代都城的官府寫經, 是經過京城各寺高僧大德的反復校對的, 格式謹嚴, 沒有任何錯字, 是可以信賴的善本。

Based on the textual content, formal nature of the format, high quality of the writing materials and the calligraphic style, it is reasonable to believe that the Wiant *Diamond Sutra* might be one of the official scrolls that were copied in the Tang capital first and then transferred and collected in the Library Cave in Dunhuang. Among all the Dunhuang manuscripts, there are dozens of official scrolls that were copied in the Tang capital and dated from roughly 671 to 677 and the textual content of which are either the *Lotus Sutra* or *Diamond Sutra*. The Japanese Dunhuang scholar Fujieda Akira 藤枝晃 (1911–1998) did research on these officially copied manuscripts and described the general superintendents in charge of copying canonical books in the Tang capital as the *xiejingshi* 寫經使. According to Fujieda, there are two superintendents whose names appear most frequently on these manuscripts: one is Yu Chang 虞昶 (600–674) who was the son of Yu Shinan 虞世南 (558–638), a great calligraphic master, especially in standard script writing; the other one is Yan Xuandao 閻玄道 (625–690), who Fujieda

---

73 Rong, *Dunhaungxue shiba jiang*, 250.

74 In this section I provide evidence to test the hypothetical dating and provenance suggested by Rong Xinjiang to Julia Andrews in his 2016 viewing of the sutra in San Diego, as summarized by Andrews in her note on the Wiant sutra.

believed to be a son or nephew of the great Tang painter Yan Liben (601–673).  

In addition to the directors, the copyists in the Tang capital also excelled in calligraphy, as attested in *Tang huìyào* 唐會要:

Tang officials with position above the fifth pin 品 in the capital who are interested in learning calligraphy or have a great sense in writing calligraphy will learn calligraphy writing in the (Hongwen) Building. Twenty-four people entered the building to learn calligraphy in that year. Yu Shinan and Ouyang Xun were commanded to teach the way to write standard script.

見在京文武職事五品以上子，有性愛學書及有書性者，聽于（弘文）館內學書，其書法內出，其年有二十四人入館；敕虞世南、歐陽詢教示楷法。

The Wiant sutra is transcribed in a very normative kind of standard script. Each character is framed in a tall rectangular structure, written with good control in organizing strokes and with even-pressure. The copying maintains a neat and orderly quality throughout the sutra with few connecting strokes and with the space between each pair of adjacent characters arranged equally. Although, in comparison with the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* in the *Taishō genpan Daizōkyō*, there are several lines of text and several single characters found missing in this sutra, it shares the same missing textual content with the two *Diamond Sutra* scrolls in the Stein collection which were, according to their colophons, officially transcribed in the Tang capital: one sutra is dated 672 and the other dated 676 (Figure 8 & 32). All three sutras were transcriptions of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* and they all lack the last four lines of text before Section 22, as well as the character xiang 相 in Section 27.

---

shared missing text of these three sutras has been marked in Appendix C. This can hardly be seen as a simple coincidence. Perhaps this body of texts were all faithfully copied from a single flawed version. It is also highly possible that Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* has experienced some variation and what was used in copying at that time differs slightly from the one in the *Taishō genpan Daizōkyō*. In addition, these three *Diamond Sutras* (the Wiant sutra and two *Diamond Sutras* from the Stein collection) share exactly the same layout: 17 characters per line with 31 columns per panel, and similar paper size: the Wiant sutra is 25.5 cm high and 434.7 cm long; the *Diamond Sutra* dated 672 is 25.5 cm high and 410 cm long; the *Diamond Sutra* dated 676 is 26 cm high and 442 cm long. Therefore, it is quite reasonable to believe that the Wiant sutra was a contemporary sutra of the two *Diamond Sutras* in the Stein collection and may also be one of the sutras that were transcribed in the Tang capital.\(^{77}\)

