

The Piṃgalātreya sūtra of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins: its edition and study.
Investigation of the Piṃgalātreya sūtra's status within the *Dīrghāgama*
“Collection of Long (Discourses of the Buddha)”.



Lita Peipina

Master Thesis

Department of Culture Studies and Oriental Languages

University of Oslo

Spring 2008

ABSTRACT

The focus of this study is on the manuscript of the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra of the (Mūla)sarvāstivāda tradition, being a part of the Śīlaskandha (Moral conduct) section within the Dīrghāgama (Collection of Long [Discourses of the Buddha]). A bundle of birch bark manuscripts written in Sanskrit was found in the area of Greater Gandhāra, today's Afghanistan and Pakistan in 1998.

The study is done by, firstly, getting acquainted with the lexical scope and syntactic structures of the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra by transliterating, reconstructing and translating it, as well as collecting relevant material from other works within the Buddhist literature and collating parts of the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra with it. This first stage of the study has been carried out by following the established praxis of editing the Buddhist manuscripts in the *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection* and already completed works on the manuscripts from the Dīrghāgama collection that, as a rule, correspond to the general method of textual editing. Secondly, a detailed and comparative examination of the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra's contents and structure in connection to the related material from the Buddhist literature and scholarly publications is accomplished according to the principles of textual criticism that again is a part of the approach for textual editing.

The results of this study, though limited in their scope, present a previously unknown sūtra in a way that it will be at hand for future scholarly research on the Dīrghāgama manuscript, as well as contribute to the recent scholarly debate on the origin and development of the (Mūla)sarvāstivāda tradition and their religious literature.

Contents

Acknowledgements	4
Conventions and Abbreviations	5
Introduction	6
The Dīrghāgama manuscript.....	7
My background and perspective.....	8
Structure of the thesis	8
Survey of sources	10
Background information	12
The characteristics of Dīrghāgama manuscript and its Śīlaskandha section.....	12
Challenges in trying to place the <i>Piṃgalātreya</i> sūtra in Buddhist historical context.....	13
Birch bark.....	16
Theory	17
Textual scholarship: Technical apparatus of the theory and method.....	17
Manuscript description	20
Physical description.....	20
Palaeographic features of the <i>Piṃgalātreya</i> sūtra.....	21
Punctuation in the <i>Piṃgalātreya</i> sūtra.....	22
Orthographic features in the <i>Piṃgalātreya</i> sūtra.....	23
Textual criticism	25
Contents and concordance.....	25
Analysis and commentary.....	27
Transliteration	40
Reconstruction	43
Conclusion	71
Appendix	75
Pictures of folios	78
Bibliography	81

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my supervisor Professor Jens Braarvig for being a ceaseless source of knowledge, inspiration and wit, for teaching me that only the sky is the limit.

I am very grateful to Professor Jens-Uwe Hartmann for welcoming me at Institut für Indologi und Iranistik at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich, for being a brilliant teacher, scholar and constructive critic, for introducing me to the exciting world of manuscripts.

Many thanks to the expert in palaeography of manuscripts, Dr. Lore Sander, for reading through my transliteration, pointing out mistakes and kindly suggesting changes.

My thanks to Elsa Legittimo for providing me with a computer program enabling me to search in Buddhist texts in the Chinese canon, for helping me to find a Chinese parallel to the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra.

I am thankful to Mariko Mori for helping me with a Japanese article, for being a friend and for having fun time together. I would like to thank Professor Adelheid Mette, Zhen Liu, Oliver von Criegern, Keao Chanwit, Jowita Kramer and librarian Hildegard at the Institute in Munich for helping with advices and for making my stay in Munich fruitful in terms of knowledge exchange and full with lovely memories.

Last but not least, my thanks to Ilze for being with me, supporting, sharing and reading and commenting upon this work.

CONVENTIONS AND ABBREVIATIONS

Description of a fragment:

Recto and verso, abbreviated r and v.

Symbols:

- () restoration in a gap
[] damaged akṣara(s)
< > omission of (part of) an akṣara without gap in the manuscript
{ } superfluous (part of) an akṣara
+ one destroyed akṣara
.. one illegible akṣara
. illegible part of an akṣara
/// beginning or end of a fragment when broken
' avagraha, not to be added in transliteration, but added without brackets in reconstruction
h jīhvāmūlīya
h upadhmānīya

Punctuation:

- | daṇḍa
|| double daṇḍa
| daṇḍa when punctuation interrupts with sandhi
· high point
* virāma

BHSD – Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. 2: Dictionary, New Haven, 1953.

MW – Monier Monier-Williams, *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford, 1899.

