

創価大学
国際仏教学高等研究所
年報

平成15年度
(第7号)

Annual Report
of
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
at Soka University
for the Academic Year 2003

Corrigenda and addenda to Peter Skilling, “Random Jottings on Śrīghana: An Epithet of the Buddha”

Corrigenda

- n. 38. The inscriptions are published in Surya Mani Adhikary, *The Khasa Kingdom: A Trans-Himalayan Empire of the Middle Age*, New Delhi: Nirala, [1988] Revised paperback edition, 1997, Appendix B-22, B-26, B-33.
- n. 44. Change “leave use” to “leave us”.

Addendum

The term “Śrīghana” is used in the Sanskrit verse of Sri Lanka: see Heinz Bechert, *Sanskrittexte aus Ceylon*, Munich: Kitzinger, 1962:

- p. 23. The work entitled *Nāmāṣṭasatakaya*, line 2a.
- p. 25. The work entitled *Navaratnaya* opens with *namaḥ śrīghanāya*.
- p. 41. The first verse of the work entitled *Vṛttamālākhyāva* begins *śrīghanakamalajam amalam*.

8 March 2004

Nandapuri

Corrigenda to Tilmann Vetter and Stefano Zacchetti, “On *Jingfa* 經法 In Early Chinese Buddhist Translations”

- p. 164, n. 26 (line 4) for “as: 可作為標準的書” read: “is explained as: 可作為標準的書”.
- p. 164, n. 27 (line 1-2): for “see n. 2 above” read “see n. 24 above”.

Corrigenda to Jan Nattier, “The Twelve Divisions of Scriptures (十二部經) in the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations”

p. 168, n. 5 (line 11), p. 170 (line 14), and p. 189 (line 9 from bottom): for “Mahānikāya” read “Mahāvihāra”.

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報
平成15年度（第7号）



Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology
(ARIAB)
at Soka University for the Academic Year 2003
Vol. VII

目 次 CONTENTS

● 研究報告 RESERACH ARTICLES:

Akira YUYAMA:

The *Golden Light* in Central Asia — To the Memory of Ronald Eric Emmerick (1937-2001) 3

Seishi KARASHIMA:

A Trilingual Edition of the Lotus Sutra — New editions of the Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese
versions (2) 33

Seishi KARASHIMA:

Sanskrit Fragments of the *Kāśyapaparivarta* and the *Pañcapāramitānirdeśa* in the Mannerheim
Collection 105

Jens-Uwe HARTMANN:

Contents and Structure of the *Dīrghāgama* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins 119

Klaus WILLE:

Some Recently Identified *Saddharmapuṇḍarikasūtra* Fragments in the British Library (London) 139

Peter SKILLING:

Random Jottings on Śrīghana: An Epithet of the Buddha 147

Tilmann VETTER and Stefano ZACCHETTI:

On *Jingfa* 經法 in Early Chinese Buddhist Translations 159

Jan NATTIER:

The Twelve Divisions of Scriptures (十二部經) in the Earliest Chinese Buddhist Translations 167

Stefano ZACCHETTI:

Teaching Buddhism in Han China: A Study of the *Ahan koujie shi'er yinyuan jing*
T 1508 Attributed to An Shigao 197

Noriyuki KUDO:

Karmavibhaṅga 第61節の付加部分の検討—正量部所屬説有力資料とされる一節 225
[On the Interpolation in *Karmavibhaṅga* § 61 as positive evidence for the school affiliation of
the KV]

Akira YUYAMA:

Miscellanea Bibliographica Buddhica (II) 255

● 国際仏教学高等研究所彙報 IRIAB BULLETIN:

活動報告 IRIAB Activities 281
所長・所員の著作 List of Publications of the IRIAB Director and Fellows 285
受贈受入書籍 Books/Journals Received 288

● EDITORIALS:

執筆者紹介 Contributors to this Issue 295
編集後記 Editorial Postscript 295
新刊・既刊案内 New Publications/Back Issues [BPPB]

Contents and Structure of the *Ārghāgama* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins¹

Jens-Uwe HARTMANN



Due to the political turmoil in Afghanistan, in recent years a tremendous amount of Buddhist manuscripts in Indian languages has found its way from the area of Greater Gandhāra to the Western rare book market. Regrettably, the overwhelming majority of these manuscripts consist only of fragments, and in no case do we know their exact find spot or what their original depository — (cave) monastery, stūpa, etc. — was. Nonetheless these manuscripts are of prime importance for our knowledge of Indian Buddhist literature, since most of them contain texts which were previously unknown or preserved only in Chinese or Tibetan translations. Both Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī, the two scripts used side by side for several centuries in that part of the Indian Buddhist world, are represented, and if Richard Salomon's tentative dating to the first half of the first century CE proves correct, some of the birch-bark scrolls written in Kharoṣṭhī now hold the honour of being the oldest Buddhist, and at the same time the oldest Indian, manuscripts known so far. The Brāhmī manuscripts are somewhat younger; the oldest of them — palm-leaf fragments written in Kuṣāṇa Brāhmī — probably go back to the 2nd and 3rd centuries, while the youngest date to the 8th, the time when Buddhism finally began to disappear from the area.

Foremost among the finds written in Brāhmī script is a manuscript first glimpsed in the last years of the nineties when bundles of it, each consisting of 55 to 70 folios, began to reach the Western market. In 1999 a Japanese scholar published a photograph which had been made available to him by a manuscript dealer,² and the suspicion that all these bundles belonged to a manuscript containing a Sanskrit version of the *Ārghāgama*, the “Collection of Long (Discourses of the Buddha)”, was confirmed when the last folio became available for scholarly inspection. It contained a brief colophon, its last sentence stating *samāptaś ca ārghāgamaḥ*, “and finished is the Long Collection”. At present, approximately 55% of the

¹ Thanks are due to the owners of the manuscript for providing excellent reproductions and for permission to study the manuscript. Moreover, I am grateful to various colleagues, notably Lance Cousins, Paul Harrison (who also took care of my English) and Klaus Wille, for useful information and suggestions. Several times I had a chance to present parts of this paper, and I wish to thank all those who participated in the ensuing discussions. The last presentation took place during my stay in Hachioji in the autumn of 2003, and I am happy to take this opportunity to thank my hosts and colleagues there for a splendid period of research, scholarly exchange and, last but by no means least, fun.

² SADAKATA 1999.

manuscript is known to have made its way into three private collections, one in Japan, one in Norway and the other in the U.S.A.; the whereabouts of the remaining parts are still a matter of speculation. All three private collectors were willing to oblige scholarly interests and very kindly provided the photographs successively put at our disposal. Based on them it became possible to study the structure of this version of the “Long Collection” and to form an idea of its contents. On two occasions preliminary results of these studies have been published, each describing the contents of a specific section.³

Although some parts of the manuscript are still unavailable, and others are most probably lost forever,⁴ it is now possible to reconstruct the original structure of the collection with such a high degree of probability as to come close to certainty. In the following pages first a survey of all the sūtras contained in the *Dirghāgama* will be given, and then, second, a specimen edition of a section of one of those sūtras.

