

MANUSCRIPTS IN THE SCHØYEN COLLECTION



BUDDHIST MANUSCRIPTS

Volume III

General Editor:
Jens Braarvig

Editorial Committee:
Jens Braarvig, Paul Harrison, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda, Lore Sander

HERMES PUBLISHING · OSLO

2006

CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	xi
GENERAL INTRODUCTION	xiii
CONVENTIONS	xvii
ABBREVIATIONS	xix
I) Sūtra:	
a) Āgama:	
1. A Version of the Śikhālakasūtra/Siṅgālovādasutta, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Klaus Wille	1
2. Maitreyavyākaraṇa, Jens-Uwe Hartmann	7
b) Mahāyāna:	
3. Fragments of the Bodhisattvapiṭakasūtra, Jens Braarvig, Ulrich Pagel	11
4. Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā, Paul Harrison, Shogo Watanabe	89
5. Vajracchedikā Prajñāpāramitā: A New English Translation of the Sanskrit Text Based on Two Manuscripts from Greater Gandhāra, Paul Harrison	133
II) Vinaya:	
6. The Prātimokṣa-Vibhaṅga of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins in Early Western Gupta Script, Seishi Karashima	161
7. More Fragments of Karmavācanā Texts, Jin-il Chung	177
8. A Vinaya Fragment on the Qualifications of a Vinayadhara, Shizuka Sasaki, Nobuyuki Yamagiwa	189
III) Miscellaneous:	
9. A Fragment of a Commentary (?) on a Hitherto Unknown Recension of the Mahā- samājasūtra, Siglinde Dietz, Olle Qvarnström, Peter Skilling	195
10. Fragments of the Avadānaśataka, Mitsuyo Demoto Hahn	207
11. A Fragment of a Play, Jens-Uwe Hartmann	245
12. A Copper Scroll Inscription from the Time of the Alchon Huns, Gudrun Melzer, in collaboration with Lore Sander	251
13. Radiocarbon Dating of Kharoṣṭhī Fragments from the Schøyen and Senior Manuscript Collections, Mark Allon, Richard Salomon, Geraldine Jacobsen, Ugo Zoppi	279
14. On the Metre of the Verses of the Sarvadharmāpravṛttinirdeśa, Asao Iwamatsu	293
BIBLIOGRAPHY	301
PLATES	317
Photographs of the possible place of origin of Buddhist manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection	I–II
Facsimiles	III–XXXVIII

A Version of the Śikhālakasūtra/Siṅgālovādasutta

Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Klaus Wille

The sermon to the layman Śikhālaka—this is his name in the Sanskrit version—or to Sigālaka/Siṅgāla, as he is called in the Pāli sources, ranks among the best-known discourses of the Buddha, since it is famous for containing all the fundamentals of the ethics of a Buddhist lay person. Consequently, every school we know of incorporated a version of this discourse in their collection of canonical scriptures. The Theravādins and, presumably, the Dharmaguptakas included it in their versions of the Collection of Long Sūtras (*Dīghanikāya/Dirghāgama*), while the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins assigned it to the Discourses of Intermediate Length (*Madhyamāgama*). Only the Theravāda version has been entirely preserved in its original language, Pāli, while a number of fragments of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda version in Sanskrit were known from Central Asia. Now, with the appearance of the Indian fragments from Afghanistan, a third Indian version has come to light. Its language differs distinctively from the other two versions in that it still preserves a fairly large amount of Prakritic words and forms in an otherwise Sanskritized text. This specific mixture is so typical of many fragments of canonical texts among the manuscripts from Afghanistan that one feels tempted to consider it as the standard “church language” of the school which produced them, be it the Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravādins or any other of the schools that once were present in the region of Gandhāra.¹

Regrettably, so far only two fragments of the text have been identified in the Schøyen Collection. They belong to the same leaf and can be joined. The material is palm leaf; the script is close to Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I, probably dating to the 5th century.² The left part of the folio is missing, and therefore no folio number is available which could tell us if the manuscript contained only the present sūtra or belonged to a larger collection. The folio preserves part of the account of the six places, or rather ways, in which one decreases one’s substance (*ṣaḍ bhogānām apāyasthānāni* according to *Mahāvvyutpatti* 2504; cf. SHT IV 412 fragment 23v5 [p. 50]). Although similar in contents, the particular order of the six differs from version to version as the following table illustrates. Surprising are the different orders of the Chinese *Madhyamāgama*, the Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia (SHT 412) and the *Mahāvvyutpatti*, since all three are supposed to belong to the same version, i.e., that of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins.