PTSD – T. W. Rhys Davids, and William Stede (ed.), *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*, Routledge & Kegan Paul LTD, London, 1972.

MSC – Manuscripts of Schøyen Collection, volume I, II and III

INTRODUCTION

The focus of this study is on the manuscript of the *Piṅgalātreyā* sūtra of the (Mūla)sarvāstivāda tradition, being a part of the Śīlaskandha (Moral conduct) section within the Dīrghāgama (Collection of Long [Discourses of the Buddha]). A bundle of birch bark manuscripts written in Sanskrit was found in the area of Greater Gandhāra, today's Afghanistan and Pakistan in 1998. As the *Piṅgalātreyā* sūtra has hitherto been unknown and is not a part of other collections of Long Discourses,¹ a detailed examination of the sūtra's contents and structure, an investigation of its placement and relation to other sūtras within the Dīrghāgama, as well as its connection to other works of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins may cast light over some obscure aspects of both the *Piṅgalātreyā* sūtra and the (Mūla)sarvāstivāda tradition.

The study is done by, firstly, getting acquainted with the lexical scope and syntactic structures of the *Piṅgalātreyā* sūtra by transliterating, reconstructing and translating it, as well as collecting relevant material from other works within the Buddhist literature and collating parts of the *Piṅgalātreyā* sūtra with it. This first stage of the study has been carried out by following the established praxis of editing the Buddhist manuscripts in the *Manuscripts of Schøyen Collection* and already completed works on the manuscripts from the Dīrghāgama collection that, as a rule, correspond to the general method of textual editing. Secondly, a detailed and comparative examination of the *Piṅgalātreyā* sūtra's contents and structure in connection to the related material from the Buddhist literature and scholarly publications is accomplished according to the principles of textual criticism that again is a part of the approach for textual editing.

The results of this study, though limited in their scope, present a previously unknown sūtra in a way that it will be at hand for future scholarly research on the Dīrghāgama manuscript, as well as contribute to the recent scholarly debate on the origin and development of the (Mūla)sarvāstivāda tradition and their religious literature.

¹ Dīgha Nikāya in Pāli and Chinese Dīrghāgama (T1).

The Dīrghāgama manuscript

Regrettably, the exact finding spot of the manuscript is unclear, and hence also the original depository – a cave, a stūpa, a monastery or other location is unknown (Hartmann 2004:119). Nevertheless, with the find of this manuscript the existence of the *Sūtra Piṭaka* of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins in original language is confirmed. Until recently only a greater part of the *Vinaya Piṭaka* and single fragments of the *Abhidharma Piṭaka* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins in the original language were known. A previous knowledge of the Dīrghāgama collection of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins was mainly based on the fragments from the area of Northern Silk Routes assumed to belong to the Sarvāstivādins, as well as from the quotations in *Vinaya* and commentary literature (Melzer 2006:5).

According to the formal similarity with the manuscript of the *Vinayavastu*² and much of the same kind of mistakes contained in both manuscripts, the Dīrghāgama manuscript may likely have come from the same area in Gilgit where the famous Gilgit manuscripts from the 1931 and 1938 were discovered (2006:4). Separate parts of the Dīrghāgama manuscript belong to two private collections: The largest part of folios is in possession of a private collection in Virginia, USA, and some parts belong to Ikuo Hirayama collection in Kamakura, Japan, now held by the Bukkyō-University in Kyōto, Japan.

The Dīrghāgama manuscript contains in all 47 sūtras. 23 of these sūtras constitute the Śīlaskandha section. The *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra is number 26 in the manuscript, and number 2 in the Śīlaskandha section. Together, at least 234 folios make up more than a half part of the whole Dīrghāgama collection and are available to scholarly study in form of photos or scans (2006:1). The manuscript is written in a later form of Proto-Śāradā script, the kind of script that was used in the 7th and 8th century in North-East India. According to a radiocarbon test, the manuscript is dated with the second part of the 8th century.³ There is an impression that the manuscript has never been read (2006:3).

Due to several reasons that are closer explained in the chapter “Challenges in trying to place the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra in Buddhist historical context”, it is at this stage impossible to date and trace the place for the first source text from which the presently available manuscript of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra may be copied. It is likewise impossible to determine exactly where in the successive line of copies the manuscript can be placed. Consequently, although the

² The corpus of Vinaya literature ascribed to the Mūlasarvāstivādins constitutes a part of the famous Gilgit manuscripts. These manuscripts were found in Turfan and Gilgit in Central Asia in 1931 and 1938.

³ Undertaken by manuscript dealer Sam Fogg in London (Melzer 2006:2).

manuscript in question can be dated to the second part of the 8th century, the original source text may or may not be older.

