

# 敦煌吐魯番研究

Journal of the Dunhuang and Turfan Studies

第十二卷

Volume XII

季羨林先生紀念專號

中國敦煌吐魯番學會

上海師範大學敦煌吐魯番學研究所

香港中華文化促進中心

香港大學饒宗頤學術館

北京大學東方學研究院

合辦

上海古籍出版社

二〇一一年·上海

編委會（以姓名拼音字母為序）

主 編

饒宗頤

編 委

柴劍虹	陳 明	鄧文寬	方廣錫	郝春文
李焯芬	林悟殊	劉 叻	孟憲實	榮新江
孫曉林	王邦維	王 素	徐 俊	湛 如
張涌泉	趙和平			

編輯部主任

郝春文

副 主 任

劉 叻

# 目 錄

卷首語 ..... 郝春文 ( 1 )

## 紀念文

德國的印度學之初與季羨林先生的學術底蘊 ..... 段 晴 ( 1 )  
二十世紀八十年代西域研究的力作——季羨林先生與《大唐西域記校注》 ..... 王邦維 ( 15 )  
高舉“敦煌學在世界”的大旗——紀念季羨林會長逝世一週年 ..... 柴劍虹 ( 21 )  
我眼心中的季羨林先生 ..... 趙和平 ( 29 )  
獎掖多後進 謙恭比前靈——記與季羨林先生交往二三事 ..... 王 素 ( 41 )  
季羨林先生《西域佛教史》讀後 ..... 榮新江 ( 45 )  
季羨林先生敦煌吐魯番學及東方學論著編年目錄 ..... 宇文卒 編 ( 51 )

## 論文

Was *barčuk tili* a Turkic Language? ..... Peter Zieme ( 69 )  
Lost in the *Daśottarasūtra*, Found in the *Kṣudrakavastu* ..... Jens-Uwe Hartmann ( 85 )  
吐火羅文和回鶻文《彌勒會見記》比較研究——以吐火羅文 YQ1.3 1/2、  
YQ1.3 1/1、YQ1.9 1/1 和 YQ1.9 1/2 四頁為例 ..... 張鐵山 ( 99 )  
《四部犍陀羅語雜阿含經》初探 ..... 李 穎 ( 109 )  
敦煌藏文文書 P. t. 960 所記佛法滅盡之情形——《于闐教法史》譯注之四 ..... 朱麗雙 ( 123 )  
《生經·舅甥經》“不制”補說 ..... 陳 明 ( 137 )

克孜爾石窟佛學思想探析 ..... 霍旭初 ( 145 )  
古靈寶經出世論——以葛巢甫和陸修靜為中心 ..... 劉 歆 ( 157 )  
漢代敦煌郡縣建立的特殊過程特殊模式 ..... 李正宇 ( 179 )  
懸泉漢簡編年輯證之——漢武帝時期 ..... 張德芳 ( 191 )  
論十六國、北朝時期吐魯番地方的絲織業及相關問題 ..... 孟憲實 ( 197 )

後唐明宗時代的國家政局與歸義軍及甘州回鶻的入貢中原…… 吳麗娛、楊寶玉	(229)
敦煌藏經洞所出繪畫品中的日、月圖像研究…………… 張元林	(245)
加拿大維多利亞美術館藏敦煌寫經與佛畫 ……………… 王 素	(269)
古書雙行注文抄刻齊整化研究 ……………… 張涌泉	(279)
敦煌講經文是否為變文爭議之平議 ……………… 鄭阿財	(303)
從文學本位論變文研究之發展與趨勢 ……………… 朱鳳玉	(323)
關於“敦煌遺書庫”的構想 ……………… 方廣錫、李際寧、朱 雷	(335)
內藤湖南的敦煌學 ……………… 高田時雄	(353)

\* \* \* \*

旅博本《壇經》的再發現及其學術價值 ……………… 王振芬	(367)
試論中古時期“蓮花化生”形象及觀念的演變——兼論民間摩睺羅形象之起源 ……………… 姚瀟鵠	(381)
唐後期五代宋初敦煌寺院的福田事業 ……………… 陳大爲	(399)
釋令狐懷寂告身 ……………… 唐 星	(413)
敦煌本《白澤精怪圖》校錄——《白澤精怪圖》研究之一 ……………… 游自勇	(429)
柏林舊藏吐魯番出土“不知名類書”殘卷的初步研究 ……………… 胡 鴻	(441)
俄藏殘本索清《月儀帖》之綴合及研究 ……………… 蔡淵迪	(451)
敦煌籍帳文書字詞箋釋 ……………… 張小豔	(463)
一個維吾爾家庭與高昌故城的百年滄桑 ……………… 徐婉玲、張銘心	(485)

## 書評

劉進寶主編《百年敦煌學：歷史、現狀、趨勢》(上、下) ……………… 劉 歆	(501)
榮新江、李肖、孟憲實主編《新獲吐魯番出土文獻》上下二冊 ……………… 高田時雄 撰、裴成國 譯	(507)
Timothy Lenz, <i>Gandhāran Avadānas: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment I – 3 and 21 and Supplementary Fragments A – C</i> ……………… 陳 明	(516)