¹ Cf. the remarks on the school affiliation of the *Cāṅḡīsūtra* in BMSC II, p. 2.

² Cf. Sander 2000: 291–295; the script corresponds to the Gupta alphabet i (cf. Sander 1968).

Schøyen fragment	DN	C-DĀ	C-MĀ	Skt.-MĀ= SHT IV 412	Mvy	T. 17
1. surā°	1	1	3	?	1	1
2. vikāla°	2	3	2	?	3	2
3. pāpamitra°	5	5	4	5	4	5
4. (dyūta)°	4	2	1	3	2	3
5. mahāsamāj(a)°	3	4	5	4	5	4
6. ālasya°	6	6	6	6	6	6

Not only their order, but also the terms themselves differ in the various versions, as far as the original Indian words are preserved or are capable of being reconstructed.

1. MS *surā-m(ai)r(e)ya-madyapāna-pramāda-sthānānuyoga* : DN *surā-meraya-majja-pamāda-tṭhānānuyoga* : Mvy *madyapānam*;
2. MS *vikālaveśi*/// : DN *vikāla-visikhā-cariyānuyoga* : Mvy *vikālacaryā*;
3. MS *pāpamitrajanasamsevā* : DN *pāpamittānuyoga* : Mvy *pāpamitrātā*;
4. MS *(dyūta)*³ : DN *jūtappamādatṭhānānuyoga* : Mvy *dyūtam*;
5. MS *mahāsamāj(a-)*⁴ : DN *samajjābhicarāṇa* : Mvy *samājadarśanam* : SHT 412 (24) r4 *mahāsamājadarśana*;
6. MS *ālasyakosīdya* : DN *ālassānuyoga* : Mvy *ālasyam* : SHT 412 (24) v6 *ālasyakausīdya*.

Naturally, the wording of each section differs from version to version. Although the Pāli text is mostly in close agreement with the Schøyen fragment and helps considerably in its reading and understanding, at least once it differs to such an extent that it is difficult even to assign the relevant line of the Schøyen fragment to a specific section (see line r5, probably belonging to section 4). There is another formal similarity which appears to link the Pāli and the text preserved in the Schøyen fragment more closely: the statement that when one follows the six ways of decreasing one's substance, new riches will not be generated and the existing ones will be diminished, is repeated in SHT, C-DĀ (T. 1), C-MĀ (T. 26) and T. 17 at the end of each section, while in the Pāli and in the Schøyen fragment the full repetition of the formula occurs only once, after the sixth section. However, *tasya evaṃ ratikr[d]yānuyoga*/// in line verso 1 appears to point to a repetition at least here, and possibly in verso 3, too, but if so, it must have been abbreviated.

In the fragment, the Buddha never addresses his interlocutor by his personal name, but always with the title “son of a householder” (*grhapatiputra*). The word *grhapatiputra*, appearing altogether seven times, is consistently spelled *grhapatiputrā* (once *grahapatiputrā*, in r2). This is evidently an example of the so-called Pluti, the use of which in the vocative is familiar in Middle Indian.⁵ Although no personal name occurs in the fragment, this particular group of six ways, and especially the summarizing verses at the end, appear to be rather characteristic of the discourse to Śikhālaka/Sigālaka,⁶ and there can hardly be any doubt that the fragment belongs to this sūtra. However, without any further indication in the fragment, the specific form of the name of the main figure, if it is Śikhālaka/Sigālaka/Siṅgāla, is open to conjecture, and therefore we have refrained from voicing an opinion and simply retain the combination of the Sanskrit and Pāli forms.

³ The term is not preserved.

⁴ Only the beginning of the term is preserved.

⁵ Hinüber 2001: § 311.

⁶ For a similar group of four *apāyamukha* (*itthidhutta*, *surādhutta*, *akkhadhutta* and *pāpamitta*) cf. AN IV 283.13–24 (= IV 287.20–288.17); the first three terms occur also in Sn 106.

Survey of the existing versions

1. Theravāda

Sīngālovāda-suttanta, no. 31 of the *Dīghanikāya* (DN III 180–193 ~ DN(ChS) III 146–157) in Pāli;

2. (presumably) Dharmaguptaka

Shansheng jing, no. 16 of the *Dīrghāgama* in Chinese translation (T. 1, 70a19–72c7);

3. (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda

3.1. Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia, most likely belonging to mss. of the *Madhyamāgama*:

SHT IV 412, fragments 22–31 (pp. 47–64)⁷

SHT VI 1244 (pp. 44f.)