My background and perspective

I have been working on various Buddhist text collections by reading them in Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese in a comparative perspective under supervision of Professor Jens Braarvig at the University of Oslo since 2003. In addition, I have participated in Buddhist manuscript reading seminars under supervision of Professor Jens-Uwe Hartmann at the Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität in Munich. Thus I have acquired adequate knowledge of classical Buddhist languages – Pāli, Sanskrit, Tibetan and Chinese in order to work on various Buddhist text collections and manuscripts. In addition, I read Indian Brāhmī script as research on this manuscript requires. In order to carry out a thorough reconstruction and analysis work of the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra good knowledge in Buddhist thought and practice is essential. That I have acquired by reading Buddhist texts within two main Buddhist traditions the Hīnayāna and the Mahāyāna.

My work on the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra started when Professor Jens Braarvig assigned me a task of studying a sūtra from the recently found Dīrghāgama manuscript. As Professor Jens-Uwe Hartmann at the Ludwig-Maximilian-Universität in Munich is leading the work on this manuscript, I have visited this university for several shorter periods. These stays have given me fruitful contacts and knowledge exchange with other students who had previously worked or were at that time working on other parts of this manuscript.

STRUCTURE OF THE THESIS

In the present work attention will be given to both the form and contents of the sūtra. This will involve two separate and equally important tasks:

- 1) Textual editing: presentation and translation of the text;
- 2) Textual criticism.

Presentation of a text usually also involves a description of its extant versions and previous translations. However, the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra has previously been unknown and its version in the present manuscript is the only one existing. If it has been translated at some point in its history none of translations are preserved or known at this moment. Therefore, the

sūtra will be presented in two ways. Firstly, the transliteration of the sūtra in Latin letters with an established set of conventional symbols used for this purpose⁴ will be presented in order to demonstrate the preserved condition of the text itself and particular features of the manuscript. Secondly, the reconstructed text will be presented separated in meaningful semantic entities and displayed together with the translation and fragments of similar text portions from other places in Buddhist literature to provide a comparative perspective, as well as to give an overview of where exactly similar text passages can be found in Buddhist literature. This kind of systematic overview can be used in later research for analysing all the analogous text fragments of previously unknown sūtras in the Dīrghāgama manuscript: considering the frequency of occurrence and amount of similar text passages found in each specific work of Buddhist literature allows to draw potential conclusions regarding the textual history of the Dīrghāgama manuscript. The translation of the sūtra is my own where there is no indication to the contrary.

The task of textual criticism involves a close reading and an analysis of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra by examining its contents, structure, and individual features regarding the terminology. The analysis of the sūtra will be carried out on basis of the information that is already made available regarding the Dīrghāgama manuscript and sūtras it contains.⁵ The examination of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra in relation to relevant research done on the texts where similar text passages are found will aim at shedding light upon a possible ‘text family’ – a group of thematically and probably also historically related texts.⁶

The transliteration and reconstruction work is presented in my thesis after textual critics. The purpose of this particular order is to set the reconstructed text of the sūtra in its context and make it easier accessible for the reader.

⁴ Display of symbols is given in the beginning of the thesis. These are previously used, for example, in the *Manuscripts of Schøyen collection* Volume I, II and III, in transliteration of texts in the collection of the Dīrghāgama manuscripts in question. See Melzer 2006:iv, von Criegern 2002:3.

⁵ Articles on the Dīrghāgama manuscript and other relevant material published by J.-U. Hartmann (2000, 2002a, 2002b, 2004), unpublished MA thesis by Oliver von Criegern (2002), unpublished PhD thesis by Gudrun Melzer (2006), and published remarks on *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra by Kazunobu Matsuda (2006). See chapter on survey of sources.

⁶ Expression used by Graeme Macqueen (1988:11).

SURVEY OF SOURCES

The material that is considered to be relevant for this study can be divided into three categories:

- 1) The work already completed on parts of the Dīrghāgama manuscript;
- 2) The material that has appeared to be related to the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra by providing similar textual material;
- 3) The research that has been done on works where the similar fragments to the text of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra are found.

In the first category, articles published by Jens-Uwe Hartmann (2000, 2002a, 2002b, 2004) give general information and available details of the manuscript in a very early stage of its study – as soon as it was put at scholarly disposal after the discovery. The articles gradually provide a more complete picture of it as the study proceeds. These articles have been useful in acquiring basic knowledge about the Dīrghāgama manuscript, as well as helped to get acquainted with relevant bibliography on the subject matter.