新書目 ……………… 李燕暉	(523)
《敦煌吐魯番研究》稿約 ………………	(537)
稿件書寫格式 ………………	(538)

## Contents

Editor's words .....	HAO Chunwen ( 1 )
----------------------	-------------------

### Memoritum

Prof. JI Xianlin's Academic Research and the Indology of Germany .....	DUAN Qing ( 1 )
Prof. JI Xianlin and the New Research on Xuanzang's <i>Record of the Western Regions</i> in 1980s .....	WANG Bangwei ( 15 )
Prof. JI Xianlin and Dunhuang Studies .....	CHAI Jianhong ( 21 )
Prof. JI Xianlin in My Eyes .....	ZHAO Heping ( 29 )
In the Memories of Prof. JI Xianlin .....	WANG Su ( 41 )
Prof. JI Xianlin and His <i>The History of Buddhism in Western Regions</i> .....	RONG Xinjinag ( 45 )
Prof. JI Xianlin on Dunhuang, Turfan and Oriental Studies: A Publication list .....	YUWEN Zu ( 51 )

### Articles

Was <i>barčuk tili</i> a Turkic Language? .....	Peter Zieme ( 69 )
Lost in the <i>Daśottarasūtra</i> , Found in the <i>Kṣudrakavastu</i> .....	Jens-Uwe Hartmann ( 85 )
The <i>Maitreyasamiti-Nāṭaka</i> : Four Pages Comparison of the Tocharian and Uighur Versions .....	ZHANG Tieshan ( 99 )
Study on <i>Four Gāndhārī Samyuktāgama Sūtras</i> .....	LI Ying ( 109 )
A New Translation and some Comments on the <i>Li yul chos kyi lo rgyus</i> (P. t. 960) .....	ZHU Lishuang ( 123 )
Supplementary Notes to “buzhi” (Skr. na śaknoti) in the Jātaka Story <i>Jiusheng</i> <i>Jing</i> .....	CHEN Ming ( 137 )
The Sarvāstivādin Thought and the Qizil Grotto .....	HUO Xuchu ( 145 )
On the History Background of the Lingbao Taoist Scriptures .....	LIU Yi ( 157 )

The Establishment of Dunhuang County in the Han Dynasty: A special Model ..... LI Zhengyu (179)

The Wooden Slips from Xuanquan: A Chronic Study Related to the Period of Han Emperor Wu ..... ZHANG Defang (191)

The Silk Production in Turfan from the 4<sup>th</sup> to 6<sup>th</sup> centuries ..... MENG Xianshi (197)

Political Situation and the Tributes by Guiijun and Uighurs to the Central Government during the Reign of Emperor Ming of the Latter-Tang Dynasty ..... WU Liyu and YANG Baoyu (229)

The Sun and the Moon in the Painting Discovered from the Dunhuang Cave-library: An Iconographical Study ..... ZHANG Yuanlin (245)

Dunhuang Manuscripts and Paintings Kept in the Art Gallery of Victoria in Canada ..... WANG Su (269)

The Commentaries Written in Double Lines in Medieval Texts ..... ZHANG Yongquan (279)

Some New Comments on the Relationship between the Dunhang Jiangjingwen and Transformation Texts ..... Zheng A-cai (303)

The Development of Bianwen (Transformation Texts) understood in Literary Perspective ..... ZHU Fengyu (323)

A Proposal on the Database of Dunhuang Manuscripts ..... FANG Guangchang, LI Jining and ZHU Lei (335)

Naitō Konan and Dunhuang Studies ..... Takata Tokio (353)

\* \* \* \* \*

The Re-discovery and the Value of the Lüshun Museum Version of *Platform Sūtra* ..... WANG Zhenfen (367)

The Evolution of the Figure and Notion on “Aupapaduka From Lotus” during Wei, Jin to Yuan Dynasty ..... YAO Xiaodong (381)

The Merit Fields Projects in the Dunhuang Buddhist Monasteries during the 8th to 11<sup>th</sup> centuries ..... CHEN Dawei (399)

A Research on Linghu-huaiji’s Gaoshen (Appointment Order) ..... TANG Xing (413)

.....	YOU Ziyong (429)
“The unknown Encyclopedia” in the Berlin Turfan-collection: A primary Study	..... HU Hong (441)
The Pitching-up and Study on the Fragments of Suojing’s <i>Yueyitie</i> Kept in Russia	..... CAI Yuandi (463)
Explanations of the Words in the Registration Texts Found in Dunhuang	..... Zhang Xiaoyan (485)
One Hundred years History of a Uigur Family and the old city of Gaochang	..... XU Wanling, ZHANG Mingxin (501)

## **Book Reviews**

LIU Jinbao, <i>The Dunhuangology in recent 100 years</i> .....	LIU Yi (507)
RONG Xinjiang, LI Xiao, MENG Xianshi eds. , <i>Newly Discovered Turfan Documents</i>	..... TAKATA Tokio (516)
Timothy Lenz, <i>Gandhāran Avadānas: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 1 – 3 and 21 and Supplementary Fragments A – C</i> .....	CHEN Ming (523)