SHT VIII 1914 (pp. 96f.) + X 3354 (forthcoming), same ms. as SHT 4195

SHT X 4195, same ms. as SHT VIII 1914 (cf. SHT IV 412, fragment 30)

SHT 4589 (not yet edited), from the beginning of the sūtra;

3.2. one folio of a Sanskrit manuscript apparently of the *Madhyamāgama* containing the final part of the *Śikhālakasūtra* and the beginning of the *Apramādasūtra*, preserved among the so-called Bendall Manuscripts in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu, cf. Matsuda 1990 and 1996;3.3. *Shansheng jing*, no. 135 of the *Madhyamāgama* in Chinese translation (T. 26, 639c6–642a21);

4. Mahāsāṅghika-Lokottaravāda?

two fragments of a folio from Afghanistan (see below);

5. Single translations of unknown school affiliation

5.1. *Shijialuo yue liu fang li jing* (T. 16, 250c14–252b1), allegedly translated by An Shigao;⁸5.2. *Shanshengzi jing* (T. 17, 252b9–255a7), translated by Shi Fadu.

6. Quotation

in the *Mahākarmavibhaṅga*, as *Śithālakasūtra* (most probably a scribal error for *Śikhālaka*, cf. Kudo 2003: 40, note 2, and 2004: 108 together with note 27 on p. 253). For a possible second and third quotation cf. Kudo 2003: 54 with note 7 and 2004: 118 with note 35 on p. 260.

*Transliteration***MS 2379/45 + 2376/36⁹; recto**

1 /// hapatiputrā ādīnavā sur[ā]m. r. yamadyapānapramādasthānānuyog[o] v[e]dayitavyaṃ
katame ṣaṭ* .. ++ ...

2 /// dorbalyīkaraṇaṃ ime grahapatiputrā ṣaṭ* ādīnavam || ṣa kho pun ime gr̥hapatiputrā ādī-
navā vikāl[aveśi]

3 /// aguptaṃ arakṣitaṃ svāpateyaṃ se bhoti a[gu]ptaṃ arakṣitaṃ śaṃki atmānaṃ karoti
abhūtā se vacanapathā rohaṃti

4 /// [||] ṣa kho pun ime gr̥hapatiputrā ādīnavā [pā]pamitrajanasaṃsevāye vedayitavyaṃ katame

⁷ The folio represented by fragment 24 can hardly follow immediately after fragment 23, as claimed in note 3; the manuscript must have contained another folio in between.

⁸ This ascription is doubtful (and not accepted by Erik Zürcher), as Paul Harrison informs us, since the gāthās are translated as verses. However, on the basis of the vocabulary an early translation remains a possibility.

⁹ MS 2376/36 was first transliterated by Gudrun Melzer and then identified by her as belonging to the same folio as 2379/45.

ṣaṭ* asaṃto na

- 5 /// dgachati sahadgatasya vā pariṣagatasya vā jñātikulamadhyagatamsya vā rājakulamadhya-
gatasya vā vacanā<<[ni]>> [kkra]
6 /// .. hapatiputrā [ā]dīnavā mahāsamā[j].¹⁰

verso

- 1 /// + gītaṃ kahi vādi[t]aṃ kahi kumbhaṃtuṇā kahi pāṇisvarā kahi śobhikānagarāṇi tasya
evaṃ ratikr[ḍ]yānuyoga
2 /// .. kho pun ime gr̥hapatiputrā ādīnavā ālasyakosidye vedayitavyaṃ katame ṣaṭ* iha gr̥hapa
3 /// [t]i atiuṣṇaṃ ti {{.. .. }} karmaṃ na karoti bubhūkṣito smīti karmaṃ na karoti atyāśito
ti karmaṃ na karoti tasye
4 /// + pratyavekṣitā kṣipram evaṃ bhogā kṣayavya[ya]ṃtaṃ gachati ime gr̥hapatiputrā ṣa
ādīnavā alasyakosi
5 /// .[i]vā ca svapnaṃ paricāryaṃ kāle pāpāni mitrāṇi kadaryatā caṃ ete pi sthānā puruṣa
dhvasaṃyaṃti + + +

Reconstruction

1. (ṣa kho pun' ime gr̥)(r1)hapatiputrā ādīnavā surām(ai)r(e)yamadyapānapramādasthānānuyoga^a
vedayitavyaṃ. katame ṣaṭ? (r2 ...) dorbalyīkaraṇaṃ. ime grahapatiputrā ṣaṭ ādīnavam^b <surāmaireya-
madyapānapramādasthānānuyoge>^c ||

^a Read °yoge.

