

Further Remarks on the New Manuscript of the *Dirghāgama*

Jens-Uwe Hartmann

Three years ago, Sadakata Akira published a short paper on two folios of a manuscript belonging to the recent finds from the area of “Greater Gandhāra”, to use Richard Salomon’s term, and reported to have been found in Northern Pakistan.¹ Since the middle of the nineties of the last century, bundles of this manuscript had begun to reach the Western rare book market and, luckily, from the very beginning scholars were granted access to the originals and to reproductions in various forms. Already the first bundle gave rise to the supposition that it belonged to a manuscript of the *Dirghāgama*,² the “Collection of Long (Discourses of the Buddha)”, in a Sanskrit version, and in 2000 a brief survey of that first bundle was published.³

Due to its size (about 50 × 10cm) and its state of preservation the manuscript stands out among the scrolls, leaves and thousands of fragments of Buddhist manuscripts in Indian languages which have reached Europe, Japan and the USA within the last five years from the Northwestern corner of the former Indian Buddhist world and have been made available for scholarly study. One of the later bundles in-

¹ Sadakata 1999.

² In autumn 1998 Matsuda Kazunobu and Klaus Wille recognized independently of each other that the manuscript apparently contained sūtras of the *Dirghāgama*, Matsuda when viewing the original folios in London, and Wille with the help of photographs.

³ Hartmann 2000.

cluded the last part of the manuscript with a final colophon preserving *Dirghāgama* as the title of the whole work. This conveniently confirmed the previous supposition and underlined the importance of the text. Since only a small part of the contents and structure of this Sanskrit version of the “Collection of Long Discourses” have so far been recovered from the Sanskrit fragments found in Central Asia, the principal results from a study of the newly arrived folios will be communicated in the following pages.

1. *The final folio*

Regrettably, the manuscript as it has reached the West is still by no means complete, and due to the present political developments (autumn 2001) and the vagaries of the art and book market it remains unpredictable whether all its surviving parts will ever be known or made accessible to interested scholars. So far, about 160 folios—complete or in fragments—have been ascertained; they belong mainly to the sections with the folio numbers 72-116, 264-330 and 385-454 and amount to roughly one third of the whole manuscript, since the final folio must bear the page number 454 (see below). This last folio is of particular importance for our understanding of the structure of the text, and therefore it will be introduced first. On the *recto* side it contains text of the final part of the *Brahmajālasūtra*, the Sanskrit parallel to the *Brahmajālasutta* of the *Dīghanikāya*. This points to a considerable difference in structure, since this *sutta* opens the Pāli collection, while it falls last in the present Sanskrit version, as becomes clear now from the new manuscript. The verso side of the folio begins with an *antaroddāna*, i.e., a verse-like list of key words from the preceding *sūtra*; then follows a longer *uddāna*, i.e., another verse-like list of key words which, unlike an *antaroddāna*, lists the text titles of the

preceding section. The folio concludes with two very brief colophons, one for the section and one for the entire manuscript.

The text area of the *verso* side is interrupted four times, once in the left third by the space left empty for the punch hole and three times by roundels consisting of four concentric circles, the interior of each being decorated with a different flower motif. While the other folios mostly contain eight lines, the text remaining for the *verso* side of this one comprises only five and a half lines. Regrettably, the upper layer of birch bark has peeled off in three places, which results in several gaps in the text.

1.1. *Transliteration of folio 454 verso*⁴

- 1 [a] .. [rod]d[ānam* ||] ⊗ śāśvato py ahetuś ca antakā amarās
tathā · saṃjñī caivāpy asaṃjñī ca ⊗ tathā uccheda [n]irvṛtaḥ
unmajjanti ca saṃ p[r]atītya ⊗ spa[r]ś[o] bhi
- 2 kṣu[ṇā] · || ⊗ || hetvathabrahmajālam* || || uddānam* śuka jīvaka
⊗ rājā ca vasiṣṭhaḥ kāś[y]apena [ca] + [hm]. [jā] ++ ⊗ kṛtvā
ca
- 3 virgo bha ⊗ vati samudditaḥ || ○ || tṛdaṇḍī piṅga ⊗ lā [dv].

