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At the end of the last century, news of the existence of the only known surviving manuscript of a Sanskrit Dīrghāgama [DĀ] spread among scholars. Since then a number of articles have appeared on the subject, for the most part by J.-U. Hartmann.1 The birch bark manuscript is fairly complete, and its original contents can be reconstructed from uddānas.2 Sold on the oriental book market in several bundles, parts of the manuscript are now in the possession of private collections in the United States of America, in Japan, with some fragments in Norway. It was in 2002 that my friend Professor Kazunobu Matsuda (Bukkyo University, Kyoto) offered me the opportunity to publish the Āṭānāṭiya- [ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit)] and the Mahāsamāja-Sūtra from the section of the manuscript that is kept in the Hirayama Collection in Kamakura.3 The large folios are about 9.5 to 10 cm wide and about 50 cm long.

* This article based on a paper I read during my stay in the International College for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies in Tokyo in December 2004. I feel bound to say thanks to all my colleagues, who made my stay in the College one of the most intriguing and inspiring times of my life. In first place I thank Professor Imanishi, who kindly invited me, and Professor Ilara for all his support. Both have always had an open ear for my problems. I also got support in every respect from Professor Deleanu, Professor Durt and Mr. Hori. Izawasan was my friendly and competent guide, not to forget the helpful staff of the library and the office.—My further thanks go to Professor Karashima, Dr. Skilling and last, but not least to Dr. Dietz. They supported my work with many suggestions. Peter Skilling was so kind to correct my English.

3 My sincere thanks go to Mrs Hirayama, who perfectly restored the folios. I had the
They are written in a variety of „Gilgit-Bāmiyān, Type II“, which is not the earliest form of the script, and they probably date to the 8th century. The script and the neat formatting of the folios resemble the Gilgit manuscripts. It is probable, although not absolutely sure, that the manuscript originated from this area. The ĀṭānSū is written on six and a half nearly complete pages ranging from folio 348 (obverse) to 354 (reverse, line four). It is written by a skilled hand in eight lines with a square string hole in the lines three to six measuring 3.5 to 3.5 cm. Moreover, it is a fairly good copy with not too many

pleasure to meet her in Kamakura together with my friends Professor Kazunobu Matsuda, Professor Jens Braarvig and Professor Jens-Uwe Hartmann in November 2000. Professor Matsuda provided me with all material needed for the edition.

4 How problematic it is to find a suitable name for this script, which is the basis for many North Indian alphabets, is detailed by Sander 2007 (forthcoming). For convenience I use the name for this script that I established (1968: 137).—Further remains of manuscripts written in the same type of script are known from the Bāmiyān area and from graffiti and inscriptions at the Upper Indus Valley (Fussman 1978, von Hinüber 1989a, b, 1994, 1997, 1999, 2001, 2003, 2004). The first manuscripts from Bāmiyān were found by Hackin; most of them formerly housed in the Kabul Museum (cf. Lévi 1932). Other fragments most probably originate from a different place in the same area. They now belong to the Martin Schøyen Collection in Norway. According to a first impression, which needs further investigation, the arrangement of the script on the folios from Bāmiyān differs slightly from that of the Gilgit manuscripts. Furthermore, most of them are written in a somewhat earlier type, using exclusively a tri-partite ya, which is not present in the ĀṭānSū(Gilgit). According to oral information of Gudrun Melzer both types of ya occur side by side in other Sūtras in the same DĀ manuscript.

5 The manuscript was sent for being tested by Sam Fogg in 2001. The radiocarbon date with 90% probability ranges between 764 and 1000; cf. Allon et al. 2007 forthcoming BMSC III. Our thanks go to our British colleagues Somadev Vasudev and Lance Cousins for providing us with all the information they gathered about the manuscript and the work they have already done on it.

6 Gudrun Melzer was so kind to show me the relevant chapter of her Ph. D. thesis, which has the title “Ein Abschnitt aus dem Dīrghāgama“. For the first time she could convincingly show how ancient manuscripts were copied by a team of copyists. Her analysis is a model for further work with composite manuscripts.
scribal mistakes. Hartmann (2004: 121-128) showed in his analysis of the uddānas that it is Sūtra no. 32 and that it belongs to the yuganipāta "The Twin Chapter" of the DĀ. In the light of their contents the Āṭānātiyā- and the Mahāsamāja-Sūtra (no. 33) make up a pair. That both Sūtras are rakṣās, protection texts, appearing in the same sequence in a list of Mahāsūtras in the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.

That this Sūtra was popular on the northern Silk Route—under the variant title Āṭānātika-Sūtra [ĀṭānSū(CASkt)]—is shown by the fact that fragments of 28 Sanskrit manuscripts have come down to us. Moreover, translations into the Uigur language written in Brāhmī and Uigur script demonstrate its importance for the Buddhist communities and lay followers, although little of the manuscripts survive. Only one early manuscript (cat.-no. 33) contains remains from many parts of the text, but in a very fragmentary state. It originates from the annexes of the "Rotkuppelhöhlle" (Chinese: Caves 66-67), and can be dated palaeographically into the 5th to 6th centuries (Sander 1968, alphabet q). Another fragmentary manuscript (cat.-no. 175) from the same find-spot consists of four nearly complete folios, which are of small size and therefore contain only little text. Two folios (36, 37) preserve text from the beginning, one folio (55) from the middle, and another folio ([6]X) from the end of the Sūtra. The four folios belong to a younger

---

7 Hartmann (2004: 122) remarks at the end of his discussion about the yuganipāta: "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."

8 Cf. Skilling vol. II 1997: 54 and 56. For the problem of whether the Sarvāstivādin and the Mūlasarvāstivādin were distinct schools cf. Enomoto 2000: 239-250.


10 Zieme 2005: 31-45.

11 The Uigur fragment U 3831+3832 (no.1) published by Zieme (2005: 31) is a good example of the use of this powerful protective spell in daily cult. The concertina book clearly indicates that the two fragments were separately pinned on a wall for giving protection. Cf. also Skilling vol. II 1997: 559.
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copy than cat.-no. 33 is, and may be roughly dated into the 7th century (Sander 1968, alphabet t). These are the two only manuscripts which can give a vague idea of how the Sanskrit text looked. Only isolated folios exist from other manuscripts, which are often very fragmentary. Although traces of this Sūtra have been found in the monasteries of the oasis towns along the northern Silk Route,12 most manuscripts originate from Qizil. Judging from their script, they were written during a period of 200 years or more (ca. 6th to 8th century, or even later). Cat.-no. 33 was part of a DĀ manuscript, as is indicated by the textual sequence Śaṅkaraka- and Āṭānātiya-Sūtra.13 But not all of the Āṭānātiya texts belonged to DĀ manuscripts. Some belonged to other compilations with a different sequence of Sūtras, as shown by two fragmentary folios, cat.-no. 681b and cat.-no. 173a, which contain the end of the Dvajāgra- and the Daśabala-Sūtra(1) respectively, both are followed by the Āṭānātiya-Sūtra. Moreover, the status of this Sūtra as a powerful protective text suggests that it was often copied alone, in its own right. Most fragments are too small to be assigned to any of these categories, but their phrasing indicates that they belong to the same Buddhist school, the Sarvāstivāda.