^b Change ādīnavam to ādīnavā?

^c surāmaireyamadyapānapramādasthānānuyoge is added in accordance with the wording in no. 6 below.

Cf. DN 182.28–183.2 (DN(ChS) 148.9–13): 8. Cha kho 'me gahapati-putta ādīnavā surā-meraya-majja-
pamāda-tṭhānānuyoge: sandiṭṭhikā dhanāñjāni,¹¹ kalaha-ppavaḍḍhani, rogānaṃ āyatanaṃ, akitti-sañjanāni,
kopīna-niddamsāni, paññāya dubbali-karaṇi¹² tv eva chaṭṭhaṃ padaṃ bhavati. Ime kho gahapati-putta cha
ādīnavā surā-meraya-majja-pamāda-tṭhānānuyoge.¹³

2. ṣa kho pun' ime gr̥hapatiputrā ādīnavā vikālaveśi^a (r3 ...) aguptaṃ arakṣitaṃ, svāpateyaṃ se
bhoti aguptaṃ arakṣitaṃ, śaṃki atmānaṃ karoti, abhūtā se vacanapathā rohaṃti ///

^a It is difficult to reconstruct *veśi*///; it does not point in the direction of Pāli *visikhā*, “street”, but rather
Skt. *veśyā*, “harlot, courtesan”.

Cf. DN 183.4–9 (DN(ChS) 148.15–19): 9. Cha kho 'me gahapati-putta ādīnavā vikāla-visikhā-cariyānuyoge.
attā pi 'ssa agutto arakkhito hoti, putta-dāro pi 'ssa agutto arakkhito hoti, sāpateyyam¹⁴ pi 'ssa aguttaṃ
arakkhitaṃ hoti, saṃkiyo¹⁵ ca hoti pāpakesu ṭhānesu, abhūtaṃ vacanaṃ ca tasmim rūhati, bahunnaṃ¹⁶ ca
dukkha-dhammaṃ purakkhato hoti.

¹⁰ The rest of the line is empty; either the scribe felt the remaining space to be insufficient or this is an insertion.

¹¹ DN(ChS) *dhanāñjāni*.

¹² DN(ChS) *dubbali-karaṇi*.

¹³ DN °yogo.

¹⁴ DN(ChS) *sāpateyyam*.

¹⁵ DN(ChS) *saṃkiyo*.

¹⁶ DN(ChS) *bahūnaṃ*.

3. (r4 ...) || ṣa kho pun' ime gr̥hapatiputrā ādinavā pāpamitrajanasamsevāye^a vedayitavyam. katame ṣaṭ? asaṃto na ///

^a °samsevāye loc.sg.; rare in Pāli, contamination of (f.) -āya(m) and (m.) -e; cf. Oberlies 2003: 187; cf. also BHSG § 9.41 (all examples from Mv).

Cf. DN 183.23–25 (DN(ChS) 149.9–11): 12. Cha kho 'me gahapati-putta ādinavā pāpa-mittānuyoge: ye dhuttā, ye soṇḍā, ye pipāsā, ye nekatikā, ye vañcanikā, ye sāhasikā, tyāssa mittā honti, te sahāyā.

4. (r5 ...) dgachati sahadgatasya vā pariṣagatasya vā jñātikulamadhyagata{ṃ}sya vā rājakulamadhyagatasya vā vacanāni kkra(ma) ///

This line must preserve part of the section corresponding to *dyūta*, or *jūta* in Pāli, but here the overall correspondence between the wording of the Pāli and that of the Schøyen fragments becomes very loose. Apparently there is only one point of contact, and that is the word *sahadgatasya* which is likely to correspond to *sabhāgatassa*; for the development *sabhāmgata* > *sahāmgata* > *sahamgata* > *sahadgata* cf. *sabhāpati* (Przyluski 1924 and Bongard-Levin *et alii* 1996: 98, note 26). If so, ///dgachati should correspond to Pāli *rūhati* and is possibly to be restored to (u)dgachati or (samud)gachati. For °gachati here and in v4 cf. the same phenomenon in a Central Asian manuscript: SHT I 399 fol. 196v1 *ichamti* (MPS-S 31.10); fol. 200r4 *ichāma* (MPS-S 31.19); fol. 201v1 *ichatha* (MPS-S 31.26); 204v3 *ichasi* (MPS-S 31.59).