⁴ The text was read together with my friend Klaus Wille, Göttingen; Lance Cousins and Somadeva Vasudeva, Oxford, contributed some corrections of our readings and various very useful suggestions; Paul Harrison, Christchurch, corrected the English of this paper. I wish to thank all of them. Moreover, I am grateful to the present owner of the manuscript for putting excellent black and white photographs at my disposal and granting permission for their publication. — 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 and ⊗ for the circular decorations.

- [ca] lohityabhā .i + k. .e .ī [a] .. ⊗ maṇḍīśa
 4 [s ta]c ca bhi ⊗ kṣuṣu bhāṣate · ○ mahallī pṛ ⊗ + + + + [v].
 ko bhavati sa [i]ṣṭha ⊗ h kāśyapa
 5 ś caiva ⊗ brahmajālam a ○ nopamā || ⊗ śīlaskandhani-
 [p]. [t]. s samāptaḥ || ⊗ || samā
 6 pta ⊗ ś ca dīrghā ○ + maḥ || ⊗ ||

1.2. Reconstruction

For the sake of a more lucid presentation, uncertain and problematic readings are not signified by square brackets in the reconstruction. The verses are provisionally numbered in order to facilitate reference in the discussion of each key word.

a(nta)roddānam ||

- (1) śāśvato 'py ahetuś ca antakā amarās tathā |
 saṃjñī caivāpy asaṃjñī ca tathā uccheda nirvṛtaḥ < || >
 (2) unmajjanti ca saṃ(kliṣṭāḥ) pratītya sparśo bhikṣuṇā ||
 hetva < r > thabrahmajālam ||

|| uddānam ||

- (3) śuka jīvaka rājā ca v < ā > siṣṭhaḥ kāśyapena ca < >
 (bra)hm(a)jā(lena) kṛtvā ca v < a > rgo bhavati samudditaḥ ||
 (4) tṛdaṇḍī piṅgalā(treya) dv(e) ca lohityabhā(ṣ)i(tau) < >
 k. .e .ī a(thā) maṇḍīśas tac ca bhikṣuṣu bhāṣate ||
 (5) mahallī pṛ(ṣṭhapālaś ca) v. ko bhavati sa < >
 (vās)iṣṭhaḥ kāśyapaś caiva brahmajālam anopamā ||
 śīlaskandhanip(ā)t(a)s samāptaḥ || || samāptaś ca dīrghā-
 (ga)maḥ || ||

1.3. Commentary

The *uddānas* display 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). Beyond such normal deviations from the usage of classical Sanskrit — which was never intended, to be sure — the verses are apparently defective in several places, as will become clear from a closer look at the section summarized in them.

The *antaroddāna* is included in the separate Tibetan translation of the sūtra edited by Friedrich Weller (Weller 1934), forming § 223 of his edition, and also in the second Tibetan translation which appears as a citation of the complete sūtra in Śamathadeva's *Abhidharmakośaṭīkōpāyikā*.⁵ This second version of the *antaroddāna* is shorter than the first and deviates in two places. Without a more detailed discussion of such phenomena, the Tibetan translations of each key word and the number of the respective section of the sūtra they refer to, as already pointed out by Weller in his translation (Weller 1935-36, p.38 [= p.679]), will be given here.