<b>New Publications</b> .....	LI Yanhui (537)
<b>Introduction to the <i>Journal of Dunhuang and Turfan Studies</i></b> .....	(538)

## Lost in the *Daśottarasūtra*, Found in the *Kṣudrakavastu*

Jens-Uwe Hartmann

### 1. Introduction

The *Kṣudrakavastu* in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādins contains a whole cycle of stories connected with king Pradyota from Ujjayinī who, together with three other princes, is said to be born at the same time as the future Buddha. These stories are quite diverse, interesting, sometimes amusing, and at least one of them is very well-known, namely the romance of Udayana and Vāsavadattā. In some of them Bharata, a former farmer, plays a prominent role. Pradyota had appointed him as minister due to his cleverness, and it is a dialogue between this wise minister and the king which contains the passage that will be of interest here. The conversation is preceded by events that lead up to a heated exchange between Pradyota and his wife Śāntā in the course of which the king becomes so enraged — his wife has just smashed a pot on his head and thereby caused a certain amount of damage — that he orders Bharata to dispose of the unruly Śāntā. However, the minister, being farsighted enough to understand the temporariness of the king's fury, does not comply with the order. Instead, he has the queen vanish from the scene by removing her to a secret place. Soon after, the king apparently feels remorse and starts to inquire about his wife. This results in a long dialogue between Pradyota and his minister in which the king asks questions with regard to the presumed death of his wife and the wise minister answers by adducing aphorisms from the inexhaustible treasure store of old Indian *nīti* sayings and *subhāśitas*.

More than hundred years ago Anton Schiefner drew attention to the story when he published a German translation of the whole section of the *Kṣudrakavastu* in 1875,<sup>[1]</sup> and he was also the first to notice the *nīti* character of the answers when he translated the dialogue from Tibetan into Latin in the same year.<sup>[2]</sup> Many of the verses contain numerical items as, e. g., the verses in section 5 (three naked objects), 6 (three useless things), 7 (three things unused), 8 (three to be killed) according to Schiefner's numbering. Towards the end of the dialogue the number of items is growing: six in the verses of sections 42 – 44, seven in 45, eight in 46 – 48, nine in 49, and ten in 50 – 52. Probably it was this principle of the growing figures that induced the author (s) of the dialogue to include sections 49 – 52 with answers that contain nine and ten items, but otherwise break the formal scheme. Hitherto, the king had asked a prose question, and Bharata had responded by quoting a verse. In 49, all of a sudden he answers with a lengthy prose passage that suits the context, but not the previous format of the dialogue. The answer deals with dispelling nine kinds of anger (*mnar sems, āghāta*), a topic fitting very well with the behaviour of the irascible king, but its prose, consisting of repeated phrases, has nothing to do with the succinct and pointed wording of a *subhāṣita* verse. Rather, it reminds one of the characteristic diction of a Buddhist canonical text, and indeed this is the apparent source of the quotation.<sup>[3]</sup>

[1] Schiefner 1875b; for a summary of the stories around king Pradyota in the *Kṣudrakavastu* cf. Panglung 1981: 181 – 190.

[2] Schiefner 1875a. The most recent studies of the verses are Okada 1993 and Okada 1994; I wish to thank Michael Hahn, Marburg, for bringing them to my attention. The conversation between Pradyota and his minister with its relation to the topic of *nīti* has possibly served as a model for a talk between the same king and the Jaina follower Satyaka in a Mahāyāna sūtra, the *Bodhisattva-gocara-upāya-viṣaya-vikurvana-nirdeśa-sūtra* or *Satyakaparivarta*, on the topic of *rājanīti*, cf. Zimmermann 2000, esp. 187 with an extract from the Tibetan translation, and Jenkins 2010.

[3] Remarkably, in Yijing's Chinese translation of the *Kṣudrakavastu*, the answer is condensed into two verses, see Taishō 1451, vol. 24, 323c11 – 14. This entails a considerable abbreviation that removes the repetitive character and is thus no longer reminiscent of canonical prose. Most likely this is an accommodation to Chinese taste in such a narrative and otherwise very homogeneous passage (significantly, the next three sections are also entirely in prose in the Tibetan translation, but contain verses in the Chinese).

Groups of dogmatic terms in numerical order are collected in, among others, such texts as the *Daśottarasūtra* and the *Saṅgītisūtra*, both belonging to the *Dirghāgama*, the “Collection of Long (Discourses of the Buddha)”.<sup>[1]</sup> An inspection of the two sūtras quickly reveals that there is nothing about nine kinds of anger in the Sanskrit text of the *Saṅgītisūtra*. The *Daśottarasūtra*, however, must have contained such a group. This becomes evident from An Shigao’s translation into Chinese<sup>[2]</sup> and from a few fragments of Sanskrit manuscripts found in Central Asia. As the title indicates, the sūtra consists of decades of terminological groups. Altogether there are ten decades, and they are arranged in a growing order: the first decade contains ten groups consisting of a single term, the second decade ten groups of two terms, and so forth up to the tenth decade containing ten groups of ten terms each. Naturally, the nine kinds of anger belong to the ninth decade, and there they must have formed the sixth group, as indicated by the Chinese translation. However, the final section of the Sanskrit text with the decades nine and ten is so badly preserved that its first editor, Kusum Mittal, simply refrained from including them in her edition.<sup>[3]</sup> When Dieter Schlingloff later supplemented the two decades,<sup>[4]</sup> he also had to confine himself to presenting only a partial and rather tentative reconstruction of the nine kinds of anger and the way to dispel them. Two more fragments, one from the Hoernle Collection in London, the other from the Pelliot Collection in Paris, were identified in the nineties,<sup>[5]</sup> and a few years ago another two rather small fragments from the German Turfan Collection;<sup>[6]</sup> they brought more text, but no better understanding. It seemed that the passage would permanently resist reconstruction.