1. The structure of the *Dirghāgama* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins

The manuscript contains a number of *uddānas*, i.e., lists of key words, some of them verse-like and some in prose, which summarize the text titles of the preceding or following section of sūtras. Altogether six *uddānas* are preserved in the available parts of the manuscript. They represent four different lists, since two of them are duplicated. For the existing parts of the manuscript, the particulars given in the *uddānas* can be checked against the texts and the folio numbers; for those parts which are not available so far, we must rely only on the *uddānas* for information on the number, sequence and titles of the sūtras to be expected there. In both cases, however, it is possible to compare, and even verify, the data with another source. The information on the structure of the *Dirghāgama* (*DĀ*) obtained from the new manuscript reveals that the Sanskrit *DĀ* transmitted in Central Asia must have been virtually identical, as far as contents and structure are concerned. Large parts of the structure of the latter version had previously been laboriously reconstructed from the Central Asian fragments and from citations and references in Buddhist commentarial literature.⁵ When the new manuscript became accessible, it quickly and pleasantly confirmed the earlier attempts at reconstruction and thereby proved that the manuscript and the Central Asian fragments preserve the same version of the *DĀ*, a version apparently circulated among monks and nuns who observed the Sarvāstivāda or Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya regulations.

So far, three different versions of the “Long Collection” are known. The only complete one in an Indian language is the *Dīghanikāya* (*DN*) in Pāli of the Theravāda tradition. A second, also complete version is preserved in Chinese translation (T 1); it belongs to the school of the Dharmaguptakas. Like the *Dīghanikāya* and the *Dirghāgama* in Chinese translation, the *Dirghāgama* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins is tripartite. Two of its three

³ HARTMANN 2000 and 2002.

⁴ Since fragments of the first 70 folios are already extant in the American and the Norwegian collections, it appears unlikely that still more of it could surface in the future.

⁵ HARTMANN 1992.

sections, however, are fundamentally different from those of the *Dīghanikāya* and T 1, and it is impossible to trace them back to a common principle of arrangement. Only the third, named *Śīlaskandha* in Sanskrit and *Sīlakkhandha* in Pāli, shares not only the name, but also the basic arrangement. Since our knowledge of the *DĀ* is largely based on only one manuscript, it should be noted that the folios preserving the transition from the first section to the second are not available at present. While the identity of the last text of the first section, the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (no. 6 in the table below), is beyond doubt, the first text of the second section has to be deduced. The last preserved folio of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* is 123 or 124 (the folio number is lost), yet it contains text from the beginning of the sūtra (corresponding to section 9 of altogether 51 sections in WALDSCHMIDT's edition of the Central Asian fragments). The first preserved folio number after the gap is 264 of the *Mahāgovindasūtra*. This leaves a very considerable gap of 140 folios, which raises the question whether more texts should be expected here than those which can be inferred from the next preserved *uddāna*. This *uddāna* presupposes seven sūtras (nos. 7-13) before the *Mahāgovindasūtra* and its folio number 264. The *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* begins on folio 111, and a calculation of its probable length based on the size of WALDSCHMIDT's edition yields a folio number somewhere around 170 for its ending. This would leave about 90 folios for the following seven texts. Judging from the very diverse length of those sūtras which are preserved it is not impossible that 90 folios leave enough room for another, still unknown and rather short, section. Yet it is equally possible that the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and the seven texts before the *Mahāgovindasūtra* filled the gap and that this manuscript did not contain more than the 47 sūtras which are found in the list below. At least, there is no indication whatsoever in the Central Asian fragments that further texts should be expected in this version of the *Dirghāgama*.

1.1. The Sections

1.1.1. *Ṣaṣṭsūtrakaniṣṭha*⁶, “Six Sūtra Section”

In the manuscript, this section comprises folios 1 to approximately 170 and contains six texts, as indicated by the title. It has no counterpart in the *Dīghanikāya* or the *Dirghāgama* in Chinese translation. One of the six sūtras, the *Arthavistarasūtra* (no. 2), is unknown in Pāli; another, the *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra* (no. 4), has no correspondence in the Nikāyas, but only in the Vinaya. While the *Mahāśudassanasuttanta* appears as a separate text in the *Dīghanikāya*, in the *DĀ* it is included in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (no. 6).

1.1.2. *Yuganipāta*, “Section of Pairs”⁷

In the manuscript, this section comprises the folios from ca. 170 to 360 verso, line 2, and

⁶ The name is not preserved in the manuscript, but known from a quotation, cf. WALDSCHMIDT 1980: 140 and HARTMANN 1994: 328 with note 10.

⁷ Kazunobu Matsuda kindly informed me that there is also a section entitled *Yuganipāta* (Shuangpin) in the Chinese *Madhyamāgama*, which contains ten sutras (nos. 182 to 191 in 5 pairs), cf. Taishō, vol. 1, pp. 724-740. For its two *uddānas* as quoted in Śamathadeva's *Abhidharmakośa-ṭīkā* cf. the reference in HONJŌ 1984: 66-67, no. 4-75.

contains altogether eighteen texts. It is divided into two sub-sections (*varga*), the first containing ten texts, the second eight. There is no counterpart in the *Dīghanikāya* or the *Dīrghāgama* in Chinese translation. Seven of its sūtras find their Pāli counterparts in various sections of the *Majjhimanikāya* (cf. the table below). The title of one text, *Sarveka* (? No. 8) according to the reading of the *uddāna*, cannot be related to any other parallel version, and since that part of the manuscript is still missing, we do not know the contents of this sūtra. One text, the *Māyājālasūtra* (no. 18), was known so far only from a Tibetan translation⁸ and from some Central Asian Sanskrit fragments (*SHT* IV 33, IV 165, III 883, V 1025); there is no counterpart in Pāli and no Chinese translation of it. The reason for the application of the ordering principle, obviously the arrangement of pairs of sūtras, is not very evident in every case and needs further consideration.

1.1.3. *Śīlaskandhanipāta*, “Section on Ethics”

In the manuscript, this section comprises folios 360 to 454 and contains altogether 23 texts. It is divided into three sub-sections (*varga*), the first containing ten texts, the second seven and the third six. Basically, this section agrees with the *Dīghanikāya* and T 1, although the sequence of the corresponding sūtras is different. In the *Dīghanikāya*, the *Śīlakkhandha* forms the first section and it starts with the *Brahmajālasuttanta*, while in contrast the *Śīlaskandha*, being the last section of the *Dīrghāgama*, ends with the Sanskrit version of that sūtra (no. 47). This is striking, and it is difficult to avoid the impression that the order of sections and texts within them has been reversed intentionally, at least in this regard. Only one of the texts, the *Jīvakasūtra*, has a parallel in the *Majjhimanikāya*, while several others, as, e.g., the *Tridaṇḍi*- (no. 25) and the *Piṅgalātreyasūtra* (no. 26), are not represented in the Pāli canon. Most amazing is a sequence of altogether five rather short texts in the middle sub-section, starting with *Kāraṇavādin* (no. 37) and ending with a duplication apparently called *Anyatama* in the *uddāna* (no. 41). As far as Pāli parallels exist, they are found in the *Majjhima*- and also in the *Anguttaranikāya*. At present it is difficult to understand and to explain how they came to be included in a collection which is, according to its name, defined by the relative length of the texts it comprises.

1.2. The sequence of the sūtras

With the help of folio numbers, as far as they are preserved, and of the *uddānas* the sequence of texts can be established with certainty. Only for the first section, the *Ṣaṭsūtrakanipāta*, is additional help needed since no folio numbers are preserved for the second and third sūtras. Their sequence is derived from the Central Asian recension. In Central Asia, the *Ṣaṭsūtrakanipāta* became especially popular and was also copied separately; therefore this section is by far the best preserved, and the order of the sūtras it contains is well-known.⁹

⁸ For an edition cf. SKILLING 1994: 3-57.

⁹ Cf. HARTMANN 1994.