Next work in chronological order is the description and study of the *Kūṭatāṇḍya* sūtra, completed by Oliver von Criegern in his yet unpublished MA thesis (2002). The *Kūṭatāṇḍya* sūtra also belongs to the *Śīlaskandha* section, the 10th sūtra is this section, but has number 34 in succession in the manuscript. It has allowed me to get insight into a range of orthographic peculiarities owing his minute description of various aspects of Sanskrit usage in the *Kūṭatāṇḍya* sūtra.

The most extensive and thorough work done until now regarding the investigation of the Dīrghāgama manuscript is by Gudrun Melzer in her, also yet unpublished, PhD thesis (2006). The work is used as a ‘book of references’ by everyone working on other parts in this manuscript. The systematic study of the *Śīlaskandha* section and presentation of seven sūtras from this section provides a great assistance in studying the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra as Melzer also accounts for details of importance regarding the concept of ‘Tathāgata-predict’, as well as gives a detailed description of idiosyncratic features of all scribes of the manuscript.

The article on the *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra (number 25 in succession in the manuscript, but 1st sūtra in the *Śīlaskandha* section, immediately proceeding the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra) by the Japanese scholar Kazunobu Matsuda (2006) reveals a number of facts that are of great importance for the study of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra as these two sūtras are rather similar in

terms of content. Matsuda's article can be considered to be the most recent contribution to the research on the Dīrghāgama manuscript.

There are two articles on language peculiarities of Sanskrit texts from Turfan and Gilgit manuscripts that account for orthographic features of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and the Sarvāstivādins, one by Georg von Simson (1985) and other by Siglinde Dietzt (1993). The latter partly refers to the facts presented by von Simson. These two articles fall between the first two categories of sources, but have provided great assistance in the reconstruction work of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra.

The second category of sources – the ones providing similar text material to the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra start with reference to texts from Pāli (Theravādin) sūtra collections. Since Pāli *Sūtra Piṭaka* is one of Buddhist sūtra collections that has been systematized and can be considered to be a relatively closed collection of Buddhist scriptures, it is natural to start looking for similar text passages exactly in this collection. As for the next step, it could seem appropriate to choose the Dīgha Nikāya (the Long Discourses in Pāli) as the first group of texts where to look for similarities with the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra, as this sūtra belongs to the Dīrghāgama. However, my research shows that it is not the case as two main and most extensive in size analogous text passages to the *Piṃgalātreya* are to be found in the *Tikaṇṇa* sutta of the Anguttara Nikāya (the Numerical Discourses) and in in the *Caṅkī* sutta of the Majjima Nikāya (the Middle Length Discourses). The *Saṅghabhedavastu*, a text corpus belonging to the *Vinaya* literature of the Mūlasarvāstivādins provides as much as two thirds of similar textual material to the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra.

The same text fragment as that in Sanskrit from the *Saṅghabhedavastu* is also available in Tibetan as the *Vinaya* literature of the Mūlasarvāstivādins was translated into Tibetan in the end of the 8th and the beginning of the 9th century AD. Since this text piece is a translation of a fragment that is available in Sanskrit, the Tibetan version has only a secondary importance for the present study, and therefore is not displayed together with the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra and its similar text fragments in the reconstruction. Instead, it is presented in the appendix as a piece of reference for collating certain Sanskrit terms with their Tibetan counterparts for the cases where Sanskrit terms of the *Piṃgalātreya* may appear difficult to translate in English.

The instance of similar text piece from the Chinese translation that covers approximately one third of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra occurs in the Chinese Samyukta Āgama 雜阿含經(zááhánjīng) (the Connected Discourses), T 2, number 99 and is translated by

Guṇabhadra 求那跋陀羅(qiúnàbátuóluó) in 435 and 436 AD. This is a very small sūtra with no name. It has only been attributed the succession number 886.

In the last category of sources – the research that has been done on works where the similar fragments to the text of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra are found - the *Śrāmaṇyaphala* sūtra is represented in three different study versions: By Konrad Meisig (1987), Graeme Macqueen (1988), and Peter Ramers (1996). The most extensive similar text fragment to the *Piṃgalātreya* is found in the *Śrāmaṇyaphala* sūtra as it, although without a name, occurs in the *Saṅghabhedavastu*. No examination of the *Sāmañña phala* sutta is included in present work since the Pāli version does not contain the introduction part to the Tathāgata-Predict where the similar text fragment to the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra appears.