Hoffmann’s 1939 edition of the Sanskrit text would not have been possible without the help of the Tibetan translation, and the many internal repetitions that are integrated into the text. Hoffmann reconstructed many parts of the text, based on considerably less evidence than that available today. Despite his learned attempt, doubts remain about some of his reconstructions in the light of the new material. For example, because the Sanskrit text has so many lacunae, he used the fragmentary leaf cat.-no. 31 (Hoffmann: 517) in his

12 Most fragments originate from Qizil, fewer from Šorčuq (Qarašahr) in the west of the northern Silk Route and only some from eastern find-spots, such as Sāṅgim or Murtuq, from where also most of the fragments in Uigur language originate; cf. Maue 1985: 101 and Zieme 2005: 31-45.

reconstruction, even though he himself had serious doubts about it, realizing that this fragment differs much in wording. These parts of the text can be improved by the more recently identified fragments. But even with the better textual situation lacunas remain, especially in the metrical parts. Moreover, there are uncertainties when the wording of the fragmentary manuscripts differs only slightly. Some fragments are closer to the text of ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) than others.\footnote{E.g. cat.-no. 33, 681b and 1242.}

Only in rare cases were Hoffmann’s reconstructions based on wrong reading, something which easily happens when only a part of an akṣara is readable. One example is the phrase with which Vaiśravaṇa makes known the names of the Kumbhāṇḍas and their leaders before the Lord (Hoffmann 1939: 63 = MIAKPh 1987: 79): \textit{kīrtayi syāmi bhadanta bhagavataḥ purataḥ kumbhāṇḍaḥ nāṃ mahakumbhāṇḍa(nāṃ\footnote{Hoffmann 1939: 22 (=MIAKPh 1987: 38) 459.4 (=cat.-no. 165) R4 reads \textit{(kumbhāṇḍa)}ʃaʃam and annotated „Lies: \textit{kumbhāṇḍanam}“. His reading has to be corrected to \textit{(kumbhā}ʃaʃam).} senāpatināṃ seṇāyaḥ paricā(rakṣanāṃ namani tadyathā), “Venerable Ones, I make known before the Lord the names of the Kumbhāṇḍas, the Great Kumbhāṇḍas, the Generals and the Leaders of the army”. Little remains of three fragments\footnote{Cat.-no. 1189v3, cat.-no. 165v3-4, and cat.-no. 959r5. Only cat.-no. 165v3-4 (=459) was at Hoffmann’s disposal, and it is difficult to read; see also note 19.} clearly show that the enumeration uses the accusative \textit{kumbhāṇḍān} and not genitive \textit{kumbhāṇḍānāṃ}, and that therefore Hoffmann’s addition of adding \textit{nāmāni} in his reconstruction was influenced by the Tibetan translation\footnote{Cf. Hoffmann 1939: 62 [=MIAKPh 1987: 78] and Skilling Vol. I 1994: 506.5.1: ... \textit{kiy mi}n (name) \textit{bryod} par \textit{bgyi} lags so. I owe this reference to Siglinde Dietz.} although not supported by the manuscripts. This example further indicates that the wording preserved in the manuscripts from the northern Silk Route is closer to that of ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) than Hoffmann’s edition suggests; the latter reads \textit{kīrtayisyāmy aham bhadanta bhagavataḥ purasthat kumbhāṇḍan mahakumbhāṇḍan kumbhāṇḍasenaṇāpatī(m)}.}
Another problem concerns language. The manuscripts do not always follow the rules of classical Sanskrit. Hoffmann harmonizes the slightly differing readings according to the rules of classical Sanskrit and ignores traces of spoken language as, e.g., alpha privativum, which is preferred to sandhi in the most Central Asian manuscripts. In contrast, the new ĀṭānŚū (Gilgit) manuscript observes the sandhi rules more strictly, which speaks in favour of a revision on the basis of written texts.

For the reasons mentioned, a new edition can hardly be without errors. However, it is useful to undertake the effort, because, especially in the later part, Hoffmann’s text has many gaps, which can partly be filled by new fragments. In spite of the possibility of improving the text, one should never lose sight of the poor textual situation. Only in rare cases is the text preserved in more than one fragment, but this is necessary to affirm the reading and give a solid basis for the reconstruction.

In the following the condition of the text of the ĀṭānŚū(CASkt) is demonstrated by a survey of the fragments from the beginning of the Śūtra. This survey shows dramatically how little text survives, even though four more fragments (cat.-no. 681b, 1242b, 173a, and IOL Toch. 355) were identified after Hoffmann’s edition was published. It also displays scribal errors, and in rare cases slightly diverging versions; both will be noted.

**Cat.-no.**

175, fol. 37 r1: evām mayā śrutam ekasamayam bhagavām śrāvastyaṃ
viharati

174 r4: ... m.y. ru ...

681b v4: ... ś(r)āvastyāṃ\textsuperscript{20} ni(dā)nām\textsuperscript{21}

175, fol. 37 r2: smāj jetavane anāthapiṇḍadārāme

175, fol.37 r2-3: atha vaiśravaṇo mahārāja\textsuperscript{22} anekayakṣaṇataparivāraḥ

33.11 r2: ... ś(a)t(aparivā)raḥ

174 r3: ... rā(ja) anekayakṣaṇat(a) ...

681b v4: atha vaiśravaṇ(o) ...

1242b vy: ... (ya)kṣaṇatapari...

175, fol.37 r3-4: anekayakṣasaḥsraparivāraḥ atikrāntavarnaḥ

33.11 r2: anekayakṣas(a)h(a)srapari(vāraḥ) ...

IOL Toch.355 rb: ... (saha)srapa(r)i/vār(aḥ) atikrāmt(a) ...

681b v5-6: (a)nekayakṣasaḥsra(parivāraḥ anekayakṣaṇatasahas-ra)parivāraḥ atikr(ā) ...

\textsuperscript{20} The restored akṣaras or words are written in round bracket. Virāma is marked by an asterisk.

\textsuperscript{21} The opening of the Sūtra differs from that in the other manuscripts using the abbreviated form śrāvastīyāṃ nīdānāṃ; see other examples in SWTF nīdāna(3). In the early DĀ manuscripts cat.-no. 32 and 33 from Qizil the complete wording interchanges with the abbreviated form; cf. SHT 4: 109, 130, 137 (cat.-no.32), 159, 164, 171 (cat.-no.33). Wille (SHT 8: 198) rightly remarks that the fragments cat.-no. 681b and 1242b had most likely the same wording as ĀṭānŚū(Tib) and therefore are also closer to ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit).

\textsuperscript{22} Read mahārāja; annotated by Hoffmann 1939: 18 (=MIAKPh 1987: 34), note 5.
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175, fol.37 r4-5: abhikrāntāyām rātrau yena bhagavāṃs tenopajagāma

175, fol.37 r5-6: upetya bhagavatpādau śirasā vantitvā ekante nyaśīdad

33.11 r3: upetya bhag(a)v(at)pād(au) ś(i)r(a)sā vantitvā ek(ānte nya)śīdat* ...

165.26 va: (upet)y(a) bhag(a)v(a) ...

174 r4: ... (ekā)n(te) nyaśīdad

175, fol.37 r6-v1: apiḍ(ānīṃ) vaiśravaṇasya mahārājñāḥ varṇānubhāvena

174 r4: apiḍānīṃ vaiśr(avaṇa)sy(a ma)h(ā)r(ā) ...

IOL Toch. 355 rc: ... rājñō varṇānubh. ...

175, fol. 37 v1-2: sarvvaṃ jeta(va)nam udāreṇāvabhāsenā sphuṭam abhūt*

33.11 r4: sarvaṃ jetavanam udāreṇāvabhāsenā sphiu ...

165.26 vb ... (s)phuṭam abhūd

175, fol.37 v2-3: ekāntaniśāṇaḥ vaiśravapo mahārājā tasyaṃ velāyāṃ gāthā25 babhāсе

33.11 r4-5: ekānt(a) ... (velāyāṃ)

---

23 vantitvā for vantitvā indicates that this manuscript was probably copied by a Tokharian. The Tokharian language does not distinguish between tenuis and media as the Sanskrit does. Cf. Krause-Thomas 1960: 39-42.