---

[1] For an overview of the Sanskrit version see Hartmann 2004.

[2] Taishō 13, cf. de Jong 1966: 14.

[3] Mittal 1957.

[4] Schlingloff 1962.

[5] Or. 15009/542 (Hoernle 149. add. 2), cf. Hartmann/Wille 1992: 43, and Pelliot Sanskrit Numéro bleu 334, cf. Hartmann/Wille 1997: 143.

[6] SHT 3579 and SHT 4333, cf. Wille 2008: 129 and 384f.

When I found the quotation in the story of king Pradyota, it raised new hopes. Against all expectations, the complete text of the passage lost in the manuscripts of the *Daśottarasūtra* had now become available. However, the Tibetan text is difficult to understand in some places, as will be seen below; it is not always easy to reconcile it with the text preserved in the Sanskrit fragments, and in one point it clearly deviates. A full reconstruction became possible only when another sizeable Sanskrit fragment contributed so much text that the remaining gaps could be closed and the structure of the passage fully understood. This time it was not a fragment from Central Asia, but a folio from the *Dirghāgama* manuscript possibly found in the Gilgit area that brought the solution. On one side, it preserves phrases mainly from the fifth group of the ninth decade, but it turned out that part of the wording must be identical in groups five and six. Group five describes nine kinds of anger as the nine factors that lead to (spiritual) decrease (*nava dharmā hānabhāgīyāḥ*), while group six takes up exactly these nine kinds and presents their dispelling as the nine factors that lead to progress (*nava dharmā viśeṣabhāgīyāḥ*).

## 2. Reconstruction of the Sanskrit text

At present, five different versions of the passage are available: first, a Pāli version in the *Saṅgīti-* and in the *Dasuttarasutta* of the *Dirghanikāya*; <sup>[1]</sup> second, a version of the *Daśottarasūtra* in a *Dirghāgama* of unknown school affiliation preserved only in a Chinese translation; <sup>[2]</sup> third, An Shigao's Chinese translation of the *Daśottarasūtra*; <sup>[3]</sup> fourth, the passage in the *Kṣudrakavastu* preserved only

[1] *Saṅgītisutta*, DN III 262, 32 – 263, 8, and (abbreviated) *Dasuttarasutta* DN III 289, 13 – 15.

[2] Taishō 1, vol. 1, 56b14 – 19. Nowadays it is generally ascribed to the school of the Dharmaguptakas. One of the first to study its language was Professor Ji (cf. Dschi 1944: 142 – 143) during the time he spent in Göttingen in the same academic environment that much later also initiated my own research on the various versions of the *Dirghāgama*. This is one of the reasons why I felt very close to him when in 1997 I had the honour and the pleasure to meet him in person in his nice house on the campus of Beida.

[3] Taishō 13, vol. 1, 239b23 – c24.

in Chinese and Tibetan translations;<sup>[1]</sup> and fifth, the Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia and Gilgit. There are now altogether seven Sanskrit fragments available:

1. *Dirghāgama* ms., fragment G3. 5 (Private Collection in Virginia): unpublished, see section 4 below for lines a4 – 8;
2. Or. 15009/542 (Hoernle 149. add. 2): unpublished, see section 4 below for lines r1 – 4;<sup>[2]</sup>
3. Pelliot Sanskrit Numéro bleu 334: unpublished, see section 4 below for lines r1 – 2;
4. SHT 652 (X 420), fragments g<sub>1</sub> and g<sub>2</sub>: published in Schlingloff 1962: 11;<sup>[3]</sup>
5. SHT 780 (X 708): published in Schlingloff 1962: 11;<sup>[4]</sup>
6. SHT 3579: published in Wille 2008: 129;
7. SHT 4333: published in Wille 2008: 384f.

Theoretically, An Shigao's translation, the *Kṣudrakavastu* and the Sanskrit fragments should represent the same version, namely that of the (Mūla-) Sarvāstivādins, but contrary to this expectation they all deviate from each other, and this makes it difficult to reconstruct and understand the Sanskrit with full confidence. Clearest is the version preserved in the Pāli canon and in the Chinese *Dirghāgama*. In short sentences it differentiates three situations, each in the three times past, present and future: somebody harmed me (harms me, will harm me), somebody harmed my friend (harms my friend, will harm my friend), and somebody benefitted my enemy (benefits my enemy, will benefit my enemy). The other versions basically follow the same distinction between myself,

---

[1] Taishō 1451, vol. 24, 323c8 – 14; Derge Kanjur, vol. *da*, fol. 22v6 – 23r6; Peking Kanjur, vol. *ne*, fol. 21r6 – v6.