The reading of *kkra* at the end of the line is somewhat uncertain, and below *nākr̥ra* there seem to be traces of the akṣara *ni*. However, we do not really understand *vacanāni kra(ma)///*, and therefore a reconstruction appears impossible.

Cf. DN 183.16–21 (DN(ChS) 149.2–6): 11. Cha kho 'me gahapati-putta ādinavā jūtappamāda-tṭhānānuyoge: jayam veram pasavati, jino vittam¹⁷ anusocati, sanditṭhikā dhanāñjāni,¹⁸ sabhā-gatassa vacanam na rūhati, mittāmaccānam paribhūto hoti, āvāha-vivāhakānam apatthito hoti, akkha-dhutto purisa-puggalo¹⁹ nālam dārā-bharaṇāyāti.²⁰

The Turfan fragment SHT 412 (24) r1 possibly also belongs here: /// m parā + + .. maddhyagatasya ca yukta .r. ///

5. (r6 ... ṣa kho pun' ime gr̥)hapatiputrā ādinavā mahāsamāj(a) (v1 ... kahi) gītaṃ, kahi vāditam, kahi kumbhamtuṇā, kahi pāṇisvarā^a, kahi śobhikānagarāṇi^b, tasya evam ratikṛḍyānuyoga(m^c anuyuktasya?) ///

^a For *kumbhatuṇa* and *pāṇisvara* cf. BHSD s.vv. *kumbhatuṇa* and *pāṇisvara*; cf. also SBV II 235.17–18 and Abhidh-k-vy 420.30–421.1 *pāṇisvare kumbhatuṇīre*.

^b For the difficult *śobhikānagarāṇi* cf. Lüders 1940: 423 ff. and BHSD s.v. *śobhika*; the situation is additionally complicated by the fact that the word (or its equivalent) appears to have been transferred from a list of sounds and other amusements into a closely related list of fights, military operations and similar diversions, cf. DN I 6.11–13 and 65.12–15: *naccam gītam vāditam pekkham akkhānam pāṇissaram vetālam kumbha-thūnam Sobha-nagarakam caṇḍālam vaṇsam dhopanam* (immediately followed by *hatthiyuddham* and the list of fights etc.), but SBV II 235.9–10 *dārikayuddhe, aṭṭālavamṣe, śobhitanagare, utsantikāyām, dhvajāgre, balagre, vyūdhe senikādarśane* (followed in the next paragraph by the list of sounds etc.). In the Pāli both lists are united under the rubric of *visūkadassanam* (first *sadda*, then *yuddha*), while in SBV II they are divided into *vividhadarśanasamārambhānuyogam* (i.e., *yuddha*) and *vividhasabdaśravaṇasamārambhānuyogam* (*śabda*). In SBV II the term *śobhitanagara* appears within the list of *yuddhas* in both the Skt. text and the Tibetan translation (translated as *bro gar gyi tshogs*, cf. *Samghabhedavastu*, Q 1030, vol. 42, p. 128.3.2 = bka' 'gyur 'dul ba, vol. Ce, fol. 250b2; TibT 1, vol. 1, p. 342.544.2 = vol. ṅa, fol. 272b2; *Bhaiṣajyavastu*: Q 1030, vol. 41, p. 146.5.2 = bka' 'gyur 'dul ba, vol. ge, fol. 66b2; TibT 1, vol. 1, p. 110.142.1 = vol. kha, fol. 71b1). The quotation of the same two lists in the *Abhidharmakośavyākhyā* (Abhidh-k-vy 420.18–421.4), apparently drawn from the *Tridaṇḍisūtra* of the *Dīrghāgama*, does not contain the word. The *Tridaṇḍisūtra*, however, has it (*śobhanagarake* on fol. 363r3

¹⁷ DN *cittam*, DN(ChS) *vittam*; *vittam* was already suggested by T.W. Rhys Davids, cf. *Dialogues of the Buddha*, London 1921 (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, 4), vol. 3, p. 175, note 4. Cf. also SN I 123.2.

¹⁸ DN(ChS) *dhanajāni*.

¹⁹ DN(ChS) *ayam purisapuggalo*.

²⁰ DN(ChS) *dāra-*.

