Preliminary remarks on two versions of the Āṭānāṭīya（Āṭānāṭika)-Sūtra in Sanskrit

Lore Sander

Preliminary remarks on two versions of the Āṭānāṭīya (Āṭānāṭika)-Sūtra in Sanskrit[*]

Lore Sander

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 *uddāna*s.[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 Āṭānāṭīya- [ĀṭānSū (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.

[1] Hartmann 2000, 2002, 2004. Remains of this manuscript where first published by Sadakata 1999.

[2] For details cf. Hartmann 2004: 119–120.

[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",[4] which is not the earliest form of the script, and they probably date to the 8th century.[5] 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[6] 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 *uddāna*s 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 Āṭānāṭīyā- and the Mahāsamāja-Sūtra (no. 33) make up a pair.[7] Both Sūtras are *rakṣā*s, protection texts, appearing in the same sequence in a list of Mahāsūtras in the Tibetan Mūlasarvāstivāda Vinaya.[8]

    That this Sūtra was popular on the northern Silk Route—under the variant title Āṭānāṭika-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[9] and Uigur script[10] demonstrate its importance for the Buddhist communities and lay followers,[11] 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 "Rotkuppelhöhle" (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 *yūganipāta*: „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.

    9 Maue 1985: 98-122 and 1996: 67-70 cat.-no. 8-12, Plates 11, 34-36, 38.

    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.

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 Āṭānāṭika-Sūtra.[13] But not all of the Āṭānāṭika 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 Āṭānāṭika-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 lacunas, 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 Sängim or Murtuq, from where also most of the fragments in Uigur language originate; cf. Maue 1985: 101 and Zieme 2005: 31–45.

[13] Cf. Sander in SHT 4: 6–14; Iwamatsu 1990: 127–153; 1991: 75–80; Hartmann 1992: 25–31.

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.[14]

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): *kīrtayi(ṣyāmi bhadanta bhagavataḥ purataḥ kumbhāṇḍā) nāṃ mahākumbhāṇḍā(nāṃ[15] senāpatīnāṃ se)nāyāḥ paricā(rakāṇāṃ nāmāni 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[16] clearly show that the enumeration uses the accusative *kumbhāṇḍān* and not genitive *kumbhāṇḍānāṃ*, and that therefore Hoffmann's addition of adding *nāmāni* in his reconstruction was influenced by the Tibetan translation[17] 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 *kīrtayiṣyāmy ahaṃ bhadanta bhagavataḥ purasthāt kumbhāṇḍān mahākumbhāṇḍān kumbhāṇḍasenāpatī(ṃ)*

---

[14] E.g. cat.-no. 33, 681b and 1242.

[15] Hoffmann 1939: 22 (＝MIAKPh 1987: 38) 459.4 (＝cat.-no. 165) R4 reads *(kuṃbhāṇḍā)[ṇ]āṃ* and annotated „Lies: *kumbhāṇḍānāṃ*". His reading has to be corrected to *(kumbhā)ṇ[ḍ]āṃ*.

[16] 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.

[17] Cf. Hoffmann 1939: 62 [＝MIAKPh 1987: 78] and Skilling Vol. I 1994: 506.5.1: ... *kyi miṅ (name) bryod par bgyi lags so*. I owe this reference to Siglinde Dietz.

senāyāḥ pariṇāyakāṃ tadyathā.

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 ĀṭānSū (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.[18] In spite of the possibility of improving the text, one should never loose 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 ĀṭānSū(CASkt) is demonstrated by a survey of the fragments from the beginning of the Sūtra. 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.

<u>**Cat.-no.**</u>[19]

175, fol. 37 r1:   evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasamayaṃ bhagavāṃ śrāvastyāṃ

---

[18] Most fragments were already gathered by me from various publications in an appendix to the reprint of Hoffmann's text (1987: 193–208). Some more were identified by Wille in SHT 6–9. For the fragments from the British Library London and the Bibliothèque Nationale Paris, cf. Hartmann-Wille 1992; Hartmann 1993; Wille 2005.

[19] The following folios and fragments are already published by Hoffmann 1939 (= MIAKPh 1987). He still used the numbers given by Heinrich and Else Lüders; cf.

viharati

174 r4:	... m.y. .ru ...
681b v4:	... ś(r)āvastyāṃ[20] ni(dā)naṃ[21]

175, fol. 37 r2:   smāj jetavane anāthapiṇḍadārāme

175, fol.37 r2-3:	atha vaiśravaṇo mahārāja[22] anekayakṣaśataparivāraḥ
33.11 r2:	... ś(a)t(aparivā)raḥ
174 r3:	... rā(jā) anekayakṣaśat(a) ...
681b v4:	atha vaiśravaṇ(o) ...
1242b vy:	... (ya)kṣaśatapari...

175, fol.37 r3-4:	anekayakṣasahasraparivāraḥ atikkrāntavarṇaḥ
33.11 r2:	anekayakṣas(a)h(a)srapari(vāraḥ) ...
IOL Toch.355 rb:	... (saha)srapa(ri)vār(aḥ) atikrāṃt(a) ...
681b v5-6:	(a)nekayakṣasahasr(a)pariv(āraḥ anekayakṣaśatasahas-ra)parivāraḥ atikr(ā) ...

Waldschmidt in SHT 1: XIXf. The SHT numbers used in this article correspond to the following numbers in Hoffmann's edition: cat.-no. 33=531; 165=459; 174=523; 175=524; 180=537.

[20] The restored akṣaras or words are written in round bracket. Virāma is marked by an asterisk.

[21] The opening of the Sūtra differs from that in the other manuscripts using the abbreviated form *śrāvastyāṃ nidānaṃ*; see other examples in SWTF *nidāna*(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 ĀṭānSū(Tib) and therefore are also closer to ĀṭānSū(Gilgit).

[22] Read *mahārājā*; annotated by Hoffmann 1939: 18 (=MIAKPh 1987: 34), note 5.