[2] An excellent photograph is available from the homepage of the International Dunhuang Project (<http://idp.bl.uk/>) by searching for the manuscript number Or. 15009/542.

[3] In the light of the new material, the relation between the two pieces g<sub>1</sub> and g<sub>2</sub> has to be reconsidered; for a facsimile see Waldschmidt 1963: Tafel 102.

[4] Facsimile in Waldschmidt 1968: Tafel 174.

my friend and my enemy, but elaborate on it. In the Tibetan version of the *Kṣudrakavastu* *it is harm to me, then harm to someone who also harms me, and finally benefit to somebody who harms me*. Since the second point, namely harm to someone who harms me, is not normally a cause of anger, very likely this is a mistake for the order preserved in all the other versions.

Sanskrit text of *Daśottarasūtra* IX. 6 reconstructed from the seven fragments described above: [1]

**IX. 6 (1 – 3)** (1a7) nava dharmā viśeṣabhāgīyāḥ < | > ayam me anarthakāmaḥ (ahitakāmaḥ asukhakā) (7ra) m(aḥ) aspa(r) ś(akā) m(aḥ) a(yo) (1a8) gakṣemakāmaḥ anartham eṣo 'kārṣīt karoti kariṣyati vā < | > punaḥ tasyaivam bhavati tat (5r1) kuta etal labhyam parataḥ evam me bhavatv evam mā (bh) (7rb) ūd iti sa tasyāntike (utpannam āghātām prativinodayati |)

**IX. 6(4 – 6)** (yo vā punar me arthakā) (4ra) ma < h > h(i) ta(5r2) kāma < h > sukhakāma < h > sparśakāma < h > yogakṣemakā (mah tasyaiso 'narthakāmaḥ ahitakāmaḥ as) (2r1) ukhakāmaḥ asparśakāmaḥ ayogakṣemakāmaḥ (5r3) anartham asyaiṣo 'kār(4rb)ṣīt karoti kariṣya(ti vā | punas tasyaivam bhavati tat kuta etal labhyam parataḥ evam me bhavatv evam mā bhūd iti sa ta) (2r2) syāntike u(5r4) tpa(4rc) nnam āghātām prativinodayati |

**IX. 6(7 – 9)** yo vā pu(nar me anarthakāmaḥ ahitakāmaḥ asukhakāmaḥ asparśakāmaḥ ayogakṣemakāmaḥ tasyaiṣo) (3r1) 'rth(a)kāmo (hitakā) (2r3) mah (5r5) sukhakāmaḥ sparśakāmo yogakṣe(makāmaḥ artham asyaiṣo 'kārṣīt karoti

[1] Parentheses or round brackets ( ) signify restoration in a gap, square brackets [ ] damaged akṣaras or uncertain readings, pointed brackets < > an addition without gap, 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. Reconstructed text is additionally marked by italics. In the reconstruction the figures in round brackets refer to number and line of the seven Sanskrit fragments.

*kariṣyati vā | punas tasyaivam bhavati tat kuta eta) (3r2) | labhyam pa(rataḥ evam me bhavatv evam) (2r4; 5v1) mā bhūd iti sa tasyāntike utpannam āghā (tam prativinodayati |)*

**IX. 6(1 – 3)** Nine factors that lead to progress: [One thinks] “This one wishes harm, wishes disadvantage, wishes unhappiness, wishes unpleasant feeling, wishes spiritual failure upon me. He has done harm,<sup>[1]</sup> he is doing it or he is going to do it.” Again one thinks: “How is this acceptable on account of somebody else (to think: ) ‘He should be like this to me, he should not be like that!’ ”<sup>[2]</sup> Thus he dispels the anger which has arisen towards that person.

**IX. 6(4 – 6)** Or again, [one thinks] “This one wishes harm, wishes disadvantage, wishes unhappiness, wishes unpleasant feeling, wishes spiritual failure upon someone who wishes me well,<sup>[3]</sup> wishes advantage, wishes

[1] Tibetan adds *bdag la*, “to me”, or lost in the Sanskrit?