śāśvato 'py : rtag dan gcig pu (Weller 1934) : *rtag dan phyogs gcig* (Upāyikā). In the Sanskrit text, there is no basis for *gcig pu* "zum Teile (ewig)" (Weller), or *phyogs gcig*, but the pāda is metrically deficient. Weller refers to §§ 26ff. and 57ff.

ahetuś ca : rgyu med dañ (both translations); Weller refers to §§ 90 ff.

antakā : mtha' ldan : mtha' yod; Weller refers to §§ 108ff.

amarās tathā : de bzin lha mi spon : de bzin 'chi med dañ; Weller refers to §§ 135ff. The separate Tibetan translation apparently renders the full expression *amaravikṣepa*⁶ which has to be abbreviated in the Sanskrit text for metrical reasons.

saṃjñī caivāpy asaṃjñī ca : 'du śes 'du śes med pa dañ : 'du śes bcas dañ 'du śes med || 'du śes yod min med min; Weller refers to §§

⁵ The *uddāna* is found in TP vol. 118, p. 169/2/1-2 = fol. 177a1-2.

⁶ For this term cf. Hartmann 1989, p. 49 ad V1.

- 159ff. Only the Upāyikā lists all the four possibilities.
tathā uccheda : *chad dañ* : *chad*; Weller refers to §§ 183ff.
nirvṛtaḥ : *mya ñan 'das pa dañ* : *mya ñan 'das dan*; Weller refers to §§ 190ff.
unmajjanti ca saṃ(kliṣṭāḥ) : *dmyugs dañ kun nas rmoñs pa dañ* : *g·yeñs pa dañ* || *yañ dag rmoñs pa zes bya dañ*; Weller refers to §§ 207ff. A fragment of the Brahmajālasūtra from Central Asia suggests the form *sāṃkleśyāḥ* (cf. Hartmann 1992, Hs. 16 R4), but the *a* of *saṃ* in the present manuscript is clearly short, and therefore *saṃ(kliṣṭāḥ)* is reconstructed.
pratītya : *brten dañ* : *brten nas byuñ dañ*; Weller refers to §§ 212ff.
sparśo : *reg pa*; Weller refers to §§ 214ff.
bhikṣuṇā : *dge sloñ dañ* : *dge bas so*; Weller connects the word with § 220, adding a question mark, but this passage appears to be the only possible point of reference. In the Upāyikā, the *antaroddāna* ends with this key word.
hetva(r)thabrahmajālam: according to Tibetan *rgyu dañ don chos dra ba ste, tha ma tshans pa'i dra ba'o* (Weller § 223) one would expect a verse line like *hetvarthadharmajālaṃ brahmajālaṃ ca paścimam*. Weller refers to § 221.

The *antaroddāna* is followed by the *uddāna* verses listing a key word (in most cases probably the short title) for each sūtra in order to establish their sequence.

śuka: this denotes the parallel to the Subha-sutta of the Dīghanikāya (DN no. 10).

jīvaka: Jīvaka Kumārabhṛta appears as the interlocutor of the Buddha; without parallel in the Dīghanikāya; the correspondence is found in the Majjhimanikāya (MN I 368-371). Cf. SHT VI 1525, line R3 which also seems to preserve the transition from this to the next

sūtra.

rājā ca: a reference to the sūtra corresponding to the Sāmaññaphala-sutta (DN 2).

vasiṣṭhaḥ: probably to be corrected to *vāsiṣṭhaḥ*; it denotes the parallel to the Tevijjasutta (DN 13).

kāśyapena ca: this is the key word for the text corresponding to the Kassapasihanādasutta (DN 8).

(bra)hm(a)jā(lena) kṛtvā ca: the parallel to the Brahmajālasutta (DN 1), the first text of the Pāli and the last one of the Sanskrit version; the reconstruction follows corresponding lines in the uddānas of the Ekottarikāgama, cf. Tripathi 1995: 20-22 (§§ 16.0, 22.56, 35.0 and 36.0)⁷.

v<a>rgo bhavati samudditaḥ: “(with this) the section is summarized” (*samuddita* probably *m.c.* for *samudita*, cf. BHSD s.v.).

tridaṇḍi piṅgalā(treyo) dv(e) ca lohityabhā(ṣ)i(tau): with this half verse another key word list begins. Apparently the Śilaskandha section of the DĀ began with the Tridaṇḍisūtra, and there is reason to assume that now all the sūtras in that section are summarized in the form of an *uddāna*. If this assumption is correct, several key words must have been omitted, as will be shown below.