The *uddānas*

Once a collection of texts becomes fixed, such lists of key words are of utmost importance for its intact preservation, especially during a period of oral transmission. Even after the collection is written down they help in preserving the order and number of texts and are therefore retained. *Uddānas* tend to be in verse which facilitates their memorization, often displaying the metrical licence and the usual liberties with regard to sandhi and word forms which are, at least partly, to be explained by the transformation of texts originally composed in (a) Middle Indic language(s). Therefore it is not clear why the first two of the six *uddānas* available so far are in prose. If the section they refer to was finalized only after the written transmission had already begun, this could explain why the more easily memorized verse form of an *uddāna* had become less important. It could also account for the fact that two different versions of basically the same *uddāna* are found in Central Asia (cf. below). However, in the absence of solid historical information on the genesis of the *Ārghyagāma* this explanation remains highly speculative.

Uddānas are usually expected either at the beginning or at the end of a section, but in the present case they are found sometimes at the beginning, sometimes at the end, and sometimes at both. Again, the reason for this distribution is unknown, and it is difficult to see a pattern in it.

1.2.1. Folio 299v2-3:¹⁰

*apannakaḥ sarveko [bh]ārgavaḥ śalyo [ca] bhaya[bh]ai[ra]vo ro[ma](harṣa)ṇo jina[ya]bhaś
ca [g]ovindaḥ prāsādikāḥ prasādani[ye](na ca paścimam* || pañcatrayaṃ māyājālaḥ
kā)(verso 3)maṭhikaḥ kāyabhāvanā bodhaḥ śaṃkaraś caiva ā ○ (tānā)[t]a mahāsamājena
bhavati paścimaṃ ||*

This *uddāna* is definitely not metrical. It follows after sūtra 15, sūtra 16 being omitted from the manuscript for unknown reasons, but listed in the *uddāna* and partly extant in the manuscripts from Central Asia. Apparently the *uddāna* consists of two parts, the first summarizing the titles of sūtras 7 to 16, the second — beginning in the gap — listing sūtras 17 to 24. The second part is repeated after sūtra 24, with the variation *samājena* for *mahā-samājena*. For a study of this *uddāna* and a comparison with two Central Asian fragments cf. HARTMANN 2000 (at the time of this publication, the folio containing the repetition had not yet come to light).

1.2.2. Folio 358r1-2:

pañcatraya māyājālaḥ kāmāṭhikaḥ kāyabhāvanā bodhaḥ śaṃkaraś caiva ātānātā samājena

¹⁰ Parentheses or round brackets () signify restoration in a gap, square brackets [] damaged akṣaras or uncertain readings, pointed brackets < > an addition without gap, curly brackets { } superfluous akṣaras, double curly brackets {{ }} akṣaras deleted in the manuscript (only in the transliteration), three oblique dashes /// mark the point where the fragment breaks off; a cross + denotes a destroyed akṣara, two dots .. denote an illegible akṣara, one dot denotes an illegible part of an akṣara, the asterisk * denotes the virāma; ○ stands for the punch hole.

paścimam || dīrghāgame yugunipāto dvitīyaḥ ||

This *uddāna* follows after the first part of the *Mahāsamājasūtra*¹¹ (no. 24) and lists the titles of sūtras 17 to 24. It repeats the second half of 1.2.1. Then follows a colophon which concludes the second section.

1.2.3. Folio 360v1-2:

[||] (tridaṇḍī piṅgalātreyo dve ca lohitya)bhāṣite |
kaivarttī atha [ma](ṇḍīśas tac ca bhikṣu)[ṣ]u bhāṣate |
mamālī śroṇatāṇḍaś ca kūṭatāṇḍyena paścimam ||*

Regrettably, this *uddāna* is only preserved in part. It follows after the second part of sūtra 24 and refers to the next ten texts which form the first sub-section of the *Śīlaskandhanipāta*. It is not repeated after the sub-section, but partly at the end of the whole text, cf. below (the second verse in 1.2.6), whence the first two lines are to be restored. According to the second version, *bhāṣite* in the first line has to be corrected to *bhāṣitau*, and *mamālī* in the third is an obvious writing mistake for *mahallī*. For a corresponding Central Asian fragment cf. HARTMANN 2002: 142 (the discussion there is based on the repetition in folio 454, since folio 360 was not yet available at that time) and for its partial quotation in Śamathadeva's *Abhidharmaśāstra-tīkōpāyikā* cf. HARTMANN 2002: 139f.

1.2.4. Folio [4]10r1-2:

abamṣṭhaḥ prṣṭha(pālaś ca kārāṇavādī ca pudgalā)ḥ
śrutaṃ ma[ha]ll[o]¹² (nya)[ta]ma āna[ndo] bhikṣuśāstariḥ ||

Again, the *uddāna* precedes the section it refers to, namely the sūtras 35 to 41. It is possible to restore the text in the gaps with the help of its repetition after the section (cf. next). For a discussion of this list and its various problems cf. HARTMANN 2002: 141f.

1.2.5. Folio 430r8:

[a]ṃ[b]āṣṭha prṣṭhapālaś ca kārāṇavādī ca pudgalāḥ
śruta<ṃ> ma(ha)l[o] nya)tama anando <bhikṣu>śāstāni ||

A duplication of the preceding one, following after the section.

1.2.6. Final folio 454v2-5:

śuka jīvaka rājā ca v<ā>siṣṭhaḥ kāśyapena ca <|>
(bra)hm(a)jā(lena) kṛtvā ca v<a>rgo bhavati samudditaḥ ||
tṛdaṇḍī piṅgalā(treyo) dv(e) ca lohityabhā(ṣ)ī(tau) <|>
k. .e .ī a(tha) maṇḍīśas tac ca bhikṣuṣu bhāṣate ||

¹¹ Interestingly enough, the *uddāna* is placed where the Central Asian version of the *Mahāsamājasūtra* ends. After that, a second part of the *Mahāsamājasūtra* follows, which is also preserved in a Tibetan translation, cf. SKILLING 1994: 444 ff.

¹² A small piece containing the words *śrutaṃ ma[ha]ll[o]* is sticking to the next folio (observation of Gudrun Melzer).

mahallī pr(ṣṭhapālaś ca) v. ko bhavati sa <|>

(vās)ṣṭhaḥ kāśyapaś caiva brahmajālam anopamā ||

The first verse lists the six texts in the last sub-section (*varga*) of the *Śīlaskandhanipāta* (sūtras 42-47). The second verse repeats part of the *uddāna* which summarizes the first sub-section (sūtras 25-31, cf. above, 1.2.3). The third verse is puzzling; the second title can only be reconstructed as *pr(ṣṭhapāla-)*, but this makes little sense, since *Mahallī* (no. 32) and *Prṣṭhapāla* (no. 36) do not immediately follow each other. The next pāda recalls *v<a>rgo bhavati samudditaḥ*, the end of the first verse, “the section is summarized”, but this, too, would make no sense here. Then follow the last three sūtras of the collection (nos. 45-47), listed differently already in the first verse. In other words, the last *uddāna* lists text 9 of the first sub-section, text 2 of the second and texts 4 to 6 of the third. It is difficult to see a reason behind this peculiar selection. For a discussion of the problem cf. also HARTMANN 2002: 142f.

1.3. Table of the sūtras and their parallels

Based on all the sources of information available so far, the following table of contents can be drawn up. It presents the titles in the form in which they are listed in the *uddānas*; the first six titles, marked by an asterisk, are not preserved in the manuscript and are therefore supplied from the Central Asian fragments. If available, the folio numbers are given or, if possible, at least one folio number preserved for the text is added in square brackets. Next, the number of any corresponding text in the Chinese translation of the *Dīrghāgama* (*DĀc*) and in the *Dīghanikāya* (*DN*) or the *Majjhimanikāya* (*MN*) is given, and, for the Pāli, also the title. Variant titles in the Central Asian manuscripts are referred to in the footnotes. Again, attention should be drawn to the fact that the folios between the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-* (no. 6) and the *Mahāgovindasūtra* (no. 14) are not yet available and that it is impossible to know if another, rather brief, section should be expected here (cf. the discussion above in 1). Nonetheless, for ease of reference the sūtras are counted consecutively in the table.