---

\(^{77}\) This visual and inscriptive evidence thus strongly supports the probability of the scroll’s metropolitan provenance as suggested by Rong Xinjiang to Julia Andrews when viewing the Wiant sutra in San Diego, as summarized by Andrews in her note on the Wiant sutra.
Figure 5. *Xiejingti yanbian tu* [Evolution of the sutra copying script] from Shen Leping 沈樂平, *Dunhuang shufa zonglun* 敦煌書法綜論 (Hangzhou: Zhejiang guji chubanshe, 2009), 16.
Figure 6. *Daban niepan jing*, detail, scroll, 506, ink on paper, 10 5/8 in. × 305 1/8 in. (27 × 775 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1674143426;bst=1;recnum=81;index=1;image=1)
Figure 7. *Laozi bianhua jing*, detail, scroll, 612, ink on paper, 10 ¼ in. × 75 ¼ in. (26 × 191 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1674642566;bst=1;recnum=2294;index=1;img=1)
Figure 8. *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, scroll, 672, ink on paper, 10 in. × 161 3/8 in. (25.5 × 410 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1205273706;recnum=35;index=1)
Figure 9. *Yujia shidi lun*, detail, scroll, 855, ink on paper, Length: 252 in. (640 cm). The Royal Library, Copenhagen (http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1668160818;bst=1;recnum=116152;index=1;img=1)
Figure 11. Character you 阙 in Daban niepan jing, detail, scroll, 506, ink on paper, 10 5/8 in. × 305 1/8 in. (27 × 775 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1674143426;bst=1;recnum=81;index=1;img=g=1)
Figure 12. Character zhi 之 in Laozi bianhua jing, detail, scroll, 612, ink on paper, 10 ¼ in. × 75 ¼ in. (26 × 191 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1674642566;bst=1;recnum=2294;index=1;img=1)
Figure 13. Character yang 養 in *Laozi bianhua jing*, detail, scroll, 612, ink on paper, 10 ¼ in. × 75 ¼ in. (26 × 191 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1674642566;bst=1;recnum=2294;index=1; img=1)
Figure 14. Character da 大 in *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, scroll, 672, ink on paper, 10 in. \( \times \) 161 3/8 in. (25.5 \( \times \) 410 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1205273706;recnum=35;index=1)
Figure 15. Character ren 人 in *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 16. Character ren 人 in *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, scroll, 672, ink on paper, 10 in. × 161 3/8 in. (25.5 × 410 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1205273706;recnum=35;index=1)
Figure 17. Character yi — in *Yujia shidi lun*, detail, scroll, 855, ink on paper, Length: 252 in. (640 cm). The Royal Library, Copenhagen (http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1668160818;bst=1;recnum=116152;index=1;img=1)
Figure 18. Character yi — in *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 19. *The Lotus Sutra*, detail, scroll, 672, ink on paper, 10 5/16 in. × 318 in. (26.2 × 807.72 cm). The British Library, London (Source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1675002086;bst=1;recnum=9163;index=1;img=1)
Figure 21. Hōon-kyō sutra, detail, scroll, 752, ink on paper, 10 11/16 in. × 177 1/8 in. (27.1 x451.9 cm). Nara National Museum, Nara (http://www.narahaku.go.jp/english/collection/1231-0.html)
Figure 23. *Ming zhong ji*, detail, scroll, 873, 11 in. × 54 in. (28 × 137 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1890168958;bst=1;recnum=381;index=1;img=1)
Figure 24. Character fo 佛, luo 羅, a 阿 in The Lotus Sutra, detail, scroll, 672, ink on paper, 10 5/16 in. × 318 in. (26.2 × 807.72 cm). The British Library, London (Source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1675002086;bst=1;recnum=9163;index=1; img=1)
Figure 25. Character 佛, 佛 luo, 罗 a, 阿 in The Diamond Sutra, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiatt Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 26. Character fo 仏 in *The Lotus Sutra*, detail, scroll, 672, ink on paper, 10 5/16 in. × 318 in. (26.2 × 807.72 cm). The British Library, London (Source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1675002086;bst=1;recnum=9163;index=1; img=1)
Figure 27. Character 佛 in The Diamond Sutra, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 28. Character luo 羅 in *The Lotus Sutra*, detail, scroll, 672, ink on paper, 10 5/16 in. × 318 in. (26.2 × 807.72 cm). The British Library, London (Source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1675002086;bst=1;recnum=9163;index=1; img=1)
Figure 29. Character \( luo \) in *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. \( \times \) 171 1/8 in. (25.5 \( \times \) 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 30. Character 阿 in *The Lotus Sutra*, detail, scroll, 672, ink on paper, 10 5/16 in. × 318 in. (26.2 × 807.72 cm). The British Library, London (Source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1675002086;bst=1;recnum=9163;index=1; img=1)
Figure 31. Character 阿 in *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiart Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 32. *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, scroll, 676, ink on paper, 10 ¼ in. × 174 in. (26 × 442 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1232770106;recnum=513;index=1)
Jin Cheng—the Collector