175, fol.37 r4-5:   abhikkrāntāyāṃ rātrau yena bhagavāṃs tenopajagāma

175, fol.37 r5-6:   upetya   bhagavatpādau   śirasā   vantitvā[23]   ekante[24]
                        nyaṣīdad

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

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

174 r4:   ...   (ekā)n(te)
                        nyaṣīdad

175, fol.37 r6-v1:   apīd(ānīṃ) vaiśravaṇasya mahārājñaḥ varṇānubhāvena

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

IOL Toch. 355 rc: ...   rājño varṇānubh. ...

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

33.11 r4:   sarvaṃ jetavanam udāreṇāvabhāsena sphu ...

165.26 vb   ...   (s)phuṭam
                        abhūd

175, fol.37 v2-3:   ekāntaniṣānno vaiśravaṇo mahārājā tasyāṃ velāyāṃ
                        gāthā[25] babhāṣe ‖

33.11 r4-5:   ekānt(a) ...   (velāyāṃ)

---

[23] *vantitvā* for *vanditvā* 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 *ekānte*; cf. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (=MIAKPh 1987: 35), note 1. Judging from the classical Sanskrit this manuscript has many orthographic mistakes. Furthermore, the sign for *-ā* 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.

	gāthāṃ babhāṣe
165.26 vb:	e(kā)nta[26] ...
174 r5:	... m(a)harājā-s-[27]tasyāṃ vel(āyāṃ)
	gāthāṃ 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(ra) ...

175, fol.37 v5-6:	na tad devāḥ prajānanti yat prajānāsi cakṣumān*[28]
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:	pratyutpannān[29] atītāṃś ca ye ca buddhā anagatāḥ[30]
174 r6:	(p)r(a)tyutpannam atītāṃś ca ye ca buddh(ā) anāgataḥ[31]

175, fol.38 r1:	sarvvān ahaṃ namasyāmi tvaṃ[32] cāhaṃ śaraṇaṃ gataḥ	
174 r6:	sarvān āh(aṃ)[32] ...

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

---

[26] °kā° omitted by the scribe.

[27] Read *mahārājā*. -*s*- is often inserted before *t*° by this scribe; see also below *viditvā-s-tasyāṃ*.

[28] Read *cakṣuṣmān*; scribal error; cf. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (=MIAKPh 1987: 35), note 6.

[29] Read *pratyutpannam*.

[30] Read *anāgatāḥ*; scribal error; cf. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (=MIAKPh 1987: 35), note 7.

[31] Read *anāgatāḥ*; scribal error. Hoffmann 1939: 23 (=MIAKPh 1987: 39) read *anāgatāḥ*, but °*ta* is very sure.

[32] Read *tvāṃ*. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (=MIAKPh 1987: 35), note 8; 174-6 read *ahaṃ*. Hoffmann 1939: 23 (=MIAKPh 1987: 39), note 5.

	gandhāri	
174 r7:	... (ga)ndhāri	

| 175, fol.38 r3-4: | cori | caṇḍāli | sopakke | stulasāpati[33] | padumāpati svāha |[34] |
| 174 r7: | sobake | sthulasāpati | padumāpati svāhā[35] |

175, fol.38 r4-5:	santi bhadanta bhagavataḥ śrāvakaḥ bhikṣavo bhik-suṇyaḥ[36]
165.26 vd:	(bhikṣav)o bhikṣuṇya
33.11 v1:	... (ś)r(āvakaḥ bhikṣavo bhikṣ)u(ṇya)

175, fol.38 r4-5:	upāsakā upāsikāḥ[37] ye araṇyavanaprasthāni prāntāni śayanāsanāny adhyāvasanti
165.26 vd:	upās(akā up)āsikā ye a ...
180 rb:	... (u)pāsikā ye ...
174 r8:	... prasthāni prāntāni śayanāny[38] adhy(ā) ...
33.11 v2:	... (adhyāva)s(aṃ)ti

| 175, fol.38 v1-2: | santi cātra vyāḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā nivāsikā[39] ye bhagavatpravacane |
| 33.11 v2: | santi cātr(a) v(yā)ḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā (naivāsi)k(ā) ... |

---

[33] Read *sthula°*; scribal error.

[34] This *mantra* is missing in cat.-no. 33.11 and 165.26 as already annotated by Hoffmann 1939: 87.1 (=MIAKPh 1987: 103).

[35] *cori* | *caṇḍali* | omitted in this manuscript.

[36] Read *śrāvakā* and *bhiksuṇya*. Cf. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (=MIAKPh 1987: 35), note 11 and 12.

[37] Read *upāsikā*; cf. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (=MIAKPh 1987: 39), note 13.

[38] *°āsanāny°* omitted by the scribe.

[39] Read *naivāsikā*; cf. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (=MIAKPh 1987: 39), note16.

175, fol.38 v2:	abhiprasannā anabhiprasannāś ca |
174 v1:	...　　　　　(a)n(a)bhiprasannāś ca
165.26 ve:	...　　　　　(an)abhiprasannaś (ca)

33.11 v3:	(a)lpatarās te vyāḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā naiv(āsika) ye bhag(avatpravacane)[40]
174 v1:	alpatarās te vy(āḍā ya)kṣā ...

175, fol.38 v2-4:	atha ca punas te bahutara[41] vyāḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā naivāsikā
33.11 v4:	(atha ca pun)as t(e) bahutarā v(y)āḍ(ā) yak(ṣā) amanuṣyā naiv(āsikā)
165.26 ve:	(atha ca pu)nas te bahutarā vyā(ḍā) ...

175, fol.38 v4:	ye bhagavatpravācane anabhiprasannaḥ[42]
33.11 v5:	ye bhag. ...

175, fol.38 v5:	sādhu bhadanta bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhikṣavo bhikṣu-ṇyāḥ[43]
33.11 v5:	...　　　　　(bha)gav(ataḥ śrā)vakāḥ bhikṣavo bhi(kṣu)ṇyaḥ

175, fol.38 v5-6:	upāsakā-m[44]-upāsikā idam eva āṭānāṭikaṃ sūtraṃ vidyāṃ
33.11 v5:	upāsakā ...

---

[40] This sentence is omitted in cat.-no. 175, fol. 38.

[41] Read *bahutarā*; scribal error.