[2] For an understanding of this somewhat enigmatic sentence it is helpful to look at a passage in the *Saṅghabhedaśāstava* (Gnoli 1977/78: I 138, 14ff.) and in the *Catuspariṣaṣṭātra* (Waldschmidt 1952 – 1962: 164 with various parallels) on the egolessness of *rūpa* and *vijñāna*: ... *na ca labhyate rūpasyaivam* (resp. *vijñānasya*) *me rūpam* (resp. *vijñānam*) *bhavatu, evam mā bhūd iti*. Usually *tat kuta etal labhyam* forms a separate sentence, but here *parataḥ* appears to belong to it, since in both manuscripts where the word is fully preserved (1a8 and 5r1) there is no sandhi with the following *evam*. It is difficult to reconcile the Sanskrit with the Tibetan *gžan las bdag gi 'di ltar gyur na mi ruṇ bas bdag gi 'di kho na ltar 'gyur bar bya'o žes bya ba 'di 'grub par ga la 'gyur sñam nas*, “he thinks: ‘Since it would be wrong if it happened like this to me from another (person), it must happen to me only like this. How is this (thought) acceptable?’” There are several occurrences of the phrase *tat kuta etal labhyam*, one of them in the *Śrāvakabhūmi*, and interestingly enough there, too, follows a sentence with two imperatives, one of them negated, and the whole passage is connected with *āghātacitta*, cf. Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group 1998: 128 (similarly 190): *yathā svena lābhena sucittāḥ syām sumanāḥ, evam parasyāpi lābhena sucittāḥ syām sumanāḥ / evaṇcittāś ca punāḥ kulāny upasāṃkrameyam, tat kuta etal labhyam pravrajitena parakuleṣu yad dadatu me pare mā na dadatu / satkrtya, māsatkrtya, prabhūtām mā stokaṇi, prāṇītām mā lūham, tvaritām mā dhandham / evam caritasya (read evaṇcaritasya?) me kulāny upasāṃkramataḥ sacet pare na dadyus tenāham na teṣām antika āghātacittatayā pratīghacittatayā vyavādiryeyam* (for ms. readings, cf. *ibidem*, note 12). In the Tibetan translation the sentence *de lta bu lta ga la rñed*, the equivalent of *tat kuta etal labhyam*, concludes the whole phrase from *dadatu* to *dhandham*, cf. D 32v7 and P 39r7.

[3] According to the Tibetan, in all nine cases harm is wished upon the first person, and it is only the second person who is treated badly in cases 4 to 6 and treated well in cases 7 to 9. Line r2 of fragment 5, however, suggests that in cases 4 to 6 the first person is treated well since according to the number of missing akṣaras this line can only refer to the first person. This suggestion finds strong support in line r4 of fragment 1 which, although containing text of the preceding group of nine items, follows the same scheme.

happiness, wishes pleasant feeling, wishes spiritual success. He has done him harm, he is doing it or he is going to do it.” Again one thinks: “How is this acceptable on account of somebody else (to think: ) ‘ He should be like this to me, he should not be like that! ’ ” and thus he dispels the anger which has arisen towards that person.

**IX. 6 (7 – 9)** Or again, [one thinks] “This one wishes well, wishes advantage, wishes happiness, wishes pleasant feeling, wishes spiritual success upon someone who wishes harm, wishes disadvantage, wishes unhappiness, wishes unpleasant feeling, wishes spiritual failure upon me. He has done him good, he is doing it or he is going to do it.” Again one thinks: “How is this acceptable on account of somebody else (to think: ) ‘ He should be like this to me, he should not be like that! ’ ” and thus he dispels the anger which has arisen towards that person.

### 3. The Tibetan parallel in the Kṣudrakavastu

Here the explanation of the nine kinds is preceded by the following introduction: “(The minister) said: ‘ Your majesty, haven’ t you heard of taming the nine (kinds of) anger?’ ‘ What are the nine, Bharata?’ Your majesty, one thinks: ‘ This one wishes me harm, wishes disadvantage . . . ’ ”

des smras pa | lha | kun nas mnar sems dgu ’dul ba žes bgyi ba khyod kyis  
ma gsan (P bsan) tam | gsos pa dgu gañ yin |

**IX. 1 – 3** lha ’di ni bdag la gnod par ’dod pa phan pa ma yin par ’dod pa bde  
ba ma yin par ’dod pa reg pa ma yin par ’dod pa | grub pa dañ bde ba ma yin par  
(deest D) sñam mo | yañ de ’di sñams du sems te | gžan las bdag gi ’di ltar gyur  
na mi ruñ bas (ba P) bdag gi ’di [D 23r] kho na ltar ’gyur bar bya’o žes bya ba  
skyes pa sel bar byed do |

**IX. 4 – 6** 'di ni gañ žig bdag la gnod par 'dod pa phan pa ma yin par 'dod pa | bde ba ma yin par 'dod pa | reg (rig D) pa ma yin par 'dod pa | grub pa dañ bde ba ma yin par 'dod pa | de la gnod par 'dod pa | phan pa ma yin par 'dod pa | bde ba ma yin par 'dod pa | reg pa ma yin par 'dod pa | grub pa dañ bde ba ma yin par 'dod pa ste | 'dis de la gnod pa byas so byed do byed par 'gyur ro | (deest D) sñam mo | yañ de 'di sñam du sems te | (deest P) gžan las bdag gi 'di ltar gyur ('gyur P) na mi ruñ bas bdag gis 'di kho na ltar 'gyur bar bya'o žes bya ba 'di 'grub par ga la 'gyur sñam nas | de de la kun nas mnar sems skyes pa sel bar byed do |