24 Scribal error for ekante; cf. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (=MIAKPh 1987: 35), note 1. Judging from the classical Sanskrit this manuscript has many orthographic mistakes. Furthermore, the sign for -a as a prolongation of the head-line is not very pronounced and may therefore easily mixed up with -a.

25 Anusvāra omitted by the scribe.
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gāthāṁ babhāše
165.26 vb:  e(ka)nta²⁶...
174 r5:  ... m(a)harājā.-s²⁷tasyāṁ vel(āyām)
gāthāṁ babhā(ṣe) ∥

175, fol.37 v4–5:  namastu te mahāvīra saṃbuddha dvipadottamaḥ
33.11 r5:  namastu te mahāvīra saṃ(buddha) dv(i)p(ad)o ...
IOL Toch. 355 rd:  ... te mahāvī(ṣa) ...  

175, fol.37 v5–6:  na tad devāḥ prajānanti yat prajānāsi cakṣumān*²⁶
165.26 vc:  ... y(a)t prajānāsi cakṣuṣ(mān)
180 ra:  ... (pra)jā(na)nti yat pra ...
174 r6:  ... n*  

175, fol.37–38 v6–r1: prayutpannān²⁹ atītāṃś ca ye ca buddhā anagatāḥ³⁰
174 r6:  (p)r(a)tyutpannam atītāṃś ca ye ca buddh(ā) anāgataḥ³¹

175, fol.38 r1:  sarvān ahaṃ namasyāmi tvam³² cāhaṃ saraṇam gataḥ ∥
174 r6:  sarvān āh(ām)³² ...  

175, fol.38 r1–3:  tadyathā | bilimāha | balimele | purā | pure | ghori |

²⁶ "ka" omitted by the scribe.
²⁷ Read mahārājā.-s. is often inserted before t* by this scribe; see also below vidūtā-s.
tasyām.
²⁹ Read prayutpannam.
³⁰ Read anāgataḥ; scribal error; cf. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (=MIAKPh 1987: 35), note 7.
³¹ Read anāgataḥ; scribal error. Hoffmann 1939: 23 (=MIAKPh 1987: 39) read anāgataḥ, but 'ta is very sure.
168 Preliminary remarks on two versions of the Āṭānāṭṭya-Sûtra (Sander)

gandhāri |
174 r7: ... (ga)ndhāri |

175, fol.38 r3–4: cori | caṇḍāli | sopakke | stulasāpati33 | padumāpati svāha |34
174 r7: sobake | sthulasāpati | padumāpati svāhā35

175, fol.38 r4–5: santi bhadanta bhagavataḥ śrāvakah bhikṣavo bhikṣunyaḥ36
165.26 vd: ... (bhikṣav)o bhikṣunya
33.11 v1: ... (ś)r(āvakaḥ bhikṣavo bhikṣu)ṇya)

175, fol.38 r4–5: upāsakā upāsikāḥ37 ye aranyavanaprasthāni prāntāni 
śayanāsanāny adhyāvatasanti
165.26 vd: upās(akā up)āsikā ye a ...
180 rb: ... (u)pāsikā ye ...
174 r8: ... prasthāni prāntāni śayanāny38 adhy(ā) ... 
33.11 v2: ... (adhyāva)s(ām)ti

175, fol.38 v1–2: santi cātra vyāḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā nivasikā39 ye 
bhagavatpravacane
33.11 v2: santi cātra(va) v(yā)ḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā (naivasī)k(ā) ...

33 Read sthula; scribal error.
34 This mantra is missing in cat.-no. 33.11 and 165.26 as already annotated by 
35 cori | caṇḍāli | omitted in this manuscript.
36 Read śrāvaka and bhikṣunya. Cf. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (= MIAKPh 1987: 35), note 11 
and 12.
38 “āsanāny” omitted by the scribe.
175, fol.38 v2: abhiprasannā abhiprasannāḥ ca

174 v1: ... (a)n(a)bhiprasannāḥ ca

165.26 ve: ... (an)abhiprasannaḥ (ca)

33.11 v3: (a)lpatarāṣ te vyāḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā naiv(āṣikā) ye bhag(avyatpravacane)\textsuperscript{40}

174 v1: alpatarāṣ te vy(āḍā ya)kṣā ...

175, fol.38 v2–4: atha ca punas te bahutara\textsuperscript{41} vyāḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā naivāṣikā

33.11 v4: (atha ca pun)as te(b) bahutarā v(y)āḍ(ā) yak(ṣā) amanuṣyā naiv(āṣikā)

165.26 ve: (atha ca pu)nas te bahutarā vyāḍ̄a) ...

175, fol.38 v4: ye bhagavatpravacane abhiprasannāḥ\textsuperscript{42}

33.11 v5: ye bhag. ...

175, fol.38 v5: sādhu bhadanta bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhikṣavo bhikṣu-nyāḥ\textsuperscript{43}

33.11 v5: ... (bha)gav(ataḥ śrā)vakāḥ bhikṣavo bhī(ksu)nyāḥ

175, fol.38 v5–6: upāsakā-ṃ\textsuperscript{44} upāṣikā idam eva ātānāṭikāṃ sūtraṃ vidyāṃ

33.11 v5: upāsakā ...

\textsuperscript{40} This sentence is omitted in cat.-no. 175, fol. 38.
\textsuperscript{41} Read bahutara; scribal error.
\textsuperscript{42} Read anabhiprasannāḥ; cf. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (= MIAKPH 1987: 35), note 20.
\textsuperscript{43} Read bhikṣunyāḥ; cf. also Hoffmann 1939 (= MIAKHPH 1987: 35), note 21. See also note 36.
\textsuperscript{44} Hiatus bridger; cf. BIHS 4.59.
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174 v2: ... (u)pāsako\textsuperscript{45} vā upāsikā vā ye idam eva ātā(ṇāṭikām s)ū(traṃ) ...

165.26 vf: ... ama(ṇuṣyā vā ye) idam eva ātā\textsuperscript{46} ...

33.11 v6: ... udgrhṇīyuh ...

174 v3: (yakṣā)ṇāṃ amanuṣyānāṃ naïvāsikānāṃ abhiprasādāḥ prasannānāṃ

33.12 r1: ... (ama)nuṣyānāṃ naï(vāsikānāṃ abhiprasādāya abhiprasannā)nāṃ ca ...

IOL Toch. 355 vb: ... (naivāsikānā)ṃ abhiprasā(dāya) ...

33.12 r2: ... (ma)hārājñās tūṣñī(ṃbhāvena ||)

33.12 r2: (atha vaiśravaṇo mahārājā) bhagavatas ...

174 v4: ... (mahārājā) bhagavatas tūṣñīṃbhāvenādhivāsanāṃ viditvā-s\textsuperscript{47}-tas(yāṃ) ...

IOL Toch. 355 vb: ... (tū)ṣñīṃbhāv(e) ...

33.13 r3: ... (purata)ḥ

\textsuperscript{45} Hoffmann (1939: 23 [=MIAKPh 187: 39, note 6) annotated the different wording; singular is used for the enumeration of followers, each separated by vā. Because singular is used for plural, ye is not “unnecessary” (“überflüssig”) as Hoffmann remarks. See also cat.-no. 165.26vf, which seems to have had a different wording. See note 46.

\textsuperscript{46} The fragmentary remains of the text are not in accordance with that of the other manuscripts. But the remains are too scanty to understand this deviation. There seems to be a repetition possibly saying that the “non-human beings” (amanuṣyā) will be appeased, when they hear this Sūtra. However, because of the rendering ye idam āṭānāṭikam there is no doubt that the fragmentary text belongs to this passage.

\textsuperscript{47} See note 27.
33.12 r3: idam eva (ātānātikaṁ sūtram vidyāṁ) rakṣāṁ pā-
(davandanīṁ)

173a r1: ... (rakṣāṁ m pād(a) ...