On the title slip pasted on the exterior of the Wiant sutra scroll, the sutra’s title is written in seal script, followed by the signature of the collector Jin Cheng 金城 (1878–1926) and the date of the scroll’s acquisition which are inscribed in small standard script: “Gengshen dong Jin Cheng cang” 庚申冬金城藏 [in the winter of Gengshen (1920), Jin Cheng’s collection] (Figure 33). Two of Jin Cheng’s seals are also found on the sutra scroll, which are the only collector’s seals borne by this sutra. One seal is stamped at the right lower edge of the first panel of the sutra, on the patch, underneath the first line of sutra text, and has six characters in seal script, Gongbo pingsheng zhenshang 鞏伯平生真賞 [highly appreciated by Gongbo throughout his life] (Figure 34). A reversed mark of this seal has rubbed off on the backing of the scroll (Figure 35). The second seal appears twice, first at the left lower edge of the brown resist dyed paper frontispiece that precedes the sutra itself and follows two sections of mounting silk at the opening of the scroll. The same seal is impressed again at the left lower edge of the last panel of the sutra under the end title (weiti) and is the only seal impressed on the original sutra paper. Both have the identical six characters in seal script, Wuxing Jin Cheng zhencang 吳興金城珍藏 [Collected by Jin Cheng of Wuxing] (Figure 36 & 37).

Jin Cheng, originally named Jin Shaocheng 金紹城, was born in a scholarly family in Huzhou 湖州, Zhejiang 浙江 in 1878 and died of illness in Shanghai 上海 in 1926. He had used several different names in pursuing literary and art activities over his lifetime, including Jin Cheng, Gongbo 鞏伯, Gongbei 拱北, Beilou 北樓, and Ouhu 藕湖.
Jin Cheng served as the secretary of state affairs in the early twentieth century. As a law specialist, he played a significant role in reforming China’s prisons and legal system. On top of this, Jin Cheng was also an influential figure in the art field who devoted his great time and energy to the pursuit of art activities. He was “the administrative mind behind the 1914 founding of the Galleries of Antiquities (Guwu Chenlie Suo), the precursor of the Gugong Palace Museum that displayed imperial treasures for public viewing in the southern section of the Forbidden City.”78 He was also the leader of the Chinese Painting Research Society (CPRS, Zhongguo huaxue yanjiu hui 中國畫學研究會) and participated in planning and organizing the first four Sino-Japanese painting exhibitions.