**IX. 7 – 9** 'di ni gañ žig bdag la gnod par 'dod pa | phan pa ma yin par 'dod pa | bde ba ma yin par 'dod pa | reg pa ma yin par 'dod pa | grub pa dañ bde ba ma yin par 'dod pa | de la don du 'dod pa | phan par 'dod pa | bde bar 'dod pa | reg par 'dod pa | grub pa dañ bde bar 'dod pa ste | 'dis de la phan pa byas (byes P) so byed do byed par 'gyur ro sñam mo | yañ de 'di sñam du sems te | gžan las bdag gis 'di ltar gyur ('gyur P) na mi ruñ bas bdag gis 'di kho na ltar 'gyur bar bya'o žes bya ba 'di 'grub par ga la 'gyur sñam nas | de de la kun nas mnar sems skyes pa sel bar byed do |

#### 4. Unpublished Sanskrit fragments

##### 1. *Dirghāgama* ms., fragment G3.5 (Private Collection in Virginia)<sup>(1)</sup>

a4   /// + + y[ogak]ṣ. [m]akāmaḥ anartham eṣo ○ /// ... /// k. āghātam utpādayati | [y]. . . . [u] . . . [m]. . . . [th]. [k]. [m]. h[i] takā[m]. ///

a5   /// . . . gakṣemakāmaḥ tasyaiṣo narthakāma ○ /// . . . /// [a] sparśakāmaḥ ayogakṣemakāmaḥ anartham asyaiṣo kārṣit karoti kariṣya . . . ///

a6   /// + + āghātam utpādayati yo vā puna ○ r me anarthakāmaḥ a . i . . . . . h asukhakāmaḥ asparśakāmaḥ ayogakṣemakāmaḥ tasyaiṣo rthakāmo hi . . . . . //

(1) It is not clear whether this is the recto or the verso side, since several folios are still sticking together. The first transliteration was made by Klaus Wille, Göttingen, who kindly put it at my disposal.

a7 // + + . o[gak] . e[mak] āmah artham asyaiśo kārṣīt karoti kariṣyati  
vā punah sa tasyā[ntik] . . . ā . m utpādayati nava dharmā viśeṣabhāgīyāḥ  
ayam me anarthakāmāḥ + //

a8 // + + + + + + + + . . gakṣemakāmāḥ anartham eṣo  
kārṣīt \* karoti kariṣyati vā punah tasyaivam bhavati tat kuta etal labhyam parataḥ  
evam me bhavatv evam mā . . i + + //

2. Or. 15009/542 (Hoernle 149/Add. 2), folio no. 10 . .

r1 . [ukh] . k[ā] . . . . [p] . rśakā[m] . <sup>[1]</sup>ayogakṣemakāma ana[r] tham  
a[s].[ai] //

r2 syāntike utpāṇnam āghataṁ prativinodayati | yo vā pu . . //

r3 mah syakhakāmāḥ<sup>[2]</sup> sparśakāmo yo ○ gakṣe . . //

r4 mā bhūd iti sa ta[syā] ntike utpāṇnam ā ○ ghā[t] . m.[r] . //

3. Pelliot Sanskrit Numéro bleu 334

r1 // [ar] th. kām[o] //

r2 // + [l l] abhyam pa //

## Appendix

With the help of the *Dirghāgama* ms. it is possible to reconstruct also *Daśottarasūtra* IX. 5 on the basis of IX. 6:

**IX. 5 (1 – 3)** (*nava dharmā hānabhāgīyāḥ* | *ayam me anarthakāmāḥ*  
*ahitakāmāḥ asukhakāmāḥ asparśakāmāḥ a*) (1a4) *yogakṣ(e) makāmāḥ anartham*  
*eṣo (‘kārṣīt karoti kariṣyati vā | punah sa tasyānti) k(e) āghātam utpādayati |*

**IX. 5(4 – 6)** *y(o vā p) u(nar) m(e ar) th(a) k(ā) m(ah) hitakām(ah)*

[1] The first akṣaras in the beginning of the line are partly covered by a white material, and the correct text is written on that material; this is a very unusual way of correcting the text. The akṣara *rśa* is added below the line.

[2] Mistake for *sukhakāmāḥ*.

*sukhakāmaḥ sparśakāmaḥ yo*) (1a5) gakṣemakāmaḥ tasyaiṣo ' 'narthakāma (ḥ  
ahitakāmaḥ asukhakāmaḥ) asparśakāmaḥ ayogakṣemakāmaḥ anartham asyaiṣo  
' kārṣīt karoti kariṣya(ti vā | punaḥ sa tasyāntike) (1a6) āghātam utpādayati <|>

**IX. 5(7 – 9)** yo vā punar me anarthakāmaḥ a(h) i(*takāma*) ḥ asukhakāmaḥ  
asparśakāmaḥ ayogakṣemakāmaḥ tasyaiṣo ' 'rthakāmo hi (*takāmaḥ sukhakāmaḥ*  
*sparśakāmo y*) (1a7) ogak(ṣ) emakāmaḥ artham asyaiṣo ' 'kārṣīt karoti kariṣyati vā  
<|> punaḥ sa tasyāntik(e āgh) ā(ta) m utpādayati <|>

**Acknowledgements:** I would like to thank Paul Harrison, Walter Slaje, Klaus Wille and the current members of our manuscript reading group in Munich — Oliver von Criegern, Habata Hiromi, Hou Haoran, Jowita Kramer, Adelheid Mette and Chanwit Tudkeao — for various useful comments and suggestions.

