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In this article, I should like to make some further observations concerning the seven fragments investigated in Hori 2003. A provisional list of Sanskrit manuscripts in the Ōtani Collection at Ryūkoku University Library including the seven fragments nos. 622–628 was published in Wakahara (2003, p. 36).

No. 622 Unidentified Fragment 1 and No. 624 Unidentified Fragment 3: Suvarṇabhāsottama

Newly romanised editions of these two fragments were published together with fragments belonging to the same folios in the Lushun Museum Collection¹ in Karashima (2003, pp. 184–189). Verso 9 of no. 622 is transcribed as balabodhya on p. 187. However, the last akṣara bears certainly a vowel sign -ā and should be transcribed as dhyā.

In Skjærvø (2002, p. 375), one finds a newly published Khotanese–Saka fragment (IOL Khot 167/5; II. 147 NS 123) corresponding to no. 624, recto.

No. 623 Unidentified Fragment 2: Saddharmapuṇḍarīka

A newly romanised edition of this fragment was published in Karashima (2003, pp. 189–191).

No. 627 Unidentified Fragment 6: Dharmaśārīrasūtra

In Hori 2003, I showed that this fragment corresponded to SHT IV 623 and SHT VII 1689. No facsimile reproductions of these have been published so far, except for Kat.-Nr. 623, Bl. 27, R (SHT I, Tafel 25). In September 2004 I checked the original of SHT VII 1689 including a colophon in Bl. h, V3 (SHT VII, p. 103) at the Orientabteilung of the Staatsbibliothek zu Berlin. On the basis of the original I read the colophon as follows:

/// + [rma]/[śa]/[rī]/[a]/sūtraṃ samāp[tā] ///

The text before the akṣara rma is lost. The akṣara rma is damaged, but legible. The next akṣara apparently for śa is illegible. The vowel sign for -i in the next akṣara is legible with difficulty, while the consonant r- is more difficult to read. As for the next akṣara, only the bottom of ra is discernible.

In SHT VII the line is transcribed on the assumption of two illegible akṣaras between [rma] and [s]ū as follows:

/// + [rma]/.../[s]ūtraṃ samā[pta] ///

In SHT IX (p. 42A) a restoration (dha)rma(kāya)sūtraṃ is suggested on the basis of the title of the corresponding Chinese text 法身經. However, this title can also correspond to dharmaśārīrasūtra and it is more probable that the Sanskrit text has the title dharmaśārīrasūtra than dharmakāyasūtra, although the colophon is badly damaged.

The title dharmaśārīrasūtra leads to a new question, because two Sanskrit texts with the same title are known so far. One text in North Turkestan Brāhmī, type b, from the Turfan Collection was published in Stönner (1904,

---

2 I am grateful to Dr. Hartmut-Ortwin Feistel and Dr. Gerhard Ehlers for arranging for me to investigate the original.

3 I would like to thank Dr. Klaus Wille-Peters for sending me an unpublished manuscript of the concerned page of SHT IX.

p. 1283) and is considerably abridged compared with the other two. Another Sanskrit manuscript in South Turkestan Brāhmī script from the Petrovsky Collection (call number: SI P/69) was published in BB 33 (pp. 68-69). The last portion of SI P/69, folio 5, recto 3-verso 2, corresponds closely to SHT VII 1689, Bl. h, V1–2 (p. 103), and SHT IV 623, Bl. 42, R4–7 (p. 257), but otherwise the text contains many Mahāyāna terms like the ten bhūmis of bodhisattvas, which are not found in the other two Dharmaśarīrasūtras. The relationship of these three Sanskrit Dharmaśarīrasūtras, a Khotanese-Saka version in the Petrovsky Collection (call number: SI P/49) and a Chinese version T 766 (vol. 17, pp. 699–700) is still awaiting investigation.

No. 628 Unidentified Fragment 7: Gorakṣanātha’s Amaraughashaśasana

After the publication of Hori 2003, I could identify no. 628 as belonging to the Amaraughashaśasana ascribed to Gorakṣanātha (Gorakhnāth) on the basis of the digitalized text input by Oliver Hellwig. This fragment is the only non-Buddhist (Śaiva or Haṭhayoga) text among the seven fragments.

No. 628 consists of 20 pieces altogether, which belong to at least three folios, and covers the following passages in Shāstrī 1918. Numbers in parentheses are paragraph numbers used in Hellwig’s digitalized text.

---

5 SHT I 596 (p. 264).
7 Bongard–Levin and Vorobyova–Desyatovskaya 1986, Table I, no. 28.
9 An entry in the list in Wakahara (2003, p. 36) as Amaraughashaśasana is a misprint for Amaraughaśasana.
10 The digitalized text based upon Shāstrī 1918 is available from http://www.sub.uni-goettingen.de/ebene_1/fiindolo/gretil.htm
11 I am indebted to Prof. Jun Takashima for making the edition available to me.
Folio a (two pieces): 4.20 (10.20)–4.22 (10.22), 5.11 (10.33)–5.14 (10.36).

Folio b (five pieces): 7.12 (31)–7.14 (32), 8.6 (36)–8.9 (39).

Folio c (two pieces): 9.10 (54)–9.13 (56), 10.5 (60)–10.6 (60).

Seven pieces have no text on both sides probably due to the separation of layers of birch-bark. The other four pieces remain unidentified.

The facsimile of two larger pieces was published in Shinsaiikiki II, plate facing p. 648 with a caption “樺皮に書かれた異體文字の經典斷片（實物原色版）(fragments of a scripture written on birch-bark in variant script; photograph in original colors).” The same plate page includes two photos of the Subaši ruins near Kuća. In Shinsaiikiki II (pp. 557–722), diaries of Koichirō Yoshikawa 吉川小一郎 (1885–1978), a member of the Third Ōtani Expedition, were published. On pp. 647–658 he described his stay in Kuća and excavation at Subaši and on p. 657 reported a finding of something like a scripture volume with Sanskrit text written on fragmentary leaves (木葉片に梵文ある経冊の如きものを獲。) at the Subaši ruins on May 15, 1913. It is not certain whether these fragments refer to the two pieces of no. 628 on the plate. Given that no. 628 is really a finding at Subaši, the fact might be important both for the history and spread of Haṭhayoga and for the religious history of Kuća.
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