[information received from K. Matsuda], and the *Lohityasūtra* I, too (*śobhitanagare* on fol. 373v3).
^c *ratikṛdyānuyoga* for *ratikṛdā*°?

Cf. DN 183.11–14 (DN(ChS) 149.22–24): 10. Cha kho ’me gahapati-putta ādinavā samajjābhicarane:
 “Kuvaṃ²¹ naccaṃ, kuvaṃ²¹ gītaṃ, kuvaṃ²¹ vāditāṃ, kuvaṃ²¹ akkhānaṃ, kuvaṃ²¹ pānissaraṃ, kuvaṃ²¹
 kumbhathūnaṃ²² ti?”

6. (v2 ... ṣa) kho pun’ ime gr̥hapatiputrā ādinavā ālasyakosidye vedayitavyaṃ. katame ṣaṭ? iha
 gr̥hapa(tiputrā) (v3 ...) ti atiuṣṇaṃ ti karmaṃ na karoti, bubhūksito^a ’smīti karmaṃ na karoti,
 atyāśīto ti karmaṃ na karoti; tasye(vam ālasyakosidyānuyogam anuyuktasya?) (v4 ...) pratyavekṣitā
 kṣīpram evaṃ bhogā kṣayavyayaṃtāṃ^b gacha<ṃ>ti^c. ime gr̥hapatiputrā ṣa ādinavā alasyakosi(dye)
 ///

^a Read *bubhuksito*, but cf. SHT VIII 1914+3354 r3(below).

^b *kṣayavyayaṃtāṃ* probably stands either for *kṣayavyayāntāṃ* or for °*vyayatāṃ*.

^c For the spelling *gachati* cf. also line recto 5.

Cf. DN 184.3–10 (DN(ChS) 149.14–19): 13. Cha kho ’me gahapati-putta ādinavā ālassānuyoge.²³ “Ati-sītan
 ti” kammaṃ na karoti, “Ati-uṇhan ti” kammaṃ na karoti, “Ati-sāyan ti” kammaṃ na karoti, “Ati-pāto ti”
 kammaṃ na karoti, “Ati-chāto ’smīti” kammaṃ na karoti, “Ati-dhāto ’smīti” kammaṃ na karoti. Tassa
 evaṃ kiccāpadesa-bahulassa viharato anuppannā c’ eva bhogā n’ uppajjanti, uppannā ca bhogā parikkhayaṃ
 gacchanti.

Cf. also the Turfan fragments SHT IV 412 (24) v4: /// + (ṣa)[d] ime gr̥hapatiputra ādinavā āla(sya) ///
 and v5: /// + a[ti]sāyaṃ karma na karoti | atyuṣṇe [ka](rma na karoti) ///; SHT VIII 1914+3354 r2: ///
 (vedi)tavyāḥ katame ṣaṭ* ati + + [k](a)rma na [karoti] a(t)[i] /// and r3: /// [a]tyāśītaḥ karma na karoti ·
 a[ti](bubh)[ū]kṣitaḥ karma [n](a) + ///.

(v5 ... d)ivā ca svapnaṃ paricāryaṃ kāle^a
 pāpāni mitrāṇi kadaryatā ca {ṃ}
 ete pi sthānā puruṣa dhvaṃsaṃti^b

^a *kāle* appears opposed to Pāli *akāle*, but apparently must be understood along the same lines: read
paricāryākāle?

^b Read *dhvaṃsayanti*, cf. Pāli *dhamsayanti*.

This is also the first verse in T. 17.

Cf. DN 184.27ff. (DN(ChS) 150.9–12):

Akkh-itthiyo vāruṇi nacca-gītaṃ
 divā-sappaṃ²⁴ pāricariyā akāle,²⁵
 Pāpā ca mittā su-kadariyatā ca,
 ete cha ṭhānā purisaṃ dhvaṃsayanti.

Cf. also SHT VIII 1914+3354 v3 /// + + [da]ryatā ca sthānāny etāni (puru)[s](am) dhvaṃsa[ya]nti · 3 ..
 /// and v4: /// [sthā]nāny [e]tāni puruṣaṃ ..m + + + 4 saṃsa + + + ///.

²¹ DN(ChS) *Kva*.

²² DN(ChS) *kumbhathunan*.

²³ DN(ChS) *ālasānuyoge*.

²⁴ DN(ChS) *divāsoppam*.

²⁵ DN *akālaṃ* (v.l. *akāle*).