[42] Read *anabhiprasannāḥ*; cf. Hoffmann 1939: 19 (=MIAKPH 1987: 35), note 20.

[43] Read *bhikṣuṇyaḥ*; cf. also Hoffmann 1939 (=MIAKHPh 1987: 35), note 21. See also note 36.

[44] Hiatus bridger; cf. BHSG 4.59.

174 v2:   ... (u)pāsako[45] vā upāsikā vā ye idaṃ evaṃ āṭā(nāṭikaṃ
                           s)ū(traṃ) ...

165.26 vf: ...   ama(nuṣyā vā ye) idam eva āṭā[46] ...

33.11 v6:   ... udgṛhṇīyuḥ ...

174 v3:   (yakṣā)ṇāṃ   amanuṣyānāṃ   naivāsikānāṃ   abhipra-
                          s(ādāya)ḥ prasann(ānāṃ)

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

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

33.12 r2:   ... (ma)hārājñas tūṣṇī(ṃbhāvena ‖)

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

174 v4:   ... (mahārāj)ā bhagavatas tūṣṇīṃbhāvenādhivāsanaṃ
                          viditvā-s[47]-tas(yāṃ) ...

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

33.13 r3:   ...   (purata)ḥ

---

[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.

[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.

[47] See note 27.

33.12 r3:   idam eva (āṭānāṭikaṃ sūtraṃ vidyāṃ) rakṣāṃ pā-
                   (davandanīṃ)

173a r1:   ...   (rakṣ)ā(ṃ p)ād(a) ...

174 v5-6:   (tad)y(a)thā hili mahā hili mele phurā phure | ...udāpati
                   svāhā | ‖[34]

    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 comunity
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-Maralbaši (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 evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmiṃ   § 1 evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasamayaṃ
samaye bhagavāṃ śrāvastyāṃ viha-   bhagavāṃ śrāvastyāṃ viharati jeta-
rati jetavane anāthapiṇḍadasyārāme   vane anāthapiṇḍadārāme (‖)
(‖)

§ 2 atha vaiśravaṇo mahārājo 'nekayakṣaparivāro 'nekayakṣaśataparivāro anekay(akṣasahasrapa)-rivāro 'nekayakṣaśatasahasraparivāro 'tikrāntavarṇo 'tikrāntāyāṃ rātryāṃ yena bhagavāṃs tenopasaṃkrāntaḥ (|) upasaṃkramya bhagavataḥ pādau śirasā vanditvaikānte niṣaṇṇo (‖) 'pīdānīṃ vaiśravaṇ(asya) mah(ā)r(ā)jasya varṇānubhāvena sarvaṃ jetavanam udareṇāvabhāsena sphuṭam abhūd (‖) ekāntaniṣaṇṇo vaiśravaṇo mahārājas tasyāṃ velāyāṃ gāthāṃ bhāṣate ‖

§ 2 atha vaiśravaṇo mahārājā anekayakṣaśataparivāraḥ anekayakṣasahasraparivāraḥ atikrāntavarṇaḥ abhikrāntāyāṃ rātrau yena bhagavāṃs tenopajagāma (|) upetya bhagavatpādau śirasā vanditvā ekānte nyaṣīdat (‖) apīdānīṃ vaiśravaṇasya mahārājñaḥ varṇānubhāvena sarvaṃ jetavanam udāreṇābhāsena sphuṭam abhūt |(|) ekāntaniṣaṇṇo vaiśravaṇo mahārājā tasyāṃ velāyāṃ gāthāṃ babhāṣe ‖

§ 3

    namo 'stu te mahāvīra
    saṃbuddh(a d)v(ipadot)t(ama |)
    na taṃ devāḥ prajānanti
    yaṃ prajānāsi buddhimān |(|)
    pratyutpannam atītāṃś ca
    ye ca buddhā anāgatāḥ (|)
    sarvān ahaṃ namasyāmi
    tvāṃ cāsmi śaraṇaṃ gataḥ (‖)

§ 3

    nam'astu te mahāvīra
    saṃbuddha dvipadottama (|)
    na tad devāḥ prajānanti
    yat prajānāsi cakṣuṣmān |(|)
    pratyutpannam atītāṃś ca
    ye ca buddhā anāgatāḥ (|)
    sarvān ahaṃ namasyāmi
    tvāṃ cāhaṃ śaraṇaṃ gataḥ |(|)

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

§ 4 santi bhadaṃta bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhikṣavo (bh)i(kṣuṇya) upāsakā ye cāraṇyavanaprasthāni prāntāni śāyanāsanāny adhyāvasanti (‖) santi cātra vyāḍā yakṣā 'manuṣyā naivāsikā ye bhagavataḥ pravacane 'bhiprasannāś cānabhiprasannāś ca (|) alpakās te bhadaṃta vyāḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā naivāsikā ye bhagavataḥ pravacane 'bhiprasannāḥ (‖)

§ 4 santi bhadanta bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhikṣavo bhiksuṇya upāsakā upāsikā ye araṇyavanaprasthāni prāntāni śayanāsanāny adhyāvasanti (‖) santi cātra vyāḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā naivāsikā ye bhagavatpravacane abhiprasannā anabhiprasannāś ca | alpatarās te vyāḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā naiv(āsikā) ye bhaga(vatpravacane abhiprasannāḥ |) atha ca punas te bahutarā vyāḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā naivasikā ye bhagavatpravacane anabhiprasannāḥ (‖)

§ 5 sādhu bhadanta bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhikṣavo (bh)i(kṣuṇya) upāsakā upāsikā idam evāṭānāṭīyaṃ sūtraṃ vidyārakṣāṃ pādavaṃdanīṃ vistareṇodgṛhṇīyuḥ paryavāpnuyuḥ yāvad evātmano rakṣāyai guptaye sparśavihārāya anabhiprasannānāṃ ca vyāḍ(ā)nāṃ yakṣāṇāṃ amanuṣyānāṃ naivā(sikānāṃ abhipra)sādāyābhiprasannānāṃ ca bhūyobhāvāya | adhivāsaye bhagavāṃ vaiśravaṇasya mahārājasya tūṣṇīṃbhāvena (‖)