174 v5-6: (tad)y(a)thā hili mahā hili mele phūrā phūre | ...udāpati svāhā | ||

Even though the textual situation is poor in some places, it is evident that the
manuscripts represent a fairly homogenous text, on the basis of which it is
possible to reconstruct most of the ĀṭānSū(CASkt). Help comes also from the
end of the Sūtra, where the Buddha repeats the same text that was originally
recited by Vaiśravaṇa, the king of the North. By doing so, he sanctions this
protection (rakṣā) for monks and nuns, and other members of the community
living in the wilderness. The end of the Sūtra, only poorly preserved in
Hoffmann’s edition, could be improved with the help of a fragment from a
manuscript found at Tumšuq-Maralbaşi (SHT 1: cat.-no.10), which was
published by Waldschmidt already in 1961.

In the following the ĀṭānSū(CASkt) text is reconstructed from the extant
manuscripts. The text is placed side by side with the text of ĀṭānSū(Gilgit),
which is nearly completely preserved on folios 348 verso to 349 recto 1 of the
DĀ manuscript. The division into paragraphs structures the text for the
commentary below.

ĀṭānSū(Gilgit)                        ĀṭānSū(CASkt)

§ 1 evaṁ mayā śrutam ekasmiṁ samaye bhagavāṁ śrāvastyāṁ viharati jetavane anātha
§ 1 evaṁ mayā śrutam ekasamayaṁ bhagavāṁ śrāvastyāṁ viharati jetavane anāthapiṇḍadārāme (||)
§ 2 atha vaiśravanaḥ mahārājā 'neka-yašaparivāro 'neka-yašasata-parivāro anekay(akṣasahasrapa)-rivāro 'neka-yašasatasahasrapari-vāro 'tikrāntavarṇo 'tikrāntāyāṁ rātr-yāṁ yena bhagavāṁs tenopasaṁ-krāntaḥ (I) upasaṁkramya bhagava-taḥ pādau śirasā vanditvā ekānte niṣaṇṇo (I) 'pīdānīṁ vaiśrava-ṇasya mah(ā)r(ā)jasya varṇa-nubhāvena sarvam jetavanam udareṇabhāsenā sputaṁ abhūt (I) ekāntaniśaṇṇo vaiśravanaḥ mahārāja tasyāṁ velāyāṁ gathāṁ babhāse

§ 3

nāma 'stu te mahāvīra
saṁbuddha(d a)v(ipadot)t(ama I)
na tām devaḥ prajānanti
yaṁ prajānāsi buddhimān (I)
pratyutpannam atūtaṁś ca
ye ca buddhā anāgatāḥ (I)
sarvān aham namasyāmi
tvām cāsmi śaraṇaṁ gataḥ (I)

dadyathā | bilimahā | balimele | purā |
pure | ghori | gandhāri | cori | caṇḍāli |
sopakke | sthulasāpati | padumāpati
svāhā (I)

— 139 —
§ 4 santi badanta bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhikṣavo (bh)ī(kṣunya) upāsakā ye cāraṇyavanaprasthāṇi prāntāṇi śāyanāsanāṃ adhyāvasanti (||) santi cātra vyādā yakṣā 'manuṣyaḥ naivāsikā ye bhagavataḥ pravacane 'bhiprasannāś cānaḥbhiprasannāś ca (||) alpaṅkās te badanta vyādā yakṣā aṃuṣyaḥ naivāsikā ye bhagavataḥ pravacane 'bhiprasannāḥ (||)

§ 5 sādhu badanta bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhikṣavo (bh)ī(kṣunya) upāsakā upāsikā idam evāṭānāṭiyam sūtraṃ vidyāraksāṃ pādaṇamāṇīṃ vistareṇodgrhiṇīyuḥ paryavāpnyuḥ yāvad evātmano rakṣāyai guptaye sparśavihārāya anabhiprasannāṃ ca vyād(ā)nāṃ yakṣānāṃ aṃuṣyaṅāṃ naivā(sikānāṃ abhipra-)sādāyābhiprasannāṃ ca bhūyobhāvāya | adhivāsaye bhagavāṃ vaisravaṇasya mahārājasya tūṣṇīṃbhāvena (||)

§ 6 atha vaisravaṇaḥ mahārājō bhagavatō tūṣṇīṃbhāvenādhivāsanāṃ

§ 5 sādhu badanta bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhikṣavo bhikṣunya upāsakā upāsikā idam evāṭānāṭikāṃ sūtraṃ vidyāṃ (rakṣāṃ pādaṇamāṇīṃ vi-stareṇa) udgrhiṇīyuḥ (paryavāpnyuḥ yāvad evātmano rakṣāyai guptaye sparśavihārāya anabhiprasannāṃ vyād(ā)nāṃ yakṣānāṃ aṃuṣyaṅāṃ naivāsikānāṃ abhiprasā-(dāyaḥ abhi)prasan(ā)nāṃ ca (bhūyobhāvāya | adhivāsayati bhagavāṃ vaisravaṇasya mahā)rājānās tūṣṇīṃbhāvena (||)
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viditvā bhagavataḥ purastād idam viditvā tas(yāṁ velāyāṁ bhagavataḥ
evāṭāṇāṭīyaṁ sūtraṁ vidyārakṣāṁ purataḥ idam eva (āṭāṇāṭīkaṁ sū-
pādavandanāṁ vistareṇa bhāṣate ||
traṁ vidyāṁ) rakṣāṁ pād(avanandanāṁ
vistareṇa babhāse ||
tad)ya(tha (l) hilimāha | hilimele
phurā phure ... . udāpati svāhā | \|⁴⁴

Two characteristic differences that run throughout both texts should be mentioned, without further detailed. The first concerns the sandhi rules. As already mentioned above, in general they are better observed in the Gilgit manuscript, while in the manuscripts from the northern Silk Route, e.g., alpha privativum is preferred to sandhi, for example: mahārāja 'nekayakṣa" ĀṭānSū
(Gilgit) and mahārāja anekayakṣa" ĀṭānSū(CASkt) (see § 2 above). This indicates that in general the language of the Gilgit version is closer to classical Sanskrit. There are only rare examples, where the Central Asian version is more sanskritized (see §§ 3, 5). The second point concerns the inflection of mahārāja. In ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) the a-stem ārāja is used, while all Central Asian manuscripts retain the n-stem ārājan.

§ 1 The Sūtra begins with the normal introduction evam mayā śrutiṁ “Thus I have heard”. Ever since John Brough (1975: 416-426) published his famous article of the same title, the debate about how to understand this stereotyped Sūtra introduction has not come to an end.⁴⁸ In our versions there are two different renderings: ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) and the Tibetan translation have the locative ekasmin samaye, while in cat.-no. 175, which is the only extant Central Asian manuscript for the part in question, the adverbial form ekasamayam is used, a form which Brough did not discuss. This manuscript is not a reliable