The half verse is apparently quoted by Śamathadeva in his *Abhidharmakośaṭīkopāyikā* in order to elucidate the placement of the first Lohityasūtra. In this commentary, which is preserved only in its Tibetan translation, he explains: *phuñ po las | dbyug (dbyu D) gu gsum dañ goñ bu gsum || (P |) lu he (hi D) ta yi (ta'i P) rnam bśad gñis | (| deest P) zes bya ba'i lu he (hi D) ta'i mdo*

⁷ I owe these references to my friend Fumio Enomoto.

*dañ po la, etc.*⁸ Since it follows from other quotations that *dbyug gu gsum* serves as a translation of Tridaṇḍin, here it must denote the Tridaṇḍisūtra. Therefore the reference *phun po las* surely has to be taken as an abbreviation of *tshul khrims kyi phun po las*, (*śīla*)*skandhikāyām* or the like. Neither for the Tridaṇḍisūtra nor for the Piṅgalātreyasūtra (the key word is reconstructed according to the name as it is preserved in the sūtra itself) is a parallel text attested in the Pāli canon, and only one of the two Lohityasūtras appears to have found its way into the DN (Lohiccasutta, no. 12).

k. .e .i: according to the sequence of the sūtras in the manuscript, a key word for the text corresponding to the Kevaddhasutta (DN 11) is to be expected, e.g., *kaivartī*, and the preserved akṣara remains seem to point in the direction of the expected word, but the reconstruction of *kaivartī* is definitely excluded.

a(thā) maṇḍīśas: the introductory part of the sūtra suggests a correspondence with the Jāliyasutta (DN 7); in the Pāli version two wandering ascetics appear, namely Maṇḍissa and Jāliya, but in the Sanskrit text only Maṇḍīśa.

tac ca bhikṣuṣu bhāṣate: “and (then the Buddha) speaks this (sūtra also) among the monks”. This must be a reference to the second version of the Maṇḍīśasūtra, in which the Buddha reports his encounter with the wandering ascetic and his discourse with him to the monks. Due to this repetition, the sūtra is summarized in the manuscript by means of the usual abbreviations in roughly two lines (fol. 391v6-8).

mahallī: this denotes the parallel to the Mahālisutta (DN 6).

pr(ṣṭhapālaś ca): apparently, this key word refers to the text corre-

⁸ TP vol. 118, p. 265f. = vol. *thu*, fol. 119a8-b1; TD vol. *ñu*, fol. 74a1-2; Honjō Yoshifumi already saw *lu he ta* as corresponding to Lokecca, cf. Honjō 1985, p. 782.

sponding to the Poṭṭhapādasutta (DN 9), although it becomes obvious from the manuscript itself that three more sūtras, namely Śronatāṇḍya-, Kūtatāṇḍya- and Ambāṣṭhasūtra, are arranged between Mahalli- and Pṛṣṭhapālasūtra. The *uddāna* is evidently defective here. Since the reading of the last preserved akṣara is unambiguous, the name must be reconstructed as *pr(ṣṭhapāla)* in accordance with the form attested in the text of the sūtra and in another *uddāna*. One could assume that here we are confronted with an unnamed Piṇḍoddāna, i.e., a summary of several *uddānas* which selects the first key word of each (cf. Panglung 1980), but there are two reasons against this: first, the fact that *prṣṭhapāla* appears as the second key word in the corresponding *uddāna* (cf. below) and, second, the fact that in the following line three consecutive sūtras are enumerated.

Part of the text omitted here can be reconstructed from other passages. On folio 410 of the manuscript, an *uddāna* is found in the lines r1-2 between the Kūtatāṇḍya- and the Ambāṣṭhasūtra, which is repeated at the end of the section on folio 430r8. In both cases the text is only partly preserved, but the sequence becomes clear.