§ 5 sādhu bhadanta bhagavataḥ śrāvakā bhikṣavo bhikṣuṇya upāsakā upāsikā idam evāṭānāṭikaṃ sūtraṃ vidyāṃ (rakṣāṃ pādavandanīṃ vistareṇa) udgṛhṇīyuḥ (paryavāpnuyuḥ yāvad evātmano rakṣāyai guptaye sparśavihārāya anabhiprasannānāṃ vyāḍānāṃ yakṣā)ṇāṃ amanuṣyānāṃ naivāsikānāṃ abhiprasā-(dāya)ḥ abhi)prasann(ā)nāṃ ca (bhūyobhāvāya | adhivāsayati bhagavāṃ vaiśravaṇasya mahā)rājñas tūṣṇī(ṃbhāvena ‖)

§ 6 atha vaiśravaṇo mahārājo bhagavatas tūṣṇīṃbhavenādhivāsanāṃ

§ 6 (atha vaiśravaṇo mahārāj)ā bhagavatas tūṣṇīṃbhāvenādhivāsanāṃ

viditvā bhagavataḥ purastād idam
evāṭānātīyaṃ sūtraṃ vidyārakṣāṃ
pādavandanīṃ vistareṇa bhāṣate ‖

viditvā tas(yāṃ velāyāṃ bhagavataḥ
purata)ḥ idam eva (āṭānāṭikaṃ sū-
traṃ vidyāṃ) rakṣāṃ pād(avandanīṃ
vistareṇa babhāṣe ‖
tad)y(a)thā (|) hilimāha | hilimele
phurā phure … . udāpati svāhā | ‖³⁴

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: *mahārājo 'nekayakṣa°* ĀtānSū
(Gilgit) and *mahārājā anekayakṣa°* ĀtānSū(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 °*rāja* is used, while all Central Asian
manuscripts retain the *n*-stem °*rājan*.

§ 1 The Sūtra begins with the normal introduction *evaṃ mayā śrutaṃ* "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 *ekasamayaṃ* is
used, a form which Brough did not discuss. This manuscript is not a reliable

---

⁴⁸ I 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.

copy[49] and therefore the adverbial form could easily be a scribal mistake for *ekaṃ samayaṃ*. 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 ĀṭānSū(CASkt) represents the older wording, which is close to the Pāli introduction of Suttas *ekaṃ samayaṃ*, an accusative of duration immediately following *evaṃ mayā sutaṃ*. 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 *evaṃ mayā śrutaṃ*, 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 consideration[50]—that it is difficult to connect the accusative of duration *ekaṃ samayaṃ* with *evaṃ mayā sutaṃ*—but also Allon's (1997: 195, 246f., 287) sophisticated analysis of a rhythmic rhetoric agreeing with the old *veḍha*, speak against Brough's interpretation. These arguments count also for the adverbial rendering in ĀṭānSū(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 *ekasmiṃ samaye*. The beginning of Sūtras handed down in the manuscripts from the northern Silk Route are not

---

[49] See above note 24.

[50] Cf. also Vetter 1993: 65, note 48.

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.[51] 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 ... *śrāvastyāṃ viharati smāj*[°52] *jetavane anāthapiṇḍadārāme.* 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),[53] *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 Vaiśrāvaṇa's suite of

---

[51] 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 *nidānam* 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).

[52] *-ā* in *smāj*° is very sure, even though *-ā* is not very distinctly marked in this manuscript.

[53] This lemma has not yet been published in SWTF. See "word indexes" *viharati* in SHT 4, *vihṛ* in 7 and 9. The only Sūtra fragment reading *viharati sma* is the fragment cat.-no. 1493 (SHT 4: 161).

Yakṣas in ĀṭānSū(Gilgit). In ĀṭanSū(Gilgit) it begins with "many Yakṣas" (*anekayakṣa*) and ends with "many 100,000s of Yakṣas" (*anekayakṣaśatasahara*), while both are missing in ĀtānSū(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 ĀṭānSū(Gilgit), *yena ... tenopasaṃkrāntaḥ | upasaṃkramya*. 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 ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) is used in the Pāli Suttas, which is *upasaṃkram* in *yena ... ten' upasaṃkami | upasaṃkamitvā*, but here the aorist *upasaṃkami* is preferred to the past participle. The preference for an inflected form to express the past is maintained in ĀṭānSū(CASkt), but perfect often replaces the aorist. The interchange between aorist and perfect in the ĀṭānSū(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) are:[56] 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 ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) because *anekayakṣaśatasahasraparivāraḥ* fits prefectly 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 ĀṭānSū, which reveal, at least in this paragraph, that ĀṭānSū(CASkt) preserves an older linguistic stratum than ĀṭānSū(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 ĀṭānSū(CASkt) versions use the imperfect *nyaṣīdat*, —*upasaṃkramya bhagavataḥ pādau śirasā vanditvaikānte nyaṣīdat*—, while in ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) the sentence ends with the past participle *nisaṇṇo*.[57] The next sentence, in which is said that the Jetavana shines from Vaiśrāvaṇa'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 Vaiśravaṇa recited the appropriate verses (*ekāntaniṣaṇṇo vaiśravaṇo mahārājas/ā tasyām velāyāṃ gāthām...*), is continued after the interpolated sentence in both versions, but the tense of the verb at the end of this sentence differs. The ĀṭānSū(CASkt) retains its style by using the perfect *vaiśravaṇo ... 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 *nisīdiṃsu*. Cf. Skilling vol. I 1994: 463-64, and Hoffmann 1939: 33 (=MIAKPh 1987: 49).

[58] No direct parallel is present in Pāli, where Vessavaṇo is also the speaker.— *udāreṇābhāsena 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: *mahāpṛthivīcalo 'bhūt sarvaś cāyaṃ loka udāreṇā-vabhāsena 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 *vaiśravaṇo ... gāthāṃ bhāṣate*, which is presumably a historical past.