Uddāna title	Folios	DĀc	DN	MN
1. *Daśottara	?-? [6, 7, 11, 14]	10	34: Dasuttara	
2. *Arthavistara	?-?		Ø	
3. *Saṅgīti	?-?	9	33: Saṅgīti	
4. *Catuṣpariṣat	?-88r8 [72 etc.]		Ø	
5. *Mahāvādāna	88r8 ¹³ -(111)	1	14: Mahāpadāna	
6. *Mahāparinirvāṇa	(111)-?	2	16: Mahāparinibbāna	

¹³ Only the beginning of line recto 8 is preserved (apparently with an *antaroddāna* of the *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra*), but verso 1 already contains part of the introductory sentence of the *Mahāvādānasūtra* (identified by Takamichi Fukita).

Uddāna title	Folios	DĀc	DN	MN
...				
7. Apannaka	?-?		Ø	60: Apanṇaka (?) ¹⁴
8. Sarveka (?) ¹⁵	?-?		Ø	
9. Bhārgava	?-?	15	24: Pāṭika	
10. Śālya	?-?		Ø	105: Sunakkhatta
11. Bhayabhairava	?-?		Ø	4: Bhayabherava
12. Roma(harṣa)ṇa	?-?		Ø	12: Mahāsīhanāda
13. Jinayabha ¹⁶	?-?	4	18: Janavasabha	
14. Govinda ¹⁷	?-? (264 etc.)	3	19: Mahāgovinda	
15. Prāsādikah	?-299v2	18	28: Sampasādāniya	
16. [Prasādāniya] ¹⁸ <i>uddāna</i>	- - 299v2-3	17	29: Pāsādika	
17. Pañcatraya	299v3-306r5		Ø	102: Pañcattaya
18. Māyājāla	306r5-?		Ø	
19. Kāmaṭhika	?-329r4		Ø	95: Caṅkī
20. Kāyabhāvanā ¹⁹	329r4-340r2		Ø	36: Mahāsaccaka
21. Bodha	340r2-344v4		Ø	85: Bodhirājakumāra
22. Śaṃkara ²⁰	344v4-348r8		Ø	100: Saṅgarava
23. Āṭānāṭa ²¹	348v1-354r4		32: Āṭānāṭiya	

¹⁴ Cf. IWAMATSU 1990 and HARTMANN 2000: 365, note 20.

¹⁵ This name is strange and does not agree with the remains of the corresponding name preserved in an *uddāna* in a Central Asian manuscript, cf. *SHT* IV 32, fragment 66, recto 5: *uddānam* apanna + + + ntha[k]o bhārgavaś [śa][y]o bhayabhai(rava) ///*. Obviously, *///ntha[k]o* should correspond to what is read here as Sarveka, but at present it appears difficult to reconcile the two names. For various possible reconstructions of the name cf. IWAMATSU 1996: 705; his proposal to reconstruct it as *(nirgra)nthaka* and to relate it to the *Mahāsaccakasutta* (*MN* 36) has now become obsolete, since *MN* 36 finds its correspondence in the *Kāyabhāvanāsūtra* (no. 20).

¹⁶ For Jinarṣabha; the akṣara read as *ya* is partly damaged, but does not resemble the expected *rṣa*. In a Central Asian manuscript, *SHT* IV 165, fragment 18, the name is preserved as Janarṣabha.

¹⁷ For *Mahāgovinda* in all versions of the *sūtra*.

¹⁸ Evidently this text exists only in the *uddāna*, since the section ends with the *Prāsādikasūtra*, and the manuscript continues with the *Pañcatrayasūtra*; this apparent loss of one *sūtra* is difficult to explain.

¹⁹ The name of the interlocutor is preserved as Sātyakin in the manuscript.

²⁰ In the *sūtra* itself and in a Central Asian manuscript (*SHT* IV 165, fragment 24, verso 4) too, the name is attested as Śaṅkaraka.

²¹ In the Central Asian manuscripts the title is attested as Āṭānāṭika.

Uddāna title	Folios	DĀc	DN	MN
24. Mahāsamāja <i>uddāna</i> Mahāsamāja, 2nd part <i>uddāna</i>	354r5-358r1 358r1-2 358r2-360v1 360v1-2	19	20: Mahāsamaya	
25. Tridaṇḍin	360v2-367r4		Ø	
26. Piṅgalāreya	367r4-369r5		Ø	
27. Lohitya ²² I	369r5-382r6	29	12: Lohicca	
28. Lohitya II	382r6-386r1		Ø	
29. Kaivartin ²³	386r1-390v1	24	11: Kevaddha	
30. Maṇḍīsa I	390v1-391v6		7: Jāliya	
31. Maṇḍīsa II	391v6-8		Ø	
32. Mahallin	391v8-396v6		6: Mahāli	
33. Śroṇatāṇḍya ²⁴	396v6-401r1	22	4: Soṇadaṇḍa	
34. Kūṭatāṇḍya ²⁵	401r2-409v8	23	5: Kūṭadanta	
<i>uddāna</i> 35. Ambāṣṭha ²⁶	410r1-2 410r2-416r3	20	3: Ambaṭṭha	
36. Prṣṭhapāla ²⁷	416r3-423(?)v7	28	9: Poṭṭhapāda	
37. Kāraṇavādin	424r4-424v3		Ø	
38. Pudgala ²⁸	424v3-426v1		Ø	
39. Śruta	426v1-427v5		Ø	
40. Mahalla	427v6-430r7		Ø	
41. Anyatama <i>uddāna</i>	430r7 430r8		Ø	
42. Śuka	430r8-433r2		10: Subha	
43. Jīvaka	433r2-(435)r5		Ø	55: Jīvaka

²² In all the Central Asian manuscripts the name is attested as Lokecca.

²³ In the Central Asian manuscripts the name possibly reads Kevarta or Kevartin.

²⁴ In the Central Asian manuscripts attested as Śoṇatāṇṭhya (only *SHT* V 1290) or Śoṇatāṇḍya (all others).

²⁵ In one Central Asian manuscript (*SHT* V 1290) the name is attested throughout as Kūṭaṇṭhya.

²⁶ In the Central Asian manuscripts attested as Ambāṣṭa.

²⁷ In a Central Asian manuscript attested as Prṣṭapā(da) or Prṣṭapā(la), cf. HARTMANN 1992 s.v. (single occurrence so far).

²⁸ For a parallel, cf. *AN* II 205 ff.

Uddāna title	Folios	DĀc	DN	MN
44. Rājā	(435)r5-447(?)v2 (three folios [442-444] of the Am-bāṣṭha and one [445] of the Brahmajāla are inserted here)	27	2: Sāmaññaphala	
45. Vāsiṣṭha	447(?)v2-451r1	26	13: Tevijja	
46. Kāśyapa	451r2-v8	25	8: Kassapaśihanāda	
47. Brahmajāla <i>uddāna</i>	452r1-454r 454v2-5	21	1: Brahmajāla	

2. A specimen from the *Bodhasūtra*: The five qualities of a strenuous one

In the following, a passage from the *Bodhasūtra*²⁹ is presented in order to illustrate some of the specifics and problems of the manuscript. Fragments of the passage have been known from Central Asian manuscripts in the collections of Berlin, London and St. Petersburg,³⁰ but only now is the restoration of a consecutive text finally possible. The corresponding text in the Pāli canon, the *Bodhirājakumārasutta*, contains the same passage, but in a — as far as the correspondence goes — considerably shorter and sometimes quite different form (MN II 94.7-96.20). The topic of this passage is a group of five qualities of a strenuous one (*prādhānikāṅga*, Pāli *padhāniyaṅga*),³¹ namely being *śrāddha* (P. *saddha*) “trusting”, *aśaṭha* (*asaṭha*) “guileless”, *alpābādha* (*appābādha*) “of good health”, *ārabdhavīrya* (*āraddhavīrya*) “energetic” and *prājña* (*paññā*) “intelligent”. The Buddha first illustrates the need for these five basic qualities on the spiritual path with the example of a person who intends to learn the martial arts from prince Bodha, and then goes on to describe them with regard to the noble disciple, the *āryaśrāvaka*. This description, consisting of five sets of stock phrases, is also included in the *Daśottarasūtra* (no. V.1) and in the *Saṅgītisūtra* (no. V.17), and single

²⁹ Bodha is the key word in the *uddāna*, but the full title may also read *Bodharājakumārasūtra* in accordance with the Pāli.