Folio [4]10r1-2:

avaṃṣṭhaḥ pṛṣṭha ///

... [ta]ma āna[ndo] bhikṣusāstariḥ ||

Folio 430r8:

*[a]ṃ[b]āṣṭha pṛṣṭhapālaś ca kāraṇavādi ca pudgalāḥ
śruta<ṃ>ma(ha)l[o nya]tama anando<bhikṣu>śāstā-
ni ||*

This attests to the sequence of Ambāṣṭha, Pṛṣṭhapāla, Kāraṇavādin, Pudgala (on four kinds of persons) and Śruta. The rest of the line

must refer to the following two sūtras, the first on another old brahmin and the second a repetition thereof. It seems odd that nearly half a verse is used for two texts, but no other explanation suggests itself at the moment. Obviously, at least pāda d (*ānando bhikṣusāstāri?*) refers to a kind of duplicate of the preceding sūtra at the end of which it is said (fol. 430r7): || *ya[thā] jirṇo vṛddho mahallaka evam anyatamo brāhmaṇaḥ āyusmān ānando sāsṭā bhikṣūṇāṃ bhāṣate* || ; it is not clear which text *anyatama* belongs to, since both of them have this word in their introduction.

The sequence of sūtras between Mahallin and Ambāṣṭha can also be confirmed from another *uddāna*, but so far only from one preserved in a Central Asian Sanskrit text. The fragmentary folio c of manuscript SHT V 1290 of the German Turfan finds contains the end of the Kūṭatāṇḍya- and the beginning of the Ambāṣṭasūtra. In line R8 (p. 210) of fragment c, parts of the *uddāna* are preserved: [*pha*].. *śoṇatāṇṭhyaś ca kūṭatāṇṭhyena paścimāḥ* 1⁹ ///. At the beginning of the line traces of two akṣaras are preserved, the first of which was read as [*pha*] by the editors of the volume. However, the graphically very similar [*ha*] is equally possible, and with a high degree of probability the following syllable contains an l.¹⁰ Therefore it is very tempting to reconstruct the also metrically fitting title Mahallī which would result in the following half śloka:

(*ma*)*hal*(*lī*) *śoṇatāṇṭhyaś ca kūṭatāṇṭhyena paścimāḥ*.

v. ko bhavati sa: the textual remains recall pāda 3d *v<a>rgo bhavati samudditaḥ*, “(with this) the section is summarized”, but

⁹ It is difficult to decide if this sign is to be understood as a number or as a punctuation mark; if it is to be taken as a numerical symbol, it may possibly indicate a numbering of the *uddānas* within the Śilaskandha section.

¹⁰ Cf. the facsimile in SHT V, plate 85.

reading the first two akṣaras as *vargo* is impossible. Apart from that, one would expect such a line as the last pāda of an *uddāna* verse, but hardly as pāda b which it appears to be in the present case. In the face of the obvious break in the sequence of texts indicated by the following key words — at least four sūtras remain unmentioned — one suspects that part of the text is omitted in the verse. It seems difficult to find another explanation for the interruption of the sequence, and the reconstruction of the line is at present better left open.

(*vās*)*iṣṭhaḥ*: evidently the enumeration jumps to the text corresponding to the Tevijjasutta (DN 13), reconstructed here with reference to the name as preserved in verse 3b.

kāśyapaś caiva: again this key word denotes the text corresponding to the Kassapasihanādasutta (DN 8). A comparison of verses 3 and 5 demonstrates clearly that different wordings are (or, perhaps better, can be) used for those *uddānas* summarizing a section and those summarizing a larger part or a whole work.

brahmajālam anopamā: the first word refers of course to the Brahmajālasūtra with its parallel in DN 1. The second word is most likely to be taken as an attribute — in the sense of *anupamam*, “matchless” with lengthening for metrical reasons, cf. BHSD s.v. *anopama* — since Śamathadeva who quotes the Brahmajālasūtra as the last text in the *Śilaskandha* section,¹¹ confirms that no other sūtra can possibly follow.