Jin Cheng had reputedly shown a gift and passion for art at a very early age, as is depicted in a somewhat stereotypical biographical sketch, “Jin Gongbei xiansheng shilüe” 金拱北先生事略, written by Chen Baochen 陳寶琛 (1848–1935), a Qing scholar-official:

Born incredibly intelligent, [Jin] was fascinated by Chinese painting when he was very young. He practiced painting in his spare time, which shows a great distinctiveness from ordinary people. At times, he copied the scrolls or albums of ancient artists that were borrowed from the local gentry who owned rich collections of art and his copies even felt like the real ones. Not following any teacher to learn how to paint, his brushwork carried the quality and spirit that greatly resemble the paintings of the ancient masters. He was good at all kinds of paintings including landscape painting and bird-and-flower painting, in addition to which, he also practiced calligraphy and seal carving as well as studied classical Chinese literature.

He was said to have buried himself in art no matter how busy he was in his studies or work. Jin Cheng travelled to London in 1900 to study law, during which time, despite his heavy coursework, he still spent a great deal of time practicing painting and visiting art museums. When he served as an official in Beijing after returning to China, Jin Cheng managed to access a great many works of art by ancient masters in the collections of the local gentry, conducted art research, and became increasingly well known as a specialist in ancient Chinese art.

In 1920 the CPRS was formed with Jin Cheng as its director, according to a report in the newspaper Shenbao. Although “there have been conflicting theories concerning the leadership of the CPRS,” as Aida Yuen Wong stated in her book, there is no doubt that Jin Cheng played a crucial role as a leader of this organization. The CPRS, consisting of Chinese painters, stated its mission as “careful research on ancient methods and broad acquisition of new knowledge” (jingyan gufa bocai xinzhi 精研古法 博采新知).

---
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and “became the largest art society in early-twentieth-century Beijing.” It sponsored four Sino-Japanese painting exhibitions between 1921 and 1926. The first Sino-Japanese joint exhibition began with an idea proposed by a Japanese artist, Watanabe Shimpo (1867–1938), who suggested that Chinese works of art be shown in Japan. Watanabe came in contact with Yan Shiqing (1873–1929), a famous art collector in Beijing in the early twentieth century, who later introduced him to Jin Cheng. With the aim of enhancing the connection between Chinese and Japanese art, the first Sino-Japanese joint exhibition opened in 1921 in Beijing. One year later, the second joint exhibition was conducted in Tokyo with “the added sponsorship of the Sino-Japanese Business Association (Nikka Jitsugyō Kyōkai 日華実業協会)”. The third one took place in 1924 in both Beijing and Shanghai, and the fourth one in 1926 in both Tokyo and Osaka. The exhaustion due to the fourth exhibition and the long journey may have been the cause of Jin Cheng’s death almost immediately following his return from Japan. The Hu Society (Hushe 湖社), a splinter group of the CPRS, was established
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later in the same year in memory of Jin Cheng by his sons and pupils in Beijing, and was named by choosing the character hu 湖 from one of Jin Cheng’s alternative names Ouhu.

Based on Jin Cheng’s deep enthusiasm for ancient Chinese art over his entire life and his high reputation for art connoisseurship, his opinion that it is a Tang sutra as recorded on the title slip (Figure 38) raises the probability that the scroll is authentic. According to the title slip, Jin Cheng collected this sutra scroll in the winter of 1920 (gengshen 庚申). He died six years later, in 1926, after returning from his trip to Japan for the fourth Sino-Japanese joint exhibition. Dr. and Mrs. Wiant lived in China, where he taught music at Yanjing University between 1923 and 1951 except for the period of the Pacific War. This long sojourn in China makes it probable that the sutra scroll was transferred to Dr. and Mrs. Wiant by purchase, or by receiving it as a gift, or from the estate of Jin Cheng, who died only three years after the Wiants moved to Beijing. More research needs to be done to determine whether there is evidence of any connection between Jin Cheng’s family and the Wiant family, or whether instead this transfer was a natural result of their mutual engagement in the networks of Beijing art collecting.
Figure 33. Date and signature on the title slip of *The Diamond Sutra* scroll, detail, handscroll, rolled-up view, height: 10 5/8 in. (27 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 34. Seal on *The Diamond Sutra*, detail. The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiart Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 35. Seal on the back of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail. The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 36. Seal on the frontispiece of The Diamond Sutra scroll, detail. The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiwatch Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 37. Seal on *The Diamond Sutra*, detail. The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiart Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Figure 38. Title slip pasted outside of *The Diamond Sutra* scroll, detail. The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiart Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)
Chapter 4: Conclusion