³⁰ Berlin: *SHT* (IV) 33, fragments 22-24 (fragment 21 does not belong to the same folio as fragment 22), *SHT* (IV) 180, fragments 1-2; London: Hoernle 149/280, edited in HARTMANN 1992, no. 12; St. Petersburg: SI B/14, fragments II and III (now it is easy to see that both fragments belong to the same folio, II being the left piece), edited in BONGARD-LEVIN 1989 and BONGARD-LEVIN/VOROB'eva-DESIATOVSKAJA 1990: 247-249.

³¹ The Pāli form has been variously translated as “factor in spiritual wrestling” (T.W. and C.A.F. RHYS DAVIDS *ad DN* III 237), “quality to be striven for” (*PTSD* s.v.), “quality for striving” (I.B. HORNER *ad MN* no. 85), “factor of endeavour” (Maurice WALSHE *ad DN* III 237); *prādhānikāṅga* could be understood as “primary quality”, but the Central Asian text of the *Daśottarasūtra* has *prādhānikasyāṅgam*, (cf. MITTAL 1957: 65), and in connexion with the *Saṅgītiparyāya*, the commentary on the same passage of the *Saṅgītisūtra* (cf. STACHE-ROSEN 1968: 147), this leads to the understanding as “strenuous (one)” (cf. MITTAL 1957: 65 “Eigenschaft eines Strebsamen”); cf. also Sv III 1028.33-34 (*ad DN* III 237) *Padhāniyassa bhikkhuno aṅgāni ti padhāniy' aṅgāni*.

sets or parts of them occur in various other places in the Sūtrapīṭaka. Despite these various occurrences the Sanskrit text had until now remained extremely fragmentary, mainly because the relevant passages in the *Daśottara-* and *Saṅgītisūtra*, both available only in editions from Central Asian fragments, are very badly preserved. Only now, with the help of the *Bodhasūtra*, is it possible to fill all the gaps. This illustrates once more how close the wording of texts of the same tradition is and how the edition of every new piece works to advance our knowledge and improve the existing editions.

The sūtra deals at length with Prince Bodha's newly built palace Kokanada and with his invitation to the Buddha and the Saṃgha as its auspicious first visitors. After offering them a meal, the prince begins a conversation with the Buddha, which consists of two parts. At first he states that in his opinion happiness (*sukha*) is not gained by happiness, but by suffering (*duḥkha*), and this offers the Buddha an occasion to relate part of his autobiography, as it were: the story of leaving the palace, of his ascetic practices and of finally reaching enlightenment. In the *Bodhasūtra*, this story is abbreviated by a reference to the immediately preceding *Kāyabhāvanāsūtra* (*vistareṇa yathā kāyabhāvanāsūtre*, fol. 342r7) where it is found in full. Then follows the second question of prince Bodha, and this is where the specimen sets in.

First, a transliteration of the manuscript will be given, then a structured restoration of the text with a modest application of European punctuation, and finally a translation of the restored text.

2.1. Transliteration of fols. 342v2—344r2

342 verso

- 2 ṇāya pṛccha bo[dha] d eva yad yad evākāṃ[kṣa]si k. tibhi[r bhadam]tāṃgaiḥ sam-
a[nv]āgata āryaśrā .. [k]. + + + + .[m].m dha[rm]. + n. ye āsraṇakṣayam anuprāpnoti
tena hi bodha tvām eva pra [t].
- 3 kṣamate thainam vyākuru kiṃ manyase bodha kuśalas tvam ○ pitrye śilpasthāna-
karmasthāne ta[d]y[athā] hasti + + .āyām aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau dhanuṣy apayāne
niryāṇe aṃkuśagr. [ś]. grahe
- 4 toramaragrahe lipigaṇananyasanasamkhyāmu ○ drāyām tathyam aham bhadanta
kuśalaḥ pitrye śilpasthānakarmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyām aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau
dhanuṣy apayā
- 5 ne niryāṇe aṃkuśagrahe to[mara]grahe lipi ○ gaṇananyasanasamkhyāmudrāyām atha
puruṣa āgacchet tasyaivaṃ syāt kuśalo bata bodho rājakumāraḥ pi[t]rye śilpasthānaka
- 6 rmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyā[m a]śvapṛṣṭhe rathe ○ sarau dhanuṣy apayāne niryāṇe
aṃkuśagrahe pāsagrahe tomaragrahe lipigaṇananyasanasamkhyāmudrāyām yanv aham
a
- 7 syāntikād anyatamānyatama śilpasthānam anvāgamayeya[m] i[ti] sa ca syād aśrād-
dha{syā}h kiṃ manyase bodha ya tac chrāddhena prāptavyam prāpnuyāt saḥ no
bhadanta sa ca syāc chaṭṭhaḥ kiṃ manyase bo

- 8 dha yat tadṛśaṭhīna prāptavyan prāpnuyāt sa no bhadanta sa ca syād duṣprajña kiṃ manyase bodha yat tat prājñena prāptavyaṃ prā[pn]u[y]ā[t sa] no bhadanta ekaikena tāvad bhadanta ito na samanvāgatena tena

343 recto

- 1 puruṣeṇa na sukaraṃ mamāntikād anyatamānyatama śilpasthānakarmasthānam anvāga-
mayitum kaḥ punar vādaḥ sarvai dvitīyo .ā puruṣa āgacchet tasyaivaṃ syāt kuśalo ta
bodho rājakumāra pitrye
- 2 śilpasthānakarmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyāṃ aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau dhanuṣy
apayāne niryāṇe aṃkuśagrahe pāśagrahe tomaragrahe lipigaṇananyasanam samkhyā-
mudrāyāṃ yanv aham asyāntikād anyatamā
- 3 nyatamaśilpasthānakarmasthāna{ {karmasthāna} }m anvāgamyē ◯ yam iti sa ca syāc
chrāddhaḥ kiṃ manyase bodha yat tac chrāddhene prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa evaṃ
bhadanta sa ca syā śaṭhaḥ kiṃ manyase bodha
- 4 yat tad aśaṭhena prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa evaṃ bhadanta sa ◯ ca syād alpābādhaḥ
kiṃ manyase bodha yat tad alpābādhena prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt saḥ evaṃ bhadanta sa
ca syād ārabdhavīryaḥ kiṃ manyase
- 5 bodha yat tad ārabdhavīryeṇa prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa evaṃ bha ◯ danta sa ca syāt
prājñāḥ kiṃ manyase bodha yat tat prājñena prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa evaṃ bhadanta
ekaikena tāvad bhadanta ito ŋgena
- 6 samanvāgatena tena puruṣeṇa sukaraṃ mamāntikā ◯ d anyatamānyatamac chilpa-
sthānakarmasthāna samanvāgamayitum kaḥ punar vādaḥ sarvair evaṃ eva bodha
[pa]ṃcabhiḥ prādhā
- 7 nikāṃgaḥ samanvāgata āryaśrāvakaḥ kṣipram evā[sm]iṃ dharmavinaye āśravakṣayam
anuprāpnoti katamaiḥ paṃcabhir iha bodha āryaśrāvakasya tathāgatasyo ntike śraddhā-
bhini .. + + +
- 8 timūlajātā pratiṣṭhitā a[sa]ṃhāryā śramaṇena vā brāhmaṇena vā devena vā māreṇa vā
brahmaṇā vā kena cid vā punar loke sahadharmatamanena prathamena prādhāni-
kenāṃ[g]. [n]. + + ..