⁴⁸I thank my friend Seishi Karashima for the many inspirations for this part. He provided me with numerous articles concerning this question. The best bibliography is found in Bongard-Levin et al. 1996: 90, note 1.
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copy⁴⁹ and therefore the adverbial form could easily be a scribal mistake for ekam samayam. But since the adverbial form is well attested in other Sūtra manuscripts from the “Turfan” finds (SWTF: 437, sic!), it may be correct. There is no doubt that the ĀṭānŚū(CASkt) represents the older wording, which is close to the Pāli introduction of Suttas ekam samayam, an accusative of duration immediately following evam mayā sutam. Nowadays, most scholars follow Brough’s (1975: 416) well-founded translation affirmed by the Tibetan translation and now also attested in the Sanskrit DĀ manuscript. They connect the specification of time with evam mayā śrutam, which is in Brough’s translation “Thus I heard on one occasion”, or more literal “Thus I have heard at one time” in the translation of the Nagaropama-Sūtra referring to Harrison’s (1996: 90) argument. Brough’s free rendering of ekasmin samaye points to a problem recently taken up by Tola and Dragonetti (1999: 53-55), who speak of a “criterion of usefulness”. They argue that the interpretations of Brough and Harrison do not add an significant information to “Once I have heard”, that is, it is more reasonable to connect it with the place where the Buddha was staying rather than with the time at which he preached a Sūtra: “Thus I have heard: at a time when the Buddha stayed at ...” Not only von Hinüber’s (1968: 84-87, § 72) syntactical consideration⁵⁰—that it is difficult to connect the accusative of duration ekam samayam with evam mayā sutam—but also Allon’s (1997: 195, 246f., 287) sophisticated analysis of a rhythmic rhetoric agreeing with the old vedha, speak against Brough’s interpretation. These arguments count also for the adverbial rendering in ĀṭānŚū(CASkt). Brough’s and Harrison’s interpretations are probably based on how the translators into the Tibetan and Chinese understood the phrase, which finally may have led to a general agreement preferring the locative ekasmin samaye. The beginning of Sūtras handed down in the manuscripts from the northern Silk Route are not

⁴⁹ See above note 24.
consistent regarding the case, and there are examples of all the three renderings (SWTF: 431 and 437); but even there the locative occurs more frequently. The Sanskrit manuscripts from Central Asia show impressively that the case and possibly also the understanding of even such a stereotype as the opening of Sūtras was unstable until the locative seems to have become a standard.\footnote{The oldest DĀ manuscripts from the northern Silk Route are cat.-no. 32 and 33. They date to approximately the the 6th century AD (Sander 1968: alphabet q). They show that the introduction formula is not the same for all Sūtras within these manuscripts. Cat.-no. 32 preserves the abbreviated form with niḍānam in two cases (SHT 4: 109 and 130), and cat.-no. 33 alternates between the abbreviated (SHT 4: 159) and the full rendering (SHT 4: 164, 171). ekasamaya is not completely preserved in cat.-no. 33. The fragmentary text breaks off after e∗, resp. eka∗ (see also SHT 4: 171, note 4).} However, the problem of how to understand the beginning of the ĀṭānSū(CASkt) is not yet settled, and therefore no punctuation mark is added into the text above, which leaves it open to interpretation.

The second question in this paragraph concerns the ĀṭānSū(CASkt) only. The passage is again preserved in the not very reliable manuscript cat.-no. 175. It reads ... śrāvastyāṁ viharati smāj\footnote{.ā in smāj∗ is very sure, even though -ā is not very distinctly marked in this manuscript.} jetave anātha-piṇḍadārāme. Because smāj∗, suggesting asmād, is senseless in this context, Hoffmann (1939: 18=MIAKPh 1987: 34, note 4) conjectured to sma. Since most Central Asian Sarvāstivāda Sūtras published to day use the historical present viharati (Speyer repr. 1998: 244, § 236),\footnote{This lemma has not yet been published in SWTF. See "word indexes" viharati in SHT 4, vihr in 7 and 9. The only Sūtra fragment reading viharati sma is the fragment cat.-no. 1493 (SHT 4: 161).} sma is omitted in my reconstruction, even though Hoffmann’s conjecture may be correct.

§ 2 As Skilling (vol. II 1997: 562) has remarked, one difference between the two versions is the extension of the enumeration of Vaiśravaṇa’s suite of
Yakṣas in ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit). In ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) it begins with “many Yakṣas” (ānekayakṣa) and ends with “many 100,000s of Yakṣas” (ānekayakṣasātasa-hara), while both are missing in ĀṭānŚū(CA), except in cat.-no. 681b.54 The early DĀ manuscript cat.-no. 33, which in other cases it is closer to the Gilgit version,55 agrees here with most of the other Central Asian manuscripts.

Von Simson (1977: 479–488 and 1965: 81–83) discussed the phrase used to describe how a person approaches the Buddha and its variants in detail. According to him only the Sūtras of the Sarvāstivādins from the northern Silk Route have with rare exceptions yena ... tenopajagāma | upetya, but not their Vinaya texts, which preserve in general the same wording as ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit), yena ... tenopasamkṛántah | upasamkramya. Von Simson explains the different wording for the same phrase as a speciality possibly introduced by the Sūtra reciters (bhāṇaka). The same verb as in ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) is used in the Pāli Suttas, which is upasamkram in yena ... ten' upasamkami | upasamkamitvā, but here the aorist upasamkami is preferred to the past participle. The preference for an inflected form to express the past is maintained in ĀṭānŚū(CASkt), but perfect often replaces the aorist. The interchange between aorist and perfect in the ĀṭānŚū(CASkt) is characteristic for these texts, while the aorist is predominant in Pāli, and the past participle in the Gilgit manuscript. This observation agrees with those made by Ji already in 1949, when he compared BHS texts like the Mahāvastu and the Divyāvadāna with their Pāli counterparts. He observed a progressive aversion to using the aorist. His results (Ji 1949: 268) are56 1. In Buddhist text written—as he names it—in

54 Skilling (vol. II 1997: 563, note 44) rightly remarks that the fragment cat.-no. 681b recto agrees with ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) because anekayakaśasātasahasraparivārah fits perfectly into the gap. My suggestion (Sander 1987: 194, note 3) is wrong. The beginning of the Sūtra in Pāli differs considerably; therefore it can be used for comparison only in rare cases. Cf. Hoffmann 1939: 33 (=MIAKPh 1987: 49) and Skilling vol. I 1994: 463–467.

55 E.g. it does not contain the mantra, which is present in cat.-no. 175 and 174. See §§ 3 and 6.

56 This summary omits Ji's remarks on the relation to the “Urkanon".
mixed dialect ("Mischdialekt") and in Sanskrit the use of aorist is characteristic for the older parts. 2. Already in these older parts the aversion to the use of the aorist is obvious compared with the Pāli. 3. The younger texts and passages in the text often replace the aorist by other forms, but certain aorists are retained. Ji’s observations are also relevant for the two versions of the ĀṭānŚū, which reveal, at least in this paragraph, that ĀṭānŚū(CASkt) preserves an older linguistic stratum than ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit).

A similar difference can be observed in the following sentences, which are also highly formulaic (von Simson 1977: 480). In the sentence which relates how respect is paid to the Buddha by bowing down the head at the Lord’s feet before taking a seat, the ĀṭānŚū(CASkt) versions use the imperfect nyaśidat,—upasāmkramya bhagavataḥ pādau śirasā vanditvaikānte nyaśidat,—while in ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) the sentence ends with the past participle nisatva.n57 The next sentence, in which is said that the Jetavana shines from Vaiśrāvana’s splendour, is an interpolation.58 Both versions have the same wording ending with the aorist sphuṭam abhūt. In this case the formulaic rendering, namely that after having taken his seat the great king Vaiśrāvana recited the appropriate verses (ekāntaniśanno vaiśravano mahārājas/ā tasyām velāyām gāthām...), is continued after the interpolated sentence in both versions, but the tense of the verb at the end of this sentence differs. The ĀṭānŚū(CASkt) retains its style by using the perfect vaiśravano ... gāthāṃ babhāṣe, while the

57 The Pāli version differs because the four kings of directions approach the Buddha, but the relevant phrase ends also with the aorist nisatva.n. Cf. Skilling vol. I 1994: 463–64, and Hoffmann 1939: 33 (=MIAKPh 1987: 49).