§ 3 The following two *anuṣṭhub*s 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* (BHSG § 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 *pāda*s of the first verse. As expected, the Tibetan translation has the same wording as ĀṭānSū(Gilgit), which is *na taṃ devāḥ prajānanti yaṃ 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 *cakṣuṣmān* "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 sirīmato*). 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 Vessavaṇa 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 ĀṭānSū(CASkt) affirm the reading *yat-tad*, the Gilgit version has *yaṃ-taṃ*. 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 ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) the periphrastic perfect *asmi gataḥ* is used in the second *pāda*, the Central Asian manuscripts repeat *ahaṃ* constructed with the past participle *gataḥ*. In this case the Tibetan wording *bdag ni* likely corresponds to the Central Asian *ahaṃ*.[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 *mantra*s 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 *mantra*s are missing in cat.-no. 33 and 165. He argued that the *mantra*s 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 *mantra*s. 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. 12th 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 *mantra*s were only integrated into manuscripts to be used for ritual purposes?[64] As

---

[61] I thank my friend Siglinde 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."

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 Āṭānāṭika-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 Āṭānāṭika-Sūtra survives. Since the context of this composite manuscript is unknown, it is impossible to suggest why the *mantra*s were introduced into the text.

Another possibility cannot be excluded is that the two *mantra*s 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 *ghori (*resp. *gori), gandhāri, cori, caṇḍāli, sopakke (*resp. *sopake)*[66] and *sthulasāpati padumāpati* are constituent parts of the *mantra*s, some of them occuring 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 *rakṣā*s 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, svapākī, sopāka, sopākī, saupāka*; Pāli *sopāka, sapāka*; cf. MW *sopāka* „a man of degraded caste (the son of a Caṇḍāla by a Pulkasī)".

[67] E.g. the *mantra* against malicious snakes (*nāga*); cf. Hoffmann 1939: 68-69 (= MIAKPh 1987: 84-85). Cf. also Maue 1965: 110-111.

feminine vocatives, and may invoke dreadful and therefore powerful female beings. The creation of effective *mantra*s was very popular on the northern Silk Route.[68] 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.[69] In this formula a certain Mokṣayaśas composed a protective spell, which is integrated into a short version of the Asilomapratisara (Sander 1994: 100, note 20).[70] Finally, it should be mentioned that the wording of the end of the two *mantra*s 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,[71]

---

[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 ĀṭānSū in some manuscripts from Central Asia. See also § 5 below.

[69] Cf. Sander 1994: 93–104. The same stereotype renderings as in the ĀṭānSū occur there in magical verses (*sādhanī*) helping to accomplish an unfinished work (*ucchiṣṭakarmasādhanī*), among them the famous and powerful two pādas, which are a *satyakriyā*, a curse that becomes true: *saptadhāsya 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] *vyāḍā yakṣā amanuṣyā naivāsikā* is translated differently. Cf. SWTF *amanuṣya* and *naivāsika*. I follow Waldschmidt 1961: 201 (＝1967: 414) who separates the names translating: „Schlangen (*vyāḍha*), Riesen (*yakṣa*), Unmenschen (*amanuṣya*), Lokalgott-

for followers of the Buddha (*śrāvakā*)—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.
ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) adds only one sentence more, stating that only "a few"
(*alpakā*) of them are favorably disposed, while ĀṭānSū(CASkt) emphasizes
this fact by using the comparative *alpatarā*, which demands the repetition of
the sentence with *bahutarā*, "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 nīcā 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

---

heiten (*naivāsika*)". He refers to Edgerton BHSD sic! Hoffmann (1939: 80＝MIAKPh
1987: 96) translates "böse Yakṣa-Ortsdämonen". Skilling (vol. II, 1997: 566) speaks of
"fierce yakṣas and non-humans". The Pāli text (Hoffmann 1939: 35＝MIAKPh 1987: 51;
Skilling vol. I: 467) names only *uḷārā* "exalted" and *majjhimā yakkhā* "middling
Yakkhas".

[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 *alpatarā*. The
missing akṣaras are too many for the full wording between v1-2 in cat.-no. 174, which
suggests that the second sentence with *bahutarā* was omitted by the scribe, or that the
wording was the same as in ĀṭānSū(Gilgit).

[73] Hoffmann 1939: 35＝MIAKPh 1987: 51; Skilling vol. I 1994: 467; for discussion vol.
II 1997: 566.

[74] Cf. Hoffmann 1939: 34.13-19 (＝MIAKPh 1987: 50) and Skilling vol. I 1994:
466.3-6.

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 (*pādavandanī*)[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 *āṭānāṭīyaṃ/°ṭikaṃ sūtraṃ vidyārakṣāṃ/vidyāṃ rakṣāṃ pāda-vandanīṃ*, 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 ĀṭānSū(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 *pādavandanī* that it may refer to the powerful verses in this Sūtra and points with this note to a problem, namely, that *pādavandanī* 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 ĀṭānSū(CASkt) and the Pāli see Skilling vol. II 1997: 566.

[77] Cf. SWTF: *Āṭānāṭā*. The name is only partly preserved in cat.-no. 621 r3 (°*nāṭa*), which should be restored to *(āṭā)nāṭā*. 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 āḍānāḍa*. 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 Vaiśrāvaṇa'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.[78] Only some words about the Central Asian variant *āṭānāṭika* based on Hoffmann's argumentation. In an *hṛdaya* appended to some of the Central Asian manuscripts[79] the word *āṭānāṭi* occurs in two *anuṣṭhub*s (Hoffmann 1939: 103-04 [=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 [=MIAKPh 1987: 24]) interpretation that the Sūtra itself is meant by *āṭānāṭi* is more convincing, and is also followed by Skilling (vol. II, 1997: 159). The *hṛdaya* is not appended to the Sūtra in canonical contexts, neither in Pāli, in ĀṭānSū(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 (*śrāvakā*) etc., when they learn (*udgṛhṇīyuḥ*) and master (*paryavāpnuyuḥ*) it in detail (*vistareṇa*). 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 [=MIAKPh 1987: 53]) restored the passage to *vi(dyāṃ rakṣāṃ pādavandanīṃ vistareṇ)odgṛhṇīyur (dhārayeyur ātmano guptaye rakṣāyai sukhasparśavihāratāyā),* Waldschmidt (1961: 201 [=1967: 414], note 5) followed a similar wording in the Divyāvadāna, which increases the number of verbs. He restored the phrase to *(vistareṇa udgṛhṇīyur dhārayeyur vācayeyuḥ) paryavāpnuyur yāvad evātma(no) ...* The ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) text is even shorter than Hoffmann's reconstruction; it reads *vidyārakṣāṃ pādavandanīṃ vistareṇodgṛhṇīyuḥ paryavāpnuyuḥ yāvad evātmano rakṣāyai guptaye sparśavihār-āyā ...* The main difference between ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) and the two mainly

---

[78] For linguistic arguments cf. Skilling vol. II 1997: 557-58.