The *Diamond Sutra* is one of the most significant and influential sutras in the history of Buddhism, and it is inscribed in over 1,000 sutra scrolls among the Dunhuang manuscripts. Any *Diamond Sutra* scroll from Dunhuang would play a crucial role in helping people develop a deeper understanding of the Buddhist practice of sutra copying and the calligraphic style of the Dunhuang manuscripts. Only a small number of Dunhuang manuscripts are collected in the USA, primarily at the Princeton University, the Freer Gallery, UCLA, UCB, and Yale University. This makes the authentication of the sutra scroll from the Wiant Collection even more valuable. This paper examines the sutra scroll by studying the textual content, medium, ground, copying format, calligraphic style, and the collector’s seals in order to approach the answer to the several questions: whether it is an authentic Tang dynasty sutra; if it was transcribed in the Tang capital; and is it possible that it should be added to the body of surviving Dunhuang manuscripts?

Although the sutra is not complete, missing the first panel and the colophon, there are still multiple findings pointing to its early date and high significance. The collector Jin Cheng, who earned a great reputation in authentication, identified it as a Tang sutra. Based on the time frame in which he owned the sutra, beginning no later than the dated title slip of 1920 and his early death in 1926, it is highly possible that Dr. and Mrs. Wiant obtained this sutra through someone with connections to the Jin family, if not with Jin
Cheng himself while they were in China between 1923 and 1951. This gives a possible chronology of the sutra’s modern provenance. The textual content of the sutra scroll—the *Diamond Sutra*—was quite popular among sutra copying around the late seventh century. It follows normative copying format and was transcribed in the typical style of the Tang dynasty standard script. By comparing with other authenticated sutras of various dates, it shows great similarity to those dated the late seventh century. All these features give evidence to its being an early Tang dynasty sutra which was probably copied around the late seventh century. In addition, it is transcribed in high-quality calligraphic style on very good thick sutra paper, and it closely resembles the sutras that were once transcribed in the Tang capital in textual content, layout, paper size, and the calligraphic style. This provides evidence for the possible fact that it may be one of the sutras that were once officially transcribed in the Tang capital. Some of the sutras that were brought to Dunhuang and later stored in the Library Cave were transcribed in the Tang capital during the late seventh century. Although no firm evidence has been found, in the absence of its colophons, it is reasonable to speculate that the Wiant sutra might have also been brought to Dunhuang after being transcribed in the Tang capital and then later hidden in the Library Cave. Similar to most of the Dunhuang manuscripts, its paper is also dyed yellow with *huangbo* solution and it also shares similar points with the several Dunhuang Manuscripts listed previously in this paper. These findings help support the speculation of the Wiant *Diamond Sutra* as being a Dunhuang manuscript.

In conclusion, the Wiant *Diamond Sutra* may be one of the sutras that were transcribed officially in the Tang capital during the late seventh century and it is possible
that it was later brought to and stored in the Library Cave of Dunhuang until it was discovered.
Appendix A: Textual Comparison of the Wiant Sutra and Kumarajiva’s Translation of the Diamond Sutra, Taishō genpan Daizōkyō edition, Sections 5 to 32
Figure 39. Panel 1 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews).

Figure 40. Section 3–6 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishō Genpan Daizōkyō* Vol. 8, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 749.

Figure 41. Section 7–9 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishō Genpan Daizōkyō* Vol. 8, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 749.
Figure 42. Panel 2 of The Diamond Sutra, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiart Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews).

Figure 43. Section 7–9 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the Diamond Sutra from Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 749.