58 No direct parallel is present in Pāli, where Vessavaṇa is also the speaker.—udārenāvahāsaṇa sphuṭam abhūt is a stock phrase, which occurs in different context in many texts, especially when an extraordinary event takes place. In the references checked, which are only texts related to the Sarvāstivādin, it occurs always together with the trembling of the earth: mahāprthivicalo bhūt sarvaś cāyam loka udārena-vahāsaṇa sphuṭo bhūt and variants. Cf. MPS § 17.9, 10, MAV(1) § 4a.1,2; Saṅghbh I 41.8, 46.21–47.1, 180.7, 190.7; Divy 157.19, 204.22, 205.3–4.
Gilgit version changes to the present tense *vaiśravano ... gāthām bhāṣate*, which is presumably a historical past.

§ 3 The following two *anuṣṭhubs* praising the Buddha are not preserved in Pāli at this place. They do not differ much in the two Sanskrit versions. The Gilgit version uses the classical Sanskrit form beginning *namo 'stu*, while the Central Asian manuscripts preserve a hybrid form *nam' astu* (BIHS § 4.29).\(^{59}\)

Another difference already discussed by Skilling (vol. II 1997: 564-565), who quotes several parallels in Tibetan and Pāli, concerns the last two *pādas* of the first verse. As expected, the Tibetan translation has the same wording as ĀṭānSū(Gilgit), which is *na tam devāḥ prajānanti yaṁ prajānāsi buddhimān*, in Skilling’s translation “what you, O wise one, know, that the gods cannot fathom”. ĀṭānSū(CASkt) has the same wording, but with *caksuṣmān “seer”* instead of *buddhimān*. We may add to Skilling’s remarks by noting that a similar wording occurs also in ĀṭānSū(Pāli), in a verse praising the former Buddha Vipassi, where the Buddha is called a “seer” (*vipassissa nam’ atthu cakkhumantassa sirimato*). Once again the ĀṭānSū(CASkt) is closer to the Pāli. The Tibetan translation *blo ldan* corresponds, as expected, to *buddhimān*.\(^{60}\)

The other deviation concerns the pronouns. Where three manuscripts of

---

\(^{59}\) Cf. Hoffmann 1939: 39 (=MIAKPh 1987: 55) and Skilling vol. I 1994: 469; for discussion see Skilling vol. II 1997: 567-68. In the Pāli version Vessavana praises all the Buddhas, those of the past ending with Śākyamuni, with similar words, e.g., for Kakusandha: *nam’ atthu kakusandhassa*.

\(^{60}\) The Uigur version follows ĀṭānSū(CASkt) translating “seer”; cf. Zieme 2005: 35-36. As noticed by Zieme the Uigur version differs from both Sanskrit versions on mainly one point: Arhats and Pratyekabuddhas take the place of the gods (*devāḥ*): „Nicht erkennen die Arhats und Pratyekabuddhas, was du erkennst, o Seher.“ Most manuscripts in Uigur script date into the Yuan period; cf. Zieme 2005: 8. The Uigur manuscripts written in Brāhmī (Maue 1996: 67-70) and the Sanskrit manuscripts from the same places around the Turfan oasis are written in the later or eastern variety of “North Turkestan Brāhmī, Type b” (Sander 1968: alphabet u).
the ĀṭānŚū(CASkt) affirm the reading yat-tad, the Gilgit version has yam-tam. In this case the revisors of the Central Asian text decided for the classical Sanskrit neuter forms, while the BHS form is documented in the Gilgit manuscript (BHSG § 21.11).

The last pāda does not differ in meaning but slightly in wording, in the translation of Skilling (vol. II 1997: 565) “to them all (the Buddhās of the past, the present and the future) I pay homage, and to you I go for refuge”. Where in the ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) the periphrastic perfect asmi gatah is used in the second pāda, the Central Asian manuscripts repeat aham constructed with the past participle gatah. In this case the Tibetan wording bdag ni likely corresponds to the Central Asian aham.\(^{61}\)

The following mantra and also a similar spell coming before Vaiśravaṇa begins to recite the Sūtra are present only in two Sanskrit manuscripts from Qizil, which are cat.-no. 174 and 175. The mantras are not found in either the Tibetan or the Chinese translations,\(^{62}\) or in other Sanskrit manuscripts. Hoffmann (1939: 87, note 1=MIAKPh 1987: 103) already noted that the mantras are missing in cat.-no. 33 and 165. He argued that the mantras were evidently added to the text later, because the two manuscripts that does not contain them are older. In palaeographic terms, this is true only for cat.-no. 33. Cat.-no. 165, of which only a few fragments are preserved, is written in the same script as the two manuscripts that contain the mantras. Therefore Hoffmann’s argument is not valid. Furthermore, a late Uigur scroll originating from Murtuq and dated on palaeographic grounds to the Yuan time (U 4876), c. 12\(^{th}\) cent. AD, has to be taken into consideration. Zieme (2005: 36) remarks that the mantra is missing at this place.\(^{63}\) Is it possible that the two mantras were only integrated into manuscripts to be used for ritual purposes?\(^{64}\)

---

\(^{61}\) I thank my friend Siglindle Dietz for the references to Tibetan parallels.

\(^{62}\) Cf. also Skilling vol. II 1997: 565.

\(^{63}\) “Es fällt auf, dass der Mantra bilimahā ... svāhā, der nach dem Sanskrittext von Xinjiang in Zeile A 009 gestanden haben müßte, fehlt.”
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noted above, such compilations are not unusual. In cat.-no.174 the left margin is distorted and no folio number is preserved. In this case it is therefore impossible to determine whether or not the fragmentary folio belonged to a composite manuscript. This is not the case with cat.-no. 175, which was certainly a composite manuscript, since the Āṭānātiya-Sūtra begins with folio 37. The folios are small, measuring only 6.5 x 12 cm. The low folio numbers (fol. 37–6X) and the small size of the folios make it certain that the remains were not part of a DĀ manuscript, but it is impossible to say to which collection it originally belonged, because only the part with remains from the Āṭānātiya-Sūtra survives. Since the context of this composite manuscript is unknown, it is impossible to suggest why the mantras were introduced into the text.

Another possibility cannot be excluded is that the two mantras in question are Tokharian additions, and were not accepted by all Sarvāstivāda communities on the northern Silk Route. This assumption is supported by manuscript cat.-no. 175, which was probably written by a Tokharian scribe, as indicated by typical mistakes as the replacement of Sanskrit d- by t.65 Only this much can be said: that more than one version of this Sūtra existed at approximately the same time and even in the same monastery, in the library of Qizil. The magic syllables ghotri (resp. gori), gandhāri, cori, caṇḍāli, sopakke (resp. sopake)66 and sīhulasāpati padumāpati are constituent parts of the mantras, some of them occurring at other places in this Sūtra.67 All are probably

---

64 E.g., the only extant book from Qizil (Sander 1994: 93–104), which was composed for donation ceremonies; it contains besides poems of praise and the Upasena-Sūtra, also rakṣās and spells, side by side with donation formulas. See also note 68.

65 See note 24.

66 Siglinde Dietz suggests that sopake (from sopaki) could be related to svapāka, svapāki, sopāka, sopāki, saupāka; Pāli sopāka, sopāka; cf. MW sopāka „a man of degraded caste (the son of a Caṇḍāla by a Pulkaśī)“.

feminine vocatives, and may invoke dreadful and therefore powerful female beings. The creation of effective *mantras* was very popular on the northern Silk Route. They were sometimes composed by authors who proudly mention their names. This is well documented by the only complete Sanskrit manuscript found at Qizil, in which protection spells are part of different texts collected for the celebration of a donation ceremony. In this formula a certain Mokṣayaśas composed a protective spell, which is integrated into a short version of the Asilomaparatisara (Sander 1994: 100, note 20). Finally, it should be mentioned that the wording of the end of the two *mantras* in question, which is ... *padumāpati*, respectively ... *udāpati*, could be inspired by the end of the *mantra* against malicious Yakṣas (Hoffmann 1939: 75 = MIAKPh 1987: 91) within our Sūtra, which is ... *ghumāpati*.