[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 (=Š 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 ciṅ | 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 ĀṭānSū(Gilgit), namely, *vistareṇodgṛhṇīyuḥ paryavāpnuyuḥ*. 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 ĀṭānSū(Gilgit), especially because the remains of cat.-no. 10, ... *paryavāpnuyuḥ yāvad evātmano*..., do not differ. Another difference between the two versions is the addition of *sukha°*, and *°vihāratā* for *°vihāra* in *sukhasparśavihāratāyā* in the reconstructed texts of both Hoffmann[80] 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 ĀṭānSū(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 ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) is very

---

[80] Hoffmann (1939: 37 (=MIAKPh 1987: 53) and Skilling vol. I 1994: 466 1.8) likely followed the Tibetan translation *bde ba la reg par gnas par byi ba daṅ*, which corresponds to Sanskrit: *sukha-sparśa-vihāratā*. I owe this reference to Siglinde Dietz.

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 *adhivāsayati*, but ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) reads *adhivāsaye(d°)*.[81] The meaning of this stereotype is quite clear, the Lord consents in silence: *adhivasāsayati ... tūṣṇīṃbhāvena* (cf. SWTF *adhivas* 2). In this case the optative in ĀṭānSū(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 *anuṣṭhub*s, 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 Āṭānāṭīya/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 *vaiśravaṇo ... tasyāṃ velāyāṃ...idam eva āṭānāṭikaṃ sūtraṃ...babhāṣe*. In ĀṭānSū (Gilgit) *tasyāṃ velāyāṃ*, 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 ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) in a similar wording at the end of § 2, ... *tasyāṃ velāyāṃ gāthāṃ bhāṣate*.

Furthermore, ĀṭānSū(CASkt) reads *bhagavataḥ purataḥ*, where ĀṭānSū (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] *adhivāsaye* is either a scribal error or BHS form; cf. BHSG § 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 *(purata)ḥ* followed by *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 *bhāṣate* in ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) and the perfect *babhāṣe* in ĀṭānSū(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 ĀṭānSū(Gilgit) is closer to the Tibetan translation than the ĀṭānSū(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 *mantra*s 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] *purataḥ* is used in the same phrase in the closely related MsjSū; cf. Waldschmidt 1980: 151, § 3: *catasro brahmakāyikā devatā ... bhagavataḥ purataḥ pratitasthuḥ.*

[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.

Abbreviations

ARIRIAB	Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University
ĀṭānSū	Āṭanāṭīya- or Āṭānāṭika-Sūtra
ĀṭānSū(CASkt)	Āṭānāṭika-Sūtra (Central Asian, Sanskrit)
ĀṭānSū(CAUig)	Āṭānāṭika-Sūtra (Central Asian, Uigur)
ĀṭānSū(Gilgit)	Āṭānāṭīya-Sūtra (Gilgit)
ĀṭānSū(Pāli)	Āṭānāṭīya-Sutta (Pāli)
ĀṭānSū(Tib)	Āṭānāṭīya-Sūtra (Tibetan)
BEFEO	Bulletin d'École Française d'Extrême Orient
BHSD	Edgerton: Buddhist Hybrid Dictionary
BHSG	Edgerton: Buddhist Hybrid Grammar
BMSC	Buddhist manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection
BSOAS	Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London
cat.-no.	Catalogue number (SHT)
DĀ	Dīrghāgama
Divy	Divyāvadāna; ed. E.B. Cowell, R.A. Neil.
IIJ	Indo-Iranian Journal
IOL	India Office Library
JA	Journal Asiatique
JICABS	Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies
MIAKPh	Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Archäologie, herausgegeben im Auftrag des Stiftungsrates

	der Stiftung Waldschmidt vom Direktor des Museums für Indische Kunst der Staatlichen Museen Preußischer Kulturbesitz Herbert Härtel
MAV(1)	Mahāvadānasūtra; see Waldschmidt 1953
MsjSū	Mahāsamāja-Sūtra; see Waldschmidt 1980
MPS	Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra; see Waldschmidt 1950‒51
MW	Sir Monier Monier Williams Sanskrit-English Dictionary, new edition greatly enlarged and improved
Saṅghbh	Saṅghabhedavastu; see Gnoli
ŚāṅkSū	Śāṅkaraka-Sūtra
SHT	Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden; see Waldschmidt
SWTF	Sanskritwörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfanfunden see Bechert
VOHD	Verzeichnis der Orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, hrsg. von W. Voigt, D. George und H.-O. Feistel
WZKSO	Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Süd- und Ostasiens

Bibliography

Allon, Mark 1997: *Style and Function. A study of the dominant stylistic features of the prose portions of the Pāli canonical sutta texts and the mnemonic function.* Tokyo (Studia Philologica Buddhica, Monograph Series XII)

Allon, Mark et al. 2007 (forthcoming): "Radiocarbon Dating of Kharoṣṭhī Fragments from the Schøyen and Senior Manuscript Collections." *Buddhist Manuscripts* vol. III, ed. by Jens Braarvig et al. Oslo (Manuscripts in the Schöyen Collection, 7)

Bechert, Heinz & Klaus Röhrborn (eds.) 1973‒: *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfanfunden*, begonnen von E. Waldschmidt,

bearb. von G. von Simson, M. Schmidt et al. Göttingen.

Bongard-Levin, Gregory, Daniel Boucher et.al. 1996: *The Nagaropamasūtra: An Apotropaic Text from the Saṃyuktāgama*. A Transliteration, Reconstruction, and Translation of the Central Asian Sanskrit Manuscripts. *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen III*. Göttingen (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden. Beihelft 6)

Brough, John 1975: „Thus I have heard …" *BSOAS*, Vol. XIII: 416-426.