Figure 44. Section 10–11 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the Diamond Sutra from Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 749.
Figure 45. Panel 3 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. \(\times\) 171 1/8 in. (25.5 \(\times\) 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiatt Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews).

Figure 46. Section 12–14 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 750.

Figure 47. Section 14 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 750.
Figure 48. Panel 4 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews).

Figure 49. Section 14 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 750.

Figure 50. Section 15–16 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 750.
Figure 51. Panel 5 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiart Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews).

Figure 52. Section 15–16 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 750.

Figure 53. Section 17 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 751.
Figure 54. Panel 6 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. \( \times \) 171 1/8 in. (25.5 \( \times \) 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews).

Figure 55. Section 17 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 751.

Figure 56. Section 18–19 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 751.
Figure 57. Panel 7 of The Diamond Sutra, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiart Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews).

Figure 58. Section 18–19 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the Diamond Sutra from Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 751.

Figure 59. Section 20–24 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the Diamond Sutra from Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 751.
Figure 60. Panel 8 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiatt Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews).

Figure 61. Section 20–24 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 751.

Figure 63. Panel 9 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiatt Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews).

Figure 64. Section 25–28 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 752.

Figure 65. Section 29–32 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 752.
Figure 66. Panel 9 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews).

Figure 67. Section 32 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 752.
## Appendix B: Eleven Manuscripts Used in Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><em>Daban niepan jing</em></td>
<td>Northern and Southern dynasties</td>
<td>506</td>
<td>British Library, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td><em>Laozi bianhua jing</em></td>
<td>Sui dynasty</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>British Library, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td><em>Diamond Sutra</em></td>
<td>Tang dynasty</td>
<td>672</td>
<td>British Library, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td><em>Diamond Sutra</em></td>
<td>Tang dynasty</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>British Library, London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td><em>Yujia shidi lun</em></td>
<td>Tang dynasty</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>Royal Library, Copenhagen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td><em>Ming zhong ji</em></td>
<td>Tang dynasty</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>British Library, London</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
Table 1. Eleven manuscripts used in comparison to the Wiant *Diamond Sutra*

Table 1 continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure No.</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Dynasty</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Place</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td><em>Hōjū-kyō sutra</em> (法集經)</td>
<td>Nara period</td>
<td>740</td>
<td>Nara National Museum, Nara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td><em>Hōon-kyō sutra</em> (報恩經)</td>
<td>Nara period</td>
<td>752</td>
<td>Nara National Museum, Nara</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td><em>Daihannya haramiita-kyō</em></td>
<td>Nara period</td>
<td></td>
<td>Freer Gallery of Art, Washington DC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td><em>Samyutagama Sutra</em></td>
<td>Northern Song dynasty</td>
<td>Eleventh century</td>
<td>The Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix C: Shared Missing Text in Three *Diamond Sutras*
Figure 68. Section 20–22 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, scroll, 672, ink on paper, 10 in. × 161 3/8 in. (25.5 × 410 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1205273706;recnum=35;index=1)

Figure 69. Section 20–24 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishó Genpan Daizókyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 751.
Figure 70. Section 26–28 of The Diamond Sutra, detail, scroll, 672, ink on paper, 10 in. × 161 3/8 in. (25.5 × 410 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1205273706;recnum=35;index=1)

Figure 71. Section 25–28 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the Diamond Sutra from Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 752.
Figure 72. Section 22 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, scroll, 676, ink on paper, 10 ¼ in. × 174 in. (26 × 442 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1232770106;recnum=513;index=1)

Figure 73. Section 20–24 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 751.
Figure 74. Section 27–28 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, scroll, 676, ink on paper, 10 ¼ in. × 174 in. (26 × 442 cm). The British Library, London (source: IDP http://idp.bl.uk/database/oo_scroll_h.a4d?uid=1232770106;recnum=513;index=1)

Figure 75. Section 25–28 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8*, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 752.
Figure 76. Section 20–23 of *The Diamond Sutra*, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews).