... .. *śilaskandhanip(ā)t(a)s samāptaḥ*: possibly to be reconstructed as || *dīrghāgame śilaskandhanip(ā)t(a)s samāptaḥ* “the Śilaskandha section (in the Dīrghāgama) is completed”. This colophon concludes the last section of the Dīrghāgama. Previously, its Sanskrit name

¹¹ Honjō 1985, p. 783.

was known in the form of Śilaskandhikā only from a quotation in the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya which is explained in the Vyākhyā as *śilaskandhikā nāma nipātaḥ*, “the section named Śilaskandhikā”;¹² the corresponding Pāli term is Silakkhandhavagga.

samāptaś ca dirghā(ga)maḥ: “the Collection of Long (Discourses) is also completed”. The terms for section, *nipāta* in Sanskrit and *vagga* in Pāli, and also the terms for the collection as a whole are different: in the Sanskrit version *āgama* is chosen, while the Pāli prefers *nikāya* (although *āgama* in this context is by no means unknown to the Pāli tradition).

2 . *Loss of text in the manuscript*¹³

In my earlier paper I observed that text seemed to be missing in the manuscript, without being able to explain that omission. The apparently missing text was a whole sūtra, the Prasādanīyasūtra (Pāli Pāsādikasutta), which could not be found in the place indicated by the *uddāna* and by the parallel in the Central Asian manuscripts.¹⁴ Since then, considerable textual gaps have been noticed in the last part of the manuscript, and therefore it is now reasonable to assume that most or all of these losses occurred in the transmission process of the text. Some of the missing passages may be recovered in rather unexpected places, once the manuscript is better studied and more folios have become available. Lance Cousins kindly drew my attention to the fact that three leaves of the Ambāṣṭhasūtra (which basically covers the

¹² Abhidh-k-bh(P) 255,13 with Abhidh-k-vy 420,18.

¹³ This paper was first read on March 29, 2001, at the 28th Deutscher Orientalistentag, and I wish to thank the participants for the stimulating discussion of this point.

¹⁴ Hartmann 2000, p. 364.

folios 410-416) are inserted in a later section and probably numbered as folios 442-444. This can only be explained if one assumes that the leaves were first copied, then mixed up, wrongly rearranged and only then finally numbered.¹⁵ The last folios of the manuscript display the following situation: on folio 451r2 the Kāśyapasūtra begins, which should cover a number of leaves; the next folio 452, however, contains text from the Brahmajālasūtra, but not from its beginning; it sets in with the section corresponding to § 151 in Weller. The next folio 453r connects directly with 452v; it has not yet been separated from the final folio 454, and therefore no photographs of folios 543v and 454r are available to us. The remaining text of the Brahmajālasūtra (§§ 206-223 in Weller's edition) fits quite well into this gap, and we assume that the final part of the sūtra is completely preserved. In the first line of the *verso* side of folio 454 the *antaroddāna* begins (§ 223 in Weller). The various gaps in the *uddānas* have already been referred to above.

It appears that the manuscript was copied in a way which aimed at reproducing its exemplar folio for folio. This is indicated by the sometimes fairly copious spacing between the akṣaras in the last line of a page or by the filling up of the last line with strokes. Both serve as a means for reproducing justified margins in order to conform to the format of the exemplar.¹⁶ Such phenomena will have to be studied very carefully throughout this manuscript, but also in comparison with other similar manuscripts. At the moment there is reason to suspect that some folios had already been lost in one of our manuscript's exemplars, and without attempting to recover them from other manuscripts in the process of copying, the folio numbers were simply applied

¹⁵ Cousins refers to the same phenomenon reported by Andrew Skilton in a recent paper, cf. Skilton 2000, p. 11.