Cowell, Edward B. & Robert A. Neil 1886: The Divyāvadāna—A Collection of Early Buddhist Legends. Cambridge (repr. Amsterdam 1970)

Dschi, Hiän-lin (Ji Xianlin) 1949/1982: „Die Verwendung des Aorists als Kriterium für Alter und Ursprung buddhistischer Texte." *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, philolog.- hist. Klasse, Jg. 1949.10: 245-301 (repr. *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften zur altindischen Philologie/Selected Papers on Languages of Ancient India*. Peking)

Fukita, Takamichi 2003: *The Mahāvadānasūtra*. A New Edition Based on Manuscripts Discovered in Northern Turkestan. Göttingen (Sanskritwörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, hrsg. von Heinz Bechert, Beihelft 10)

Fussman, Gérard 1978: "Inscriptions de Gilgit." *BEFEO* 65: 1-62.

Gnoli, Raniero 1977-78: *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu; being the 17ᵗʰ and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*, Part I. Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente (Serie Orientale Roma, sotto la direzione di Giuseppe Tucci, Vol. XLIX)

Harrison, Paul 1990: *The Samādhi of Direct Encounter with the Buddhas of the Present*. An annotated English Translation of the Tibetan Version of the Pratyutpanna-Buddha-Saṃmukhāvasthita-Samādhi-Sūtra with Several Appendices relating to the History of the Text. Tokyo (Philologica Buddhica Monograph Series V)

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe 1992: *Untersuchungen zum Dīrghāgama der Sarvāstivā-*

dins. Göttingen (unpublished habilitation thesis)

—2000: „Zu einer neuen Handschrift des Dīrghāgama." *Vividharatnakaraṇḍa-ka*, Festgabe für Adelheid Mette, hrsg. v. Christine Choinacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Volker M. Tschannerl. Swisstal-Odendorf: 359–367.

—2002: „Further Remarks on the New Manuscript of the Dīrghāgama." *JICABS* V: 133–150.

—2004: „Contents and Structure of the Dīrghāgama of the (Mūla)Sarvāstivā-dins", *ARIRIAB* 2003, Vol.15.7: 119–137.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe & Klaus Wille 1992: *Die Nordturkistanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften der Sammlung Hoernle* (*Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, II*). Göttingen (Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen, 2. Folge)

von Hinüber, Oskar 1968: *Studien zur Kasussyntax des Pāli, besonders des Vinayapiṭaka.* München.

—1989a: "Brāhmī Inscriptions in the History and Culture of the Upper Indus Valley." *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies*, Vol.1: Rock Inscriptions in the Indus Valley, ed. by Karl Jettmar (Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften: Forschungsstelle "Felsbilder und Inschriften am Karakorum Highway") Mainz: 41–71.

—1989b: "Buddhistische Inschriften aus dem Tal des oberen Indus (Inschriften Nr. 68–109)." *Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies*, Vol.1: Rock Inscriptions in the Indus Valley, ed. by Karl Jettmar (Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften: Forschungsstelle "Felsbilder und Inschriften am Karakorum Highway") Mainz: 73–106.

—1994: "Zu den Brāhmī Inschriften." *Die Felsbildstation Oshibad*, Ed. Ditte König und Martin Bemmamm. Mit Beiträgen von Gérard Fussman, Oskar von Hinüber und Nicholas Sims-Williams. Mainz: 20–23 (Materialien zur Archäologie der Nordgebiete Pakistans 1)

—1997: "Zu den Brāhmī Inschriften." *Die Felsbildstation Shatial*, Ed. Gérard Fussman und Ditte König. Mit Beiträgen von Oskar von Hinüber, Thomas O.

Höllmann, Karl Jettmar und Nicholas Sims-Williams. Mainz: 89‒94 (Materialien zur Archäologie der Nordgebiete Pakistans 2)

―1999: "Zu den Brāhmī-Inschriften." *Die Felsbildstation Hodar*, Ed. Ditte Bandini-König. Mit Beiträgen von Gérard Fussman, Harald Hauptmann, Oskar von Hinüber, Thomas O. Höllmann, Ruth Schmelzer und Hellmut Völk. Mainz: 89‒94 (Materialien zur Archäologie der Nordgebiete Pakistans 3)

―2001: "Zu den Brāhmī Inschriften". *Die Felsbildstationen Shing Nala und Gichi Nala*, Ed. Ditte Bandini-König und Oskar von Hinüber. Mit Beiträgen von W. Bernhard Dickoré und Günther A. Wagner. Mainz: 51 (Materialien zur Archäologie der Nordgebiete Pakistans 4)

―2003 in: *Die Felsbildstation Thalpan―Kataloge Chilas-Brücke und Thalpan*, Ed. Ditte Bandini-König. Bearbeitung der Inschriften durch Gérard Fussman, Oskar von Hinüber, Thomas O. Höllmann und Nicholas Sims-Williams. (Materialien zur Archäologie der Nordgebiete Pakistans 5)

―2004: *Die Palola Ṣāhis: Ihre Steininschriften, Inschriften auf Bronzen, Handschriftenkolophone und Schutzzauber*. Materialien zur Geschichte von Gilgit und Chilas. Antiquities of Northern Pakistan: Reports and Studies 5 (Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften Forschungsstelle "Felsbilder und Inschriften am Karakorum Highway") Mainz.

Hoffmann, Helmut 1939: *Bruchstücke der Āṭānāṭikasūtra aus dem zentralasiatischen Sanskritkanon der Buddhisten*. Leipzig (repr. Stuttgart 1987: Franz Steiner Verlag Wiesbaden Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, hrsg. von Herbert Härtel, Bd.3)

Iwamatsu, Asao 1990: "Bonbun Agon-gyō zasso ", *Sankō Bunka Kenkyū Nempō* 22: 127‒153.

―1991: "SHT Kat.-Nrn. 32, 33 ni tsuite." *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* 40.1: 75‒80.

Ji see Dschi.

Krause, Wolfgang und Werner Thomas 1960: *Tocharisches Elementarbuch, Bd.*

I Grammatik. Heidelberg.