Figure 77. Section 20–24 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the *Diamond Sutra* from *Taishō Genpan Daizōkyō* Vol. 8, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 751.
Figure 78. Section 26–28 of The Diamond Sutra, detail, handscroll, ink on paper, 10 in. × 171 1/8 in. (25.5 × 434.7 cm). The Bliss M. and Mildred A. Wiant Collection of Chinese Art, Wexner Center for the Arts, Columbus (photo by Julia F. Andrews)

Figure 79. Section 25–28 of the text of Kumarajiva’s translation of the Diamond Sutra from Taishô Genpan Daizôkyô Vol. 8, ed. Takakusu, Junjiro and Kaigyoku Watanabe (Taipei: Xinwenfeng chubanshe, 1973), 752.
Appendix D: List of Chinese Characters

a 阿
Asuka 飛鳥

Bai Bin 白濱
Bao’en 報恩
bei 碑
Beijing 北京
Beilou 北樓
bishou 筆受

caoshu 草書
Cao Zongshou 曹宗壽
Chen 陳
Chen Baochen 陳寶琛

da 大
Daban niepan jing 大般涅槃經
Dangxiang 党項
Dunhuang 敦煌
Dunhuang shufa zonglun 敦煌書法綜論
Dunhuang yishu xulu 敦煌藝術續錄
Dunhuangxue 敦煌學
Dunhuangxue shiba jiang 敦煌學十八講

Eastern Han 東漢
Eastern Jin 東晉
Emperor Shomu 聖武天皇

Fang Guangchang 方廣鎬
Five Dynasties 五代
fo 佛
fu 弗
Fu Shen 傅申
Fujieda Akira 藤枝晃

Gansu cang dunhuang wenxian 甘肅藏敦煌文獻
gengshen 庚申
Gengshen dong Jin Cheng cang 庚申冬金城藏
Gongbei 拱北
Gongbo 鞏伯
Gongbo pingsheng zhenshang 鞏伯平生真賞

heng 横
Hetian 和田
Hsüan Hua’s 宣化
hu 湖
Hua Rende 華人德
huangbo 黃檗
Huanxuan 桓玄
Huzhou 湖州

Ikeda On 池田温

Jiang Liangfu 姜亮夫
jielan 界欄
Jin Cheng 金城
“Jin Gongbei xiansheng shilüe” 金拱北先生事略
Jin Shaocheng 金紹城
jingang 金剛
Jingang bore boluomi jing 金剛般若波羅蜜經
jingyan gufa bocai xinzhi 精研古法 博采新知

kaishu 楷書

Laozi bianhua jing 老子變化經
lishu 隸書
Liang Qichao 梁啟超
liuchao xiejing ti 六朝寫經體
“Lun liuchao xiejingtì–jianji lanting lunbian” 論六朝寫經體—兼及蘭亭論辯
luo 羅
Luo Zhenju 羅振玉
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Ming zhong ji 鴨鐘記
Mogaoku nianbiao 莫高窟年表

na 拭
Nara 奈良
neiti 内題
nengduan 能斷
Nikka Jitsugyō Kyōkai 日華実業協会
Northern and Southern dynasties 南北朝
Northern Song 北宋
Northern Wei 北魏

Ouhu 藕湖

pinming 品名

ren 人
Rong Xinjiang 榮新江

Shanghai 上海
Shen Leping 沈樂平
Shenbao 申報
Shi Pingting 施萍婷
Shiruji 施入記
Shilun cangjindong fengbi niandai 試論藏經洞封閉年代
shouti 首題
“Shuo shiliao” 說史料
Sui 隋

Tachibana Zuicho 橘瑞超
Tang 唐
Tang huiyao 唐會要
Tangren xie jingang bore boluomi jing canjuan 唐人寫金剛般若波羅蜜經殘卷
tie 帖
tiji 題記

Wang Xuezhong 王學仲
Wang Yuanlu 王圓箓
Wang Zonghan 汪宗翰
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