¹⁶ For similar observations on Khotanese manuscripts in Central Asia cf. Sander 1988, pp. 547f.

to the remaining leaves. This does not yet explain the fragmentary text of the *uddānas*, but here, too, it will be necessary to take all the evidence from the available folios into consideration before we can reach a better understanding of the textual developments within this particular manuscript.

3. *List of the sūtras in the Śilaskandha section*

The *uddānas* and the available folios of the manuscript provide enough information for an attempt at reconstructing the sequence of sūtras within the Śilaskandha section with a fairly high degree of certainty. In the following list, the first and/or the last folio of each sūtra is mentioned, if preserved and determinable, and a reference to the Pāli parallel in the DN is added. The remark that no corresponding text is traced in the DN only means that no sutta appears in the DN with the same or a similar title and with corresponding interlocutor(s). The exact relation between the so far unknown Sanskrit texts and the suttas of the Pāli Nikāyas will have to be clarified in the course of an edition and close study of each sūtra. According to the present state of knowledge the Śilaskandha section contains altogether 23 texts as opposed to 13 suttas in the Silakkhandhavagga of the DN — all the 13 texts of the Pāli find a correspondence in the Sanskrit — and 9 in that Collection of Long Discourses which is only preserved in Chinese translation and generally ascribed to the school of the Dharmaguptakas.¹⁷

1 . Tridaṇḍin	fol. ?-367r3	without correspondence in the DN
2 . Piṅgalātreyā	367r4-?	without correspondence in the DN
3 . Lohitya I	?-?	Lohicca, DN 12

¹⁷ However, cf. Boucher 2000, pp. 67f.

4. Lohitya II	?-386r1	without correspondence in the DN
5. Kaivartin	386r1-390v1	Kevaddha, DN 11
6. Maṇḍīśa I	390v1-391v6	Jāliyasutta, DN 7
7. Maṇḍīśa II	391v6-8	without correspondence in the DN
8. Mahallin	391v8-396v6	Mahāli, DN 6
9. Śronatāṇḍya	396v6-401r1	Soṇadaṇḍa, DN 4
10. Kūṭatāṇḍya	401r2-409v8	Kūṭadanta, DN 5
11. Ambāṣṭha	410r2-416r3	Ambaṭṭha, DN 3
12. Pṛṣṭhapāla	416r3-423(?)v7	Poṭṭhapāda, DN 9
13. Kāraṇavādin ¹⁸	424r4-424v3	without correspondence in the DN
14. Pudgala	424v3-426v1	without correspondence in the DN
15. Śruta	426v1-427v5	without correspondence in the DN
16. Mahalla ¹⁹	427v6-430r7	without correspondence in the DN
17. Anyatama	430r7	without correspondence in the DN
18. Śuka	430r8-433r2	Subha, DN 10
19. Jivaka	433r2-? ²⁰	without correspondence in the DN
20. Rājā	?-447(?)v2	Sāmaññaphala, DN 2

(three folios [442-444] of the Ambāṣṭha and one [445] of the Brahmajāla are inserted here)

21. Vāsiṣṭha	447(?)v2-451r1	Tevijja, DN 13
22. Kāśyapa	451r2-v8	Kassapasihanāda, DN 8: cf. above for the discussion of the omission of text
23. Brahmajāla	452r1-454r	Brahmajāla, DN 1: cf. above for the discussion of the omission of text

¹⁸ The following key words are omitted in the *uddāna*, but cf. the commentary on the key word *pr(ṣṭhapālaś)* above.

¹⁹ The reading of this and the following key word are not fully sure, cf. the remark on the key word *pr(ṣṭhapālaś ca)* above.

²⁰ The transition from this text to the next is preserved, but the folio is damaged at the left margin, and therefore the folio number is not preserved.