Lévi, Silvain 1932: "Note sur des manuscrits provenant de Bamiyan (Afghanistan) et de Gilgit (Cachemire)", *JA* (1932): 1-45.

Maue, Dieter 1985: "Sanskrit-uigurische Fragmente des Āṭānāṭikasūtra und des Āṭānāṭikahṛdaya." *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher*, Ed. Hans-Hermann Bartens, János Gulya, Klaus Röhrborn, Klaus Sagaster. Wiesbaden: 98-122.

—1997: *Alttürkische Handschriften, Teil 1,* beschrieben und herausgegeben. Stuttgart (VOHD XIII).

Sadakata, Akira 1999: „Girugitto syahon: Tenson-kyō danpen no kaidoku." *Daihōrin*: 30-35.

Sander, Lore 1968: *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung* (Diss.7). Wiesbaden (VOHD, Supplementband 8, hrsg. von Wolfgang Voigt)

—1987: *"Nachträge zu „Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte, Hefte III- V."* Stuttgart: 125-212 (Monographien zur Indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie, hrsg. von Herbert Härtel, Bd. 3)

—1994: "Tocharische Dokumente im Museum für Indische Kunst, Berlin." *Tocharisch.* Akten der Fachtagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft Berlin, September 1990. Hrsg. Bernfried Schlerath. Reykyavik: 93-104 (Tocharian and Indo-European Studies, Supplementary Series, Vol. 4)

—2007 (forthcoming): "Confusion of Terms and Terms of Confusion in Indian Palaeography". *Expending and Merging Horizons: Contributions to South Asian and Cross-Cultural Studies in Commemoration of Wilhelm Halbfass*, ed. by Karin Preisendanz. Wien: 121-139.

von Simson Georg 1965: *Zur Diktion einiger Lehrtexte des buddhistischen Sanskritkanons*. München.

—1977: "Zur Phrase *yena ... tenopajagāma | upetya* und ihren Varianten im buddhistischen Sanskritkanon." *Beiträge zur Indienforschung*. Ernst Waldschmidt zum 80. Geburtstag gewidmet. Berlin: 479-488 (Veröffentlichungen des Museums für Indische Kunst Berlin, hrsg. von Herbert Härtel, Bd. 4)

—2000: *Prātimokṣasūtra der Sarvāstivādins. Nach Vorarbeiten von Else Lüders und Herbert Härtel. Teil II: Kritische Textausgabe, Übersetzung, Wortindex sowie Nachträge zu Teil I.* Göttingen (Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden XI; Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 3. Folge, Nr. 238)

Skilling, Peter 1994/1997: *Mahāsūtras: Great Discourses of the Buddha.* Vol. I: Texts, Vol. II, Parts I & II. Oxford (The Pāli Text Society, Sacred Books of the Buddhist, Vol. XLIV and XLVI).

Speyer, J.S. 1886: *Sanskrit Syntax.* Leiden (reprint Delhi: 1998)

Tola, Fernando & Carmen Dragonetti1999: „ekaṃ samayaṃ". *IIJ* 42: 53-55.

Vetter, Tilman 1993: „Compounds in the Prologue of the Pañcaviṃśati." *WZKS(O)* 37: 45-92.

Waldschmidt, Ernst 1950-51: *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, Teil I-III. Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, verglichen mit dem Pāli nebst einer Übersetzung der chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins auf Grund von Turfan-Handschriften herausgegeben und bearbeitet. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Philolog.-hist. Klasse, Jg. 1949.1)

—1953: *Das Mahāvadānasūtra.* Ein kanonischer Text über die sieben letzten Buddhas. Sanskrit verglichen mit dem Pāli, nebst einer Analyse der in chinesischer Übersetzung überlieferten Parallelversionen auf Grund von Turfan-Handschriften herausgegeben. Berlin (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Kl. für Sprachen, Literatur und Kunst, Jg. 1952.8)

—1961/67: „Über ein der Turfan-Handschrift TM 361 fälschlich zugeteiltes Sanskritfragment." *Ural-Altaische Jahrbücher* 33: 199-203 (repr. *Von Ceylon bis Turfan, Schriften zur Geschichte, Literatur, Religion und Kunst des indischen Kulturraumes von Ernst Waldschmidt*, Festgabe zum 70. Geburtstag am 15. Juli 1967, Göttingen: 412-416).

—1980/89: „Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and their Relation to the Chinese

Āgamas." *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition* (*Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung*, II, hrsg. v. Heinz Bechert). Göttingen: 136-174 (repr. *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, ed. Heinz Bechert, Petra Kieffer-Pülz, Stuttgart: 370-408).

Waldschmidt, Ernst et al. (1965-2004): *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden 1-9* (VOHD, X).Wiesbaden/Stuttgart. [Teil 1 (1965): unter Mitarbeit von W. Clawiter und L. Holzmann, hrsg. von E. Waldschmidt; Teil 2 (1968), im Verein mit W. Clawiter und L. Sander-Holzmann hrsg von E. Waldschmidt; Teil 3 (1971): unter Mitarbeit von W. Clawiter und L. Sander-Holzmann hrsg. von E. Waldschmidt;, Teil 4 (1980) und 5 (1985): bearbeitet von L. Sander und E. Waldschmidt; Teil 6 (1989), 7 (1995), 8 (2000), 9 (2006): hrsg. von H. Bechert, beschrieben von K. Wille].

Wille, Klaus 2005: "Some recently identified Sanskrit fragments from the Stein and Hoernle collections in the British Library, London (1)." *The British Library Sanskrit Fragments*. Vol. I, ed. by Seishi Karashima and Klaus Wille Tokyo: 27-64 (Buddhist Manuscripts from Central Asia)

Witzel, Michael 1987: „The Case of the Shattered Head." *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik*, Heft 13/14, Festschrift Wilhelm Rau: 363-414.

Zieme, Peter 2005: *Magische Texte im uigurischen Buddhismus*. Turnhout (Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften Akademie-vorhaben Turfanforschung, Berliner Turfantexte XXIII)

Guest Professor,
International College
for Postgraduate Buddhist Studies