§ 4 The following paragraph in prose does not vary much, except for the last two sentences. In this paragraph Vaiśravaṇa explains the need for a powerful protection against snakes, Yakṣas (giants), non-humans, and local goddesses.

---

68 Many examples in SHT 3. Cf. also the popularity of such Sūtras as the Nagaropama-Sūtra (Bongard-Levin et al. 1996: 82-103) on the Silk Routes, to which a protection text, the *vyākaraṇa*, is added, as the *hṛdaya* is to the ĀṭānŚū in some manuscripts from Central Asia. See also § 5 below.

69 Cf. Sander 1994: 93-104. The same stereotype renderings as in the ĀṭānŚū occur there in magical verses (*śādhani*) helping to accomplish an unfinished work (*ucchiṣṭakarmasādhani*), among them the famous and powerful two pādas, which are a *satyakriyā*, a curse that becomes true: *śaptadhāṣya sphalen mūrdhā ārjukasyaiva mañjarī* „the head (of a stupid one) may burst into seven pieces as the blossom of the Ārjuka“; cf. Hoffmann 1939 (= MIAKPh 1987): 57 [73], 59 [75], 61 [77], 65 [81], 71 [87], 75 [91] and cat.-no. 904 (SHT 3: 155). This curse in Brahmanic and Buddhist literature is discussed in detail by Witzel 1987: 363-415 (for Buddhist texts see pp. 381-383).

70 See also cat.-no. 60 (SHT 4: 273).

71 *vyādā yakṣā anamasyā naivāsikā* is translated differently. Cf. SWTF *amanusya* and *naivāsika*. I follow Waldschmidt 1961: 201 (= 1967: 414) who separates the names translating: „Schlangen (*vyādha*), Riesen (*yakṣa*), Unmensen (*amanusya*), Lokalgott-
for followers of the Buddha (srāvakā)—monks, nuns, laymen and laywomen—who dwell in the wilderness. In the Gilgit version he simply says that some of the dangerous inhabitants are favorably disposed to the Lord’s words while others are not. Up to here the versions agree, but not in the following sentence. ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) adds only one sentence more, stating that only “a few” (alpaka) of them are favorably disposed, while ĀṭānŚū(CASkt) emphasizes this fact by using the comparative alpatara, which demands the repetition of the sentence with bahutara, “more are not”.  
72 The Pāli text differs considerably classifying the Yakkhas into three categories from the most important to the lowest: santi hi bhante nicā yakkhā bhagavato pasannā | yebhuyyena kho pana bhante yakkhā apasannā yeva bhagavato,73 “Sir, there are low Yakkhas who are believing in the Lord, but really, Sir, almost all are not believing in the Lord.” As already mentioned by Hoffmann (1939: 88, note 4 [=MIAKPh 1987: 104]) the Tibetan translation corresponds word by word to the Central Asian version.74 Hoffmann’s German translation of the 10th century Chinese translation of Fa Tian (since 982 Fa Xian) seems to be closer to the Gilgit

72 Hoffmann 1939: 88, note 4 (=MIAKPh 1987: 104) rightly remarks that these sentences are not well documented in the manuscripts. The sequence of the two sentences beginning with alpatarās is preserved correctly only in cat.-no. 33. Cat.-no.175, fol.38 v2-3 and 165.26 (=K 459.1) v5 omit the first sentence with alpatara. The missing akṣaras are too many for the full wording between v1-2 in cat.-no. 174, which suggests that the second sentence with bahutara was omitted by the scribe, or that the wording was the same as in ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit).


version. The other differences in this paragraph are minor.

§ 5 Similarly, the following prose part, in which Vaiśravaṇa extols the efficacy of the Sūtra, which he describes as a charm (vidyā), a protective text (rakṣā), and a reverence of the feet (pādavandani)75 taming the demonic creatures who can potentially molest the Buddha’s followers—monks and nuns, layman and laywomen—who dwell in forests, does not differ much.76

For the first time the word for the title of the Sūtra is mentioned in the stereotype ātānāṭyaṃ/ṭikāṃ sūtram vidyārakṣam/vidyām rakṣam pādavandaniṃ, which occurs in the text in the nominative and, as in this passage, in the accusative case. It is obvious from the references in accusative that vidyārakṣā was always written as a compound in ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit), while the Central Asian manuscripts have two separate words. In the light of the Tibetan translation the compound can only be understood as a dvandva with the same meaning as the Central Asian reading.

More important are the different wordings for the title of the Sūtra, which is likely named after the air-borne city of Kubera/Vaiśravaṇa.77 These have been discussed in detail by Hoffmann (1939: 8–10 [=MIAKPh 1987: 22–24])

75 Waldschmidt (1961: 201=1967: 414, note 4) comments upon pādavandani that it may refer to the powerful verses in this Sūtra and points with this note to a problem, namely, that pādavandani in the meaning “reference of the feet”, a gesture of respect, does not fit into this sequence. One expects another expression of effective power.

76 For the differences between the Tibetan, the ĀṭānŚū(CASkt) and the Pāli see Skilling vol. II 1997: 566.

77 Cf. SWTF: Āṭānāṭa. The name is only partly preserved in cat.-no. 621 r3 (‘ṇāṭa), which should be restored to (āṭānāṭa. This manuscript was not yet identified, when Hoffmann worked on his edition. At this place Hoffmann (1939: 53=MIAKPh 1987: 69) followed cat.-no.31: tadyathā adāṇāḍa. Although he realized that the text of the fragmentary leaf cat.-no. 31 differs considerably from the wording in the other Central Asian manuscripts, he used this fragment for reconstructing the text. In the introduction of his edition he discussed the different orthographies of Vaiśravaṇa’s town in detail (1938: 6–7=MIAKPh 1987: 20–21).
and Skilling (vol.II 1997: 557-58), which need not to be repeated here in detail.\textsuperscript{78} Only some words about the Central Asian variant \textit{āṭānāṭi}ka based on Hoffmann's argumentation. In an \textit{hrdaya} appended to some of the Central Asian manuscripts\textsuperscript{79} the word \textit{āṭānāṭi} occurs in two \textit{anuṣṭhubs} (Hoffmann 1939: 103-04 [\textasciitilde{} MIAKPh 1987: 119-20]), the meaning of which remains obscure. According to Hoernle it is the name of a demon, but Hoffmann's (1939: 10 [\textasciitilde{} MIAKPh 1987: 24]) interpretation that the Sūtra itself is meant by \textit{āṭānāṭi} is more convincing, and is also followed by Skilling (vol. II, 1997: 159). The \textit{hrdaya} is not appended to the Sūtra in canonical contexts, neither in Pāli, in ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit), or in DĀ manuscripts from the northern Silk Route.

In the Central Asian manuscripts very little text is preserved from the part following the title and its characterization, in which is said that this Sūtra is a protection for followers of the Buddha (\textit{śrāvakā}) etc., when they learn \textit{(udgrhṇīyuh)} and master \textit{(paryavāpṇyuḥ)} it in detail \textit{(vistarena)}. A little more text can be gained from the repetition at the end, which was published by Waldschmidt in 1961 on the basis of a fragment from Tumšuq (cat.-no. 10). While Hoffmann (1939: 37 [\textasciitilde{} MIAKPh 1987: 53]) restored the passage to \textit{vidyāraksāṃ pādavandaniṁ vistarena}odgrhṇīyur \textit{(dhārayeyur ātmano guptaye rakṣāyai sukhasparśavīhāratāyā)}, Waldschmidt (1961: 201 [\textasciitilde{} 1967: 414], note 5) followed a similar wording in the Divyāvadāna, which increases the number of verbs. He restored the phrase to \textit{(vistarena udgrhṇīyur dhārayeyur vācayeyuh) paryavāpṇyuḥ yāvad evātma(na) ...} The ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) text is even shorter than Hoffmann's reconstruction; it reads \textit{vidyāraksāṃ pādavandaniṁ vistarenodgrhṇīyuh paryavāpṇyuḥ yāvad evātmana rakṣāyai guptaye sparśavīhārāyā ...} The main difference between ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) and the two mainly

\textsuperscript{78} For linguistic arguments cf. Skilling vol. II 1997: 557-58.