343 verso

- 1 gato [bhavat]y [ā]rya[śrā]va[k]. puna bodha [ā] [k]o śaṭhī bhavaty
amāyāvī ṛju ṛjukajātīyaḥ sa yathābhūtam ātmānam āviṣkaroti śāstur antike vijñānāṃ
ca sa[bra] + + +
- 2 nena dvitīyena prādhānikenāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvaka [p]unar aparaṃ
āryaśrāvaka alpābādho bhavaty arogajātīyaḥ samayāpacanyāgrahanyā samanvāgato ..
[tyu] + +
- 3 nātiśīṭayā avyābādhayā ṛtusukhāyā yayāpy a ◯ śītapīṭakhaditāsṅvāditāni samyaksukhena
paripakam gacchati anena tṛtīyena prādhānikāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty ā
- 4 bhavaty āryaśrāvakaḥ punar aparaṃ bodha āryaśrāva ◯ kaḥ ārabdhavīryo viharati
sthānavāṃ vīryavā{ {ṃ} }n utsāhī dṛḍhaparākramo nikṣiptadhuraḥ kuśaleṣu dharmeṣu

- kāmam tvak snāyva asthi
- 5 cāvatiṣṭhatāṃ pariśuṣyatu śārīrān māmśaṣoṇi ◉ tam atha ca punar yat tad ārabdhavīryeṇa prāptavyaṃ sthāmavatā vīryavatā utsāhinā dṛḍhaparākrameṇānikṣiptadhureṇa kuśa
- 6 leṣu dharmeṣu tad vata nāprāpyāntarād vīryasya sraṃ ◉ sanam bhaviṣyaty anena caturthena prādhānikenāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvakaḥ punar aparaṃ bodhāryaśrāvaka
- 7 prajñāvān viharati lokasyodayāstaṃgaminyā prajñayā samanvāgataḥ āryayā nairyāṇikayā nairvedhikayā niryāti tat kasya hetoḥ samyagduḥkṣayāya duḥkṣayāntakriyayai anena paṃ[ca]m[e]na prādhānikenāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvakaḥ ebhir bodha paṃcabhiḥ prādhānikāṃgais samanvāgataḥ āryaśrāvakaḥ kṣipram evāsmiṃ dharmavinaye āsrava

344 recto

- 1 kṣayam anuprāpnoti atha bodho rājakumāraḥ pūrvaṃ kāyam abhyunnamayya dakṣiṇaṃ bāhum abhiprasāryāttamanāttamanā udānam udānayati aho buddha aho dharma aho saṃ{{ghaś ca}} sya
- 2 svākhyātātā ya[tr]edā[n]iṃ paṃcabhiḥ prādhānikāṃgena samanvāgata āryaśrāvakaḥ kṣipram evāsmiṃ dharmavinaye āsravakṣayam anuprāpnotīti •

2.2. Restoration

1. “pṛccha Bo(dha) {d eva} yad yad evākāṃkṣasi.”
2. “k(a)tibhir bhadamtāṃgaiḥ samanvāgata āryaśrā(va)k(aḥ kṣipram evās)m(i)ṃ dharm(a-vi)n(a)ye āsravakṣayam anuprāpnoti?”
3. “tena hi Bodha tvām eva pra³² (yathā) t(e) (v3) kṣamate ’thainam vyākuru! kiṃ manyase Bodha kuśalas tvam pitrye śilpasthānakarmasthāne tadyathā hasti(grīv)āyām aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau dhanuṣy apayāne niryāṇe aṃkuśagra(ahe pā)ś(a)grahe (v4) to{ra}maragrahe lipigaṇananyasanasamkhyāmudrāyām?”
4. “tathyam aham bhadanta kuśalaḥ pitrye śilpasthānakarmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyām aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau dhanuṣy apayā(v5)ne niryāṇe aṃkuśagrahe toma(ra)-grahe lipigaṇananyasanasamkhyāmudrāyām.”
5. “atha puruṣa āgacchet tasyaivaṃ syāt: kuśalo bata Bodho rājakumāraḥ pitrye śilpasthānaka(v6)rmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyām aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau dhanuṣy apayāne niryāṇe aṃkuśagrahe pāśagrahe tomaragrahe lipigaṇananyasanasamkhyāmudrāyām. yanv aham a(v7)syāntikād anyatamānyatamaśilpasthāna<karmasthāna>m anvāgama-yeyam iti

³² Most likely to be restored to *pracchāmi* for *pṛcchāmi*, cf. *MN II 94,11-12 Tena hi, rājakumāra, taṃ yev’ ettha paṭipucchissāmi. Yathā te khameyya tathā taṃ vyākareyyāsi.*

6. sa ca syād aśrāddhaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha: ya<t> tac chrāddhena prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt saḥ?”
“no bhadanta.”
7. “sa ca syāc chaṭṭhaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bo(v8)dha: yat tad{r} śaṭhīna³³ prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa?”
“no bhadanta.”
8. ³⁴<“sa ca syād bahvābādhaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha: yat tad alpābādheṇa prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt saḥ?”
“no bhadanta.”
9. “sa ca syād anārabdhavīryaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha: yat tad ārabdhavīryeṇa prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa?”
“no bhadanta.”>
10. “sa ca syād duṣprajñā<ḥ>; kiṃ manyase Bodha: yat tat prājñeṇa prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa?”
“no bhadanta; ekaikena tāvad bhadanta ito <’nge>na samanvāgatena tena (343r1) puruṣeṇa na sukaraṃ mamāntikād anyatamānyatama<m> śilpasthānakarmasthānam anvāgamayitum; kaḥ punar vādaḥ sarvai<ḥ>.”
11. “dvitīyo .ā³⁵ puruṣa āgacchet tasyaivaṃ syāt: kuśalo <ba>ta Bodho rājakumāra<ḥ> pitrye (r2) śilpasthānakarmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyāṃ aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau dhanuṣy apayāne niryāṇe aṃkuśagrahe pāśagrahe tomaragrahe lipigaṇananyasana{m}-saṃkhyāmudrāyāṃ. yanv aham asyāntikād anyatamā(r3)nyatamac chilpasthānakarmasthānam anvāgamayeyam iti.
12. sa ca syāc chrāddhaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha yat tac chrāddhena prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa?”
“evaṃ bhadanta.”
13. “sa ca syā<d a>śaṭṭhaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha: (r4) yat tad aśaṭhena prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa?”
“evaṃ bhadanta.”
14. “sa ca syād alpābādhaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha: yat tad alpābādheṇa prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt saḥ?”
“evaṃ bhadanta.”
15. “sa ca syād ārabdhavīryaḥ; kiṃ manyase (r5) Bodha: yat tad ārabdhavīryeṇa prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa?”
“evaṃ bhadanta.”
16. “sa ca syāt prājñāḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha: yat tat prājñeṇa prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa?”

³³ Correct to *tac chaṭṭhena*.

³⁴ Apparently the correspondences for *alpābādha* and *ārabdhavīrya* are dropped in the manuscript, most likely due to a haplography in this highly repetitive passage, but they are found in the Central Asian fragments. Therefore, the following two sections are reconstructed; *bahvābādha* is taken from *SHT* IV 180, fragment 1, recto 4, *anārabdhavīrya* is speculative, but highly probable.