## Bibliography

### DN III

*The Dīgha Nikāya*, ed. T. W. Rhys Davids, J. Estlin Carpenter, Vol. 3, London 1911 (Pali Text Society)

Dschi 1944

Dschi, Hiän-lin [Ji Xianlin]: "Die Umwandlung der Endung *-am* in *-o* und *-u* im Mittelindischen," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse*, Jahrgang 1944, Nr. 6, Göttingen 1944, 121 – 144

Gnoli 1977/78

Raniero Gnoli: The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabheda-vastu, 2 vols., Roma 1977 – 78 (Serie Orientale Roma, 49)

Hartmann 2004

Jens-Uwe Hartmann: "Contents and Structure of the *Dirghāgama* of the

(Mūla-) Sarvāstivādins,” *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University 7* (2004), 119 – 137

Hartmann/Wille 1992

Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Klaus Wille: “Die nordturkistanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften der Sammlung Hoernle (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, II),” *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neu entdeckungen und Neueditionen*, 2, Göttingen 1992, 9 – 63

Hartmann/Wille 1997

Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Klaus Wille: “Die nordturkistanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften der Sammlung Pelliot (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, IV),” *Untersuchungen zur buddhistischen Literatur II*, ed. Heinz Bechert, Sven Bretfeld und Petra Kieffer-Pülz, Göttingen 1997, 131 – 182

Jenkins 2010

Stephen Jenkins: “Making Merit through Warfare According to the Ārya-Bodhisattva-gocara-upāyavīśaya-vikurvaṇa-nirdeśa Sūtra,” *Buddhist Warfare*, ed. Michael Jerryson, Mark Juergensmeyer, New York 2010, 59 – 75

de Jong 1966

J. W. de Jong: “The Daśottarasūtra”, *Kanakura Hakushi koki Kinen: Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Ronshū*, Kyōto 1966, 3 – 25 (= J. W. de Jong: *Buddhist Studies*, ed. Gregory Schopen, Berkeley 1979, 251 – 273)

Mittal 1957

Kusum Mittal: *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus, I: Fragmente des Daśottarasūtra aus zentralasiatischen Sanskrit-Handschriften [I – VIII]*, Berlin 1957 (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, 4)

Okada 1993

Okada Yukihiro: “Konpon ubu ritsu no Niti — Bharata no kyōkun” [“A niti text in the Vinayakṣudrakavastu — The teaching of Bharata”], *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 42. 1 (1993), (45)–(51) = 502 – 496

Okada 1994

Okada Yukihiro: “Bharata no kyōkun — zōkan tekisutu oyobi wayaku” [“The teaching of Bharata — Tibetan and Chinese texts together with a Japanese translation”], *Kōbe joshi daigaku Seto tanki daigaku, Gakujutsukiyō* 5, March 1994, 15 – 28

Panglung 1981

Jampa Losang Panglung: *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya analysiert auf Grund der tibetischen Übersetzung*, Tokyo 1981 (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series, 3)

Schiefner 1875a

*Bharatae responsa tibetice cum versio latina ab Antonio Schiefner edita*, Petripoli 1875

Schiefner 1875b

Anton Schiefner: *Mahākātjājana und König Tshanda-Pradjota. Ein Cyklus buddhistischer Erzählungen*, St. Petersburg 1875 (Mémoires de l’Académie Impériale des Sciences de St. Pétersbourg, 7. série, 22, 7)

Schlingloff 1962

Dieter Schlingloff: *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus, Ia: Daśottarasūtra IX – X*, Berlin 1962 (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, 4a)

Śrāvakabhūmi Study Group 1998

*Śrāvakabhūmi, The First Chapter*, Revised Sanskrit Text and Japanese

Translation, Tokyo 1998 (Taishō University Sōgō Bukkyō Kenyūjo, 4)

Taishō

*Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*, ed. Takakusu Junjirō and Watanabe Kaikyoku, 100 vols., Tōkyō 1924 – 1935

Waldschmidt 1952 – 1962

Ernst Waldschmidt: *Das Catuśpariṣatsūtra*, Teil I – III, Berlin 1952 – 1962 (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin 1952, 2, 1956, 1, 1960, 1)

Waldschmidt 1963

Ernst Waldschmidt: *Faksimile-Wiedergaben von Sanskrithandschriften aus den Berliner Turfanfunden I: Handschriften zu fünf Sūtras des Dirghāgama*, The Hague 1963

Waldschmidt *et al.* 1968

Ernst Waldschmidt *et al.*: *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil 2, Wiesbaden 1968 (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, X, 2)

Wille 2008

Klaus Wille: *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil 10, Stuttgart 2008 (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, X, 10)

Zimmermann 2000

Michael Zimmermann: “A Mahāyānist Criticism of *Arthaśāstra*: The Chapter on Royal Ethics in the *Bodhisattva-gocaropāya-viśaya-vikurvaṇa-nirdeśa-sūtra*,” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute of Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 3(2000), 177 – 211