\textsuperscript{79} For the Sanskrit manuscripts cf. Hoffmann 1939: 27-30 (= MIAKPh 1987: 43-46), which are Hoernle manuscript no. 149 x/6. cat.-no. 444 (= S 1042), 372 (= 518), 243 (= 519), and another recently identified, but not yet published fragment cat.-no. 3164 (SHT 9: 436).
reconstructed versions concerns the verbs. The Tibetan translation has only two verbs, namely, *rgya cher 'dzin cin | kun chub par bgyid na* (Hoffmann 1939: 36.16-17 [=MIAKPh 1987: 52] and Skilling vol. I 1994: 468.2-3), which literally corresponds to ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit), namely, *vistareṇodgṛṇīyuḥ paryavā-ṃyuḥ*. This is not the only reason for having doubts about Hoffmann’s and even more in Waldschmidt’s reconstructions. Much speaks in favour of the same wording as in ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit), especially because the remains of cat.-no. 10, ... *paryavāṃyuḥ yāvad evātmano...* do not differ. Another difference between the two versions is the addition of *sukha*, and *vihārata* for *vihāra* in *sukhasparśavihāratāyā* in the reconstructed texts of both Hoffmann and Waldschmidt. It is not at all certain whether *sukha* originally belonged to the Central Asian text. The number of akṣaras missing in the fragments cat.-no. 33 and 10 speak in favour of a text similar to the Gilgit manuscript. Following Hoffmann (1939: 12 [=MIAKPh 1987: 26]) the average number of akṣaras in lines without string holes in cat.-no. 33 are 37 to 43. Even the short Gilgit version would exceed this average by 5 counting 48 akṣaras between cat.-no. 33.11 verso 6 and 33.12 recto 1. The same is true for cat.-no. 10. The text should fill the gap between recto 3 and 4; both lines are interrupted by a square empty space for the string hole. They should therefore have less akṣaras than the complete lines. Taking the missing number of akṣaras in recto 4 as guide-line, there should be not many more than 42 to 44 akṣaras in line three. Following Waldschmidt’s reconstruction the number of missing akṣaras in this line is 54, which is too many, while the text of ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) with 40 missing akṣaras without *sukha* and *tā* from *viharatā* fits perfectly into the gap. A further difference concerns the position of *guptaye* and *rākṣāyai*. Although the two nouns are not preserved in any Central Asian manuscript, the change of their position to *rākṣayai guptaye* as in ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) is very

---

probable.

The last discrepancy in this paragraph concerns the tense of the verb *adhivas* in the sentence saying that the Lord consented to Vaiśravaṇa in silence. Hoffmann (1939: 37 [≡ MIAKPh 1987: 53]) restituted the phrase from the Tibetan *gnang bar mdzad do*, which corresponds to *adhivaśayati*, but ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) reads *adhivaśaye(d)*.81 The meaning of this stereotype is quite clear, the Lord consents in silence: *adhivaśasayati ... tuṣṇimbhāvena* (cf. SWTF *adhivas* 2). In this case the optative in ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) is strange. Because “may consent” gives no sense, Dietz proposes in a letter to understand it as a gnomic optative.82

§ 6 Before the Sūtra proper, which is composed in *anusṭhubs*, begins, it is said in a stereotyped phrase that after Vaiśravaṇa realized the consent of the Lord, that “at this time” he began to recite the Āṭānāṭya/ṭika-Sūtra, the charm, the protection text, the reverence to the feet in full length. Small deviations in wording occur also in this paragraph. As before, the Central Asian version is not well preserved. Most of the text is reconstructed, partly with the help of the end of the Sūtra, and partly from the Tibetan. The Central Asian text reads *vaiśravano ... tasyāṁ velāyāṁ...idam eva āṭānāṭikam sūtram...babhāse*. In ĀṭānŚū (Gilgit) *tasyāṁ velāyām*, which corresponds to the Tibetan translation *de’i tshe* (Skilling vol. I 1994: 468.8=Hoffmann 1939: 38.5 [≡ MIAKPh 1987: 54]), is omitted. It was possibly forgotten by the copyist at this place, because it is present in ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) in a similar wording at the end of § 2, ... *tasyāṁ velāyām gāthāṁ bhāṣate*.

Furthermore, ĀṭānŚū(CASkt) reads *bhagavatalḥ puratalḥ*, where ĀṭānŚū (Gilgit) has *purastād*, both meaning the same, namely, “before the Lord”. Hoffmann’s restoration is based on cat.-no. 33.12 recto 3, where only the

---

81 *adhivaśaye* is either a scribal error or BHS form; cf. BHS § 29.7.

82 The use of the optative in this place needs further investigation; it has to be checked whether it appears also in other Sūtras in this DĀ manuscript.
Visarga is preserved \( \text{purataḥ} \) followed by \text{idam eva}.\(^83\)

The last difference concerns the tense of the verbs, already detailed in § 2 above, which, in this case, is the historical present \text{bhāṣate} in ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) and the perfect \text{babhāṣe} in ĀṭānŚū(CASkt).

From the above said is obvious that there are only relatively minor differences in wording and phrasing between the two versions. It is not a surprise that in general the ĀṭānŚū(Gilgit) is closer to the Tibetan translation than the ĀṭānŚū(CASkt). The differences between the two versions cannot be expressed better than with Peter Skilling’s (vol.II 1997: 16-17) summary of the result of his comparison of the Tibetan translation of the Mahāsūtras with their Central Asian counterparts: “There are, however, a number of differences in phrasing and in inclusion or omission of certain elements between the Central Asian Sanskrit versions ... and the corresponding Tibetan Mahāsūtra versions. Since the Central Asian versions are considered to be Sarvāstivādin, and since such discrepancies are precisely of the type that distinguish Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin recensions, this may be taken as further evidence for the Mūlasarvāstivādin affiliation of the Tibetan Mahāsūtras.” It has to be added that the Central Asian tradition is not as uniform as the edition of Hoffmann’s Āṭānāṭika-Sūtra suggests. The fragments belong to different collections; some have additions, as the \text{mantras} in cat.-no.174 and 175, others are close to the Gilgit text and the Tibetan translation.\(^84\) But all of them belong to a similar tradition, except the fragmentary folio cat.-no. 31, which does not contain a Sarvāstivāda text. For all these reasons it is

---

\(^{83}\) \text{purataḥ} is used in the same phrase in the closely related MsjŚū; cf. Waldschmidt 1980: 151, § 3: \text{catastro brahmakāyikā devatā ... bhagavataḥ purataḥ pratitasthūḥ}.

\(^{84}\) Von Simson (2000: 14-15) showed that different versions from the Prātimokṣa-Sūtra were current on the northern Silk Route. He discussed their relation to the Mūlasarvāstivāda texts on the basis of many more manuscripts than preserved from the Āṭānāṭika-Sūtra. See also Fukita 2003: XVIII-XX for the Mahāvadāna-Sūtra.
still risky to reconstruct a reliable text from the only fragmentary remains, even though it is desirable to have it.
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