³⁵ The reconstruction of this akṣara remains uncertain.

- “evam bhadanta; ekaikena tāvad bhadanta ito ’ṅgena (**r6**) samanvāgatena tena puru-
ṣeṇa sukaram mamāntikād anyatamānyatamac chilpasthānakarmasthāna{sa}m anvā-
gamayitum; kaḥ punar vādaḥ sarvair.”
17. “evam eva Bodha paṃcabhiḥ prādhā(**r7**)nikāṃgaḥ samanvāgata āryaśrāvakaḥ kṣipram
evāsmiṃ dharmavinaye āsraṇakṣayam anuprāpnoti; katamaiḥ paṃcabhir?”
- 18.1. iha Bodha āryaśrāvakaḥ tathāgatasya<ā>ntike śraddhābhini(viṣṭā bhava)(**r8**)ti mūla-
jātā pratiṣṭhitā asaṃhāryā śramaṇena vā brāhmaṇena vā devena vā māreṇa vā brah-
maṇā vā kenacid vā punar loka sahadharmatam³⁶; anena prathamena prādhānike-
nāṃgen(a samanvā)(**343v1**)gato bhavaty āryaśrāvaka(a)<ḥ>.
- 18.2. puna(r aparaṃ)³⁷ .. Bodha ā(ryaśrāva)ko ’śaṭhī bhavaty amāyāvī rju<ko> rjukajātīyaḥ
sa yathābhūtam ātmānam āviṣkaroti śāstur antike vijñānām ca sabra(hmacārīṇām
a)(**v2**)nena dvitīyena prādhānikenāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvaka<ḥ>.
- 18.3. punar aparaṃ āryaśrāvaka alpābādho bhavaty arogajātīyaḥ samayā pācanyā³⁸
grahanyā samanvāgato (nā)tyu(ṣṇayā) (**v3**) nātiśīṭayā avyābādhayā ṛtusukhāyā yayāpy
aśītapītakhaditāsvādītāni samyaksukhena paripākam gaccha<n>ti; anena tṛtīyena
prādhānikāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty ā(**v4**){bhavaty ā}ryaśrāvakaḥ.
- 18.4. punar aparaṃ Bodha āryaśrāvakaḥ ārabdhavīryo viharati sthāmavām vīryavān utsāhī
dṛḍhaparākramo ’nikṣiptadhuraḥ kuśaleṣu dharmeṣu; kāmam tvak snāyav asthi (**v5**)
cāvatiṣṭhatām, pariśuṣyatu śārīrān māmsaśoṇitam. atha ca punar yat tad ārabdha-
vīryeṇa prāptavyam sthāmavatā vīryavatā utsāhinā dṛḍhaparākrameṇānikṣiptadhureṇa
kuśa(**v6**)leṣu dharmeṣu tad vata nāprāpyāntarād³⁹ vīryasya sraṃsanam bhaviṣyaty;
anena caturthena prādhānikenāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvakaḥ.
- 18.5. punar aparaṃ Bodhāryaśrāvaka<ḥ> (**v7**) prajñāvān viharati lokasyodayāstaṃgaminyā
prajñayā samanvāgataḥ āryayā nairyaṇīkayā nairvedhikayā niryāti tatka<raḥ> {sya
hetoh}⁴⁰ samyagduḥ<kha>kṣayāya duḥkhasyāntakriyāyai; (**v8**) anena paṃcamena
prādhānikenāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvakaḥ.
19. ebhir Bodha paṃcabhiḥ prādhānikāṃgaḥ samanvāgataḥ āryaśrāvakaḥ kṣipram
evāsmiṃ dharmavinaye āsraṇa(**344r1**)kṣayam anuprāpnoti.”
20. atha Bodho rājakumāraḥ pūrvaṃ kāyam abhyunnamayya dakṣiṇaṃ bāhum abhipra-
sāryāttamanāttamanā udānam udānayati: “aho buddha aho dharma aho saṃ<gha aho
dharma>sya (**r2**) svākhyātātā, yatredānīm paṃcabhiḥ prādhānikāṃ{gena}<gaiḥ> sam-
anvāgata āryaśrāvakaḥ kṣipram evāsmiṃ dharmavinaye āsraṇakṣayam anuprāpnoti!”

³⁶ Correct to *sahadharmataḥ*.

³⁷ The gap contained at least one more akṣara, but it is difficult to guess what it could have been, apart from a writing mistake.

³⁸ The parallel passages seem to suggest a correction to *samapācanyā*, cf. *Avś* I 168.10 *samapākayā grahaṇyā samanavāgata* and *DN* II 177.27-28, III 166.15 *sama-vepākiniyā gahaṇiyā samannāgato*, but WALDSCHMIDT *ad MPS* 34.23 (reconstructed) refers to *Mvy* 7039 *samayā pācanyā grahaṇyā samanvāgataḥ*.

³⁹ Or *nā<nanu>prāpya*^o; the parallels are not unequivocal in that point, cf. *SHT* V 1103 recto 3-4 with note 4 (p. 98).

⁴⁰ For the correction from *tat kasya hetoh* to *tatkaraḥ* and for the whole formula cf. SWTF s.v. *tat-kara*.

2.3. Translation

1. "Ask, Bodha, whatever you like."
2. "Possessed of how many qualities, revered sir, does a noble disciple in this law and discipline quickly reach the cessation of the depravities?"
3. "Well then, Bodha, I will ask you a question in return. Answer it as you think fit! What do you think, Bodha, are you skilled in the matters of (military) arts and the matters of (military) techniques, as (riding) on an elephant's neck, (going) on horseback, (driving) a chariot, sword, archery, marching away, marching forth, handling an elephant-driver's hook, handling a noose, handling a lance, writing, counting, painting, mental and manual arithmetic?"⁴¹
4. "It is true, revered sir, that I am skilled in the matters of (military) arts and the matters of (military) techniques, as (riding) on an elephant's neck, (going) on horseback, (driving) a chariot, sword, archery, marching away, marching forth, handling an elephant-driver's hook, handling a lance, writing, counting, painting, mental and manual arithmetic."
5. "Now a person might come and think: 'Prince Bodha is indeed skilled in the matters of (military) arts and the matters of (military) techniques, as (riding) on an elephant's neck, (going) on horseback, (driving) a chariot, sword, archery, marching away, marching forth, handling an elephant-driver's hook, handling a noose, handling a lance, writing, counting, painting, mental and manual arithmetic. I would like to learn one or the other art and technique from him.'
6. If he were lacking in trust, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is trusting?"
"No, revered sir."
7. "If he were crooked, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is guileless?"
"No, revered sir."
8. "If he were sickly, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one with good health?"
"No, revered sir."
9. "If he were lazy, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is energetic?"
"No, revered sir."
10. "If he were unintelligent, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by an intelligent one?"
"No, revered sir. It would not be easy for him to learn one or the other craft and art

⁴¹ The translation of this stock phrase largely follows that of VOGEL/WILLE 1992: 85.