Abbreviations and Literature

- Abhidh-k-bh(P) *Abhidharmakośabhāṣyam of Vasubandhu*, ed. P. Pradhan, rev. 2nd ed. Aruna Haldar, Patna 1975.
- Abhidh-k-vy *Sphuṭārthā Abhidharmakośavyākhyā by Yaśomitra*, ed. Unrai Wogihara, Tokyo 1932-1936.
- BHSD Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary*, New Haven 1953.
- DN *The Dīgha Nikāya*, ed. T.W. Rhys Davids, J. Estlin Carpenter, 3 Vols., London 1890-1911 (Pali Text Society).
- SHT V-VI *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil 5: ed. Lore Sander und Ernst Waldschmidt, Teil 6: ed. Klaus Wille, Stuttgart 1985, 1989 (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, X, 5-6).
- TD *The Sde-dge Mtshal-par Bka'-'gyur, A Facsimile Edition of the 18th century redaction of Si-tu Chos-kyi-'byun-gnas prepared under the direction of H.H. the 16th Rgyal-dbañ Karma-pa*, 103 vols., Delhi 1976-1978; *Sde-dge Bstan-'gyur Series, Published as Part of the Dgoñs-rdzogs of H.H. the Sixteenth Rgyal-dbañ Karma-pa*, 213 vols., New Delhi 1982-1986 (reprinted together as *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Taipei Edition*, vol. 1ff., Taipei 1991ff.).
- TP *The Tibetan Tripitaka, Peking Edition* (repr.), ed. Daisetz T. Suzuki, 168 vols., Tokyo, Kyoto 1955-1961.

Boucher, Daniel

- 2000 Review of Richard Salomon, *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls From Gandhāra*, Washington 1999, in *Sino-Platonic Papers* 98, 58-71.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe

- 1989 "Fragmente aus dem Dīrghāgama der Sarvāstivādins", *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen u. Neu-editionen*, 1, Göttingen 1989 (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhisti-

schen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 2), 37-67.

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

2000 “Bemerkungen zu einer neuen Handschrift des *Dirghāgama*”, *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka. Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, ed. Christine Chojnacki, J.-U. Hartmann u. Volker M. Tschannerl, Swistal-Odendorf 2000 (*Indica et Tibetica*, 37), 359-367.

Honjō Yoshifumi

1985 “Upāyikā shoden no Jō-agon” (“The *Dirghāgama* Transmitted by Śamathadeva”), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 33, 783-779.

Panglung, Jampa Losang

1980 “Preliminary Remarks on the Uddānas in the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin”, *Tibetan Studies in Honour of Hugh Richardson*, ed. Michael Aris and Aung San Suu Kyi, Warminster, 226-232.

Sadakata Akira

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

Sander, Lore

1988 “Auftraggeber, Schreiber und Schreibeigenheiten im Spiegel khotansakischer Handschriften in formaler Brāhmī”, *Studia Indogermanica et Slavica. Festgabe für Werner Thomas zum 65. Geburtstag*, ed. Peter Kosta a.o., München (*Specimina Philologiae Slavicae*, Supplementband 26), 533-549.

Skilton, Andrew

2000 “The Letter of the Law and the Lore of Letters: The Role of Textual Criticism in the Transmission of Buddhist Scripture”, *Contemporary Buddhism* 1.1, 9-34.

Tripathi, Chandrabhal

1995 *Ekottarāgama-Fragmente der Gilgit-Handschrift*, Reinbek (Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik, Monographie 2).

Weller, Friedrich

1934 *Brahmajālasūtra, Tibetischer und Mongolischer Text*, Leipzig.

1935-36 "Das tibetische Brahmajālasūtra", *Zeitschrift für Indologie und Iranistik* 10, 1-61 = *Kleine Schriften*, 2 Bde., ed. Wilhelm Rau, Wiesbaden 1987 (Glasenapp-Stiftung, 26), 642-702.

*Professor,
Institut für Indologie und Iranistik
der Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München
Guest Professor,
International College
for Advanced Buddhist Studies*