- from me, revered sir, if he were possessed of even one such quality, let alone all of them.”
11. “(Now) a second person might come and think: ‘Prince Bodha is indeed skilled in the matters of (military) arts and the matters of (military) techniques, as (riding) on an elephant’s neck, (going) on horseback, (driving) a chariot, sword, archery, marching away, marching forth, handling an elephant-driver’s hook, handling a noose, handling a lance, writing, counting, painting, mental and manual arithmetic. I would like to learn one or the other craft and art from him.’
 12. If he were trusting, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is trusting?”
“Yes, revered sir.”
 13. “If he were guileless, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is without guile?”
“Yes, revered sir.”
 14. “If he were of good health, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one of good health?”
“Yes, revered sir.”
 15. “If he were energetic, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is energetic?”
“Yes, revered sir.”
 16. “If he were intelligent, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by an intelligent one?”
“Yes, revered sir. It would be easy for him to learn one or the other craft and art from me, revered sir, if he were possessed of even one such quality, let alone all of them.”
 17. “In the same way, Bodha, a noble disciple possessed of the five qualities of a strenuous one will in this law and discipline quickly reach the cessation of the depravities. Which five?
 - 18.1. “Here, Bodha, the trust of a noble disciple in the Realized One becomes persevering, deep-rooted, firm, not legitimately to be diverted by a recluse, a brahmin, a god, a Māra, a Brahma, or anybody else in the world. Possessed of this first quality of a strenuous one he becomes a noble disciple.
 - 18.2. “Again, Bodha, a noble disciple is guileless, not deceitful, straight, straightforward; he shows himself as he really is to the teacher and the learned among his fellow-students. Possessed of this second quality of a strenuous one he becomes a noble disciple.
 - 18.3. “Again, a noble disciple is healthy, of a healthy nature, endowed with an even and efficient digestion, neither overheated or underactive, free of disorders and comfortable with any season, by which the things eaten, drunk, chewed and tasted are digested with complete ease. Possessed of this third quality of a strenuous one he becomes a noble disciple.

- 18.4. “Again, Bodha, a noble disciple is energetic, powerful, full of energy, persevering, of strong courage, persevering in the wholesome dhammas: Let the flesh and blood dry up from the body and (only) skin, sinew, bone remain, rather than that, not having attained what can be attained by one who is energetic, powerful, full of energy, persevering, of strong courage, persevering in the wholesome dhammas, there will be a slackening of energy. Possessed of this fourth quality of a strenuous one he becomes a noble disciple.⁴²
- 18.5. “Again, Bodha, a noble disciple is intelligent, possessed of the insight into the rise and disappearance of the world, that is noble, conducive to deliverance, penetrating; activating that, he leaves for the right cessation of suffering, for the termination of suffering.⁴³ Possessed of this fifth quality of a strenuous one he becomes a noble disciple.
19. “Possessed of these five qualities of a strenuous one, Bodha, a noble disciple will in this law and discipline quickly reach the cessation of the depravities.”
20. Then prince Bodha lifted his upper body, stretched out his right arm and greatly delighted uttered a solemn utterance: “Oh the Buddha, oh the doctrine, oh the community, oh how well taught is the doctrine whereby now a noble disciple, possessed of five qualities of a strenuous one, will quickly reach the cessation of the depravities in this law and discipline!”

Abbreviations

- Avś* = *Avadānaśataka*, ed. J.S. SPEYER, St. Petersburg 1902-1909 (Bibliotheca Buddhica, 3).
- DN* = *The Dīgha Nikāya*, ed. T.W. RHYS DAVIDS, J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, 3 vols., London 1890-1911 (Pali Text Society).
- MN* = *Majjhima-Nikāya*, ed. V. TRENCKNER, Robert CHALMERS, 3 vols., London 1888-1899 (Pali Text Society).
- MPS* = *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, Teil I-III, ed. Ernst WALDSCHMIDT, Berlin 1950-1951 (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1949,1, 1950,2-3).
- Mvy* = *Mahāvīyūtpatti*, ed. Ryōzaburō SAKAKI, 2 vols., Kyōto 1916-1925.
- PTSD* = *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*, ed. T.W. RHYS DAVIDS, William STEDE, London 1921-1925.
- SHT* = *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil 1-8, ed. Ernst WALDSCHMIDT, Lore SANDER, Klaus WILLE, Wiesbaden 1965-2000 (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, X,1-8).
- Sv* = *The Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī, Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīghanikāya*, ed. W. Stede, T.W. Rhys Davids and J. Estlin Carpenter, 3 vols., London 1889-1932.
- SWTF* = *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, begonnen von Ernst Waldschmidt, hrsg. von Heinz BECHERT, bearbeitet von Georg von SIMSON und Michael SCHMIDT, Lieferung 1-15, Göttingen 1973ff.

⁴² Cf. *SHT* V 1103 recto 3-4 with note 4 (p. 98).

⁴³ For parallel passages cf. *SWTF* s.v. *tat-kara*.

Bibliography

BONGARD-LEVIN, G.M.

1989 "Three New Fragments of the Bodharājakumārasūtra from Eastern Turkestan," *JAOS* 109, 509-512.

BONGARD-LEVIN, G.M., and M.I. VOROB'eva-DESJATOVSKAJA

1990 *Pamjatniki indijskoj pis'mennosti iz central'noj azii*. Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarii, vypusk 2, Moskva (Bibliotheca Buddhica, 34).

HARTMANN, Jens-Uwe

1989 "Fragmente aus dem Dīrghāgama der Sarvāstivādins," *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen u. Neueditionen*, 1, Göttingen 1989 (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 2), 37-67.

1992 *Untersuchungen zum Dīrghāgama der Sarvāstivādins*, Göttingen (still unpublished Habilitation thesis).

1994 "Der Śaṭsūtraka-Abschnitt des in Ostturkistan überlieferten Dīrghāgama," *XXV. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Vorträge*, ed. Cornelia WUNSCH, Stuttgart (ZDMG, Supplementum, 10), 324-334.

2000 "Bemerkungen zu einer neuen Handschrift des Dīrghāgama," *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka. Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, ed. Christine CHOJACKI, J.-U. HARTMANN u. Volker M. TSCHANNERL, Swistal-Odendorf (Indica et Tibetica, 37), 359-367.

2002 "Further Remarks on the New Manuscript of the Dīrghāgama," *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies* 5, 133-150.

HONJŌ Yoshifumi

1984 *A Table of Āgama-Citations in the Abhidharmakośa and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā*, Part I, Kyoto.

IWAMATSU Asao

1990 "Bonbun Agon-gyō zasso," *Sankō Bunka Kenkyūjo Nempō* 22, 127-153.

1996 "A Supplementary Comment on the SHT Cat. Nos. 32, 33" [in Japanese], *Indian Thoughts and Buddhist Culture, Essays in Honour of Professor Junkichi Imanishi on His Sixtieth Birthday*, Tokyo, 708-694 (241-255).

MITTAL, Kusum

1957 *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus. I: Fragmente des Daśottarasūtra aus zentralasiatischen Sanskrit-Handschriften*, Berlin.

SADAKATA Akira

1999 "Girugitto syahon: Tenson-kyō danpen no kaidoku" ["The Gilgit Manuscript: Deciphering the Mahāgovindasūtra Fragment"], *Daihōrin*, January 1999, 30-35.

SKILLING, Peter

1994 *Mahāsūtras. Great Discourses of the Buddha*. Vol I: Texts. Critical editions of the Tibetan Mahāsūtras with Pāli and Sanskrit counterparts as available, Oxford (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, 44).

STACHE-ROSEN, Valentina

1968 *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus. II: Das Saṅgītisūtra und sein Kommentar Saṅgīti-paryāya*, Teil 1-2, Berlin.

VOGEL, Claus and Klaus WILLE

1992 "Some more Fragments of the Pravrajyāvastu Portion of the Vinayavastu Manuscript Found Near Gilgit," *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen II*, Göttingen (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 4), 65-109.

WALDSCHMIDT, Ernst

1980 "Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and Their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas," *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung* (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, II), ed. Heinz BECHERT, Göttingen (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 117), 136-174 (= Ernst WALDSCHMIDT, *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, ed. Heinz BECHERT, Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ, Stuttgart 1989, 370-408).