As mentioned in the description of the first category of sources, a similar fragment to the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra is found in Pāli in the *Caṅkī* sutta of the Majjima Nikāya. Although with differences in compositional structure and rather significant variations in wording, a kindred fragment appears also in the Sanskrit version of the *Caṅgī* sūtra. The examination of the *Caṅgī* sūtra by Hartmann (2002) is chosen in this study with the intention to compare the text passage in the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra with the similar piece from the *Caṅgī* sūtra. The *Caṅgī* sūtra is, namely, supposed to belong to another early Buddhist tradition⁷ than the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra belongs to. The reason for this choice is the consideration that any similar fragment that can be found in Sanskrit has a superior (research) value and are to be preferred fragments in Pāli.

In addition to these three main categories of sources, the supplementary scholarly literature that treats various subjects relevant to this work will be used.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The characteristics of Dīrghāgama manuscript and its Śīlaskandha section

The Dīrghāgama is one of the major sections of the Sūtra/Sutta Piṭaka, ‘basket’ or the Collection of Discourses. As the title indicates, discourses contained in this section are

⁷ Torkel Brekke assumed (2000:54), working on some manuscript fragments of this sūtra, that it belongs to the Mahāsaṃghika-Lokottaravādins. This assertion, however, was argued against by Daniel Boucher in his review of MSC vol. 1 (2002:248f). The manuscript of the sūtra is dated around the 4th century AD on basis of the script – it is written in the early Gupta script (Brekke 2000:53).

expected to be relatively long, and yet, there are a few exceptions.⁸ Until the last decade of the 1900s, when the bundle of manuscripts containing the Dīrghāgama of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins in Sanskrit was discovered, this collection was not available neither in translations nor in original. Only two versions of the Dīrghāgama were preserved – the Dīgha Nikāya collection in Pāli of the Theravādins and the collection of the Dīrghāgama in Chinese translations assumed to be that of the Dharmaguptakas. The compositional structure of these two collections and of the present collection diverges, as well as there are considerable variations with regard to sūtras included in the Dīrghāgama.⁹ While there are, for example, 34 *suttas* in the Pāli Dīgha Nikāya, there are 47 *sūtras* in the Dīrghāgama manuscript of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins.

A characteristic feature of discourses in the *Śīlaskandha* section is guidelines of moral conduct that are incorporated into each *sūtra*. They are discussed or reflected upon, and thus denote the formative status of this collection in comparison to the text corpus of the *Vinaya Piṭaka* (the Collection of Monastic Law) which consists of precepts to be followed and rituals to be performed – hence representing a normative part of Buddhist scriptures. The *Śīlaskandha* section is also well known by an episode called ‘the Tathāgata-Predict’ which in various lengths is incorporated into each *sūtra*. In this part of the *sūtra* the Buddha describes the way of liberation which is an essential element of the teachings in the Hīnayāna Buddhism. This episode in the full length is usually incorporated just in one *sūtra* of the *Śīlaskandha* section. The remaining *sūtras* have only portions of it quoted.¹⁰ It is supposed that the Tathāgata-Predict might be very old, much older than the preserved arrangement of the *sūtras* in the *Śīlaskandha* section of available collections.¹¹

Challenges in trying to place the Piṅgalātreya sūtra in Buddhist historical context

The information and scholarly discussion outlined in this chapter serves to illustrate the challenges that placing the *Piṅgalātreya* and other *sūtras* of the Dīrghāgama manuscript in

⁸ I refer to, for example, the *Gāliya* sutta in the Dīgha Nikāya and the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra in the Dīrghāgama manuscript. Besides, the size of some *suttas* in the Dīgha Nikāya has been increased by interpolation, so that their present length is not necessarily their archetype (Norman 1983:30).

⁹ See Melzer 2006:7f for the list of the contents of the Dīrghāgama manuscript in collation with contents of the Dīrghāgama of the Theravādins, the Chinese Dīrghāgama of the Dharmaguptakas, and the Majjima Nikāya of the Theravādins.

¹⁰ Macqueen (1988:179f) discusses its occurrence in full length in different *sūtras* in various Dīrghāgama collections.

¹¹ Meisig (1987:35ff; 53ff), Macqueen (1988:79ff), and Ramers (1996:6f) all agree upon ancient nature of the Tathāgata-Predict. Meisig and Macqueen discuss its possible belonging to another document and/or independent character. They suppose that due its popularity it was incorporated into *sūtras* in the *Śīlaskandha* section although it interrupts with the story and destroys the flow of the text in the *sūtra*.

their historical context creates. The critical point in the determination is the lack of scholarly consensus about the status and relation between the Sarvāstivāda and the Mūlasarvāstivāda tradition. The Dīrghāgama manuscript, as displayed in the title of the present work, could be identified as belonging to the (Mūla)sarvāstivāda tradition (Hartmann 2004:120). Round brackets separating words ‘mūla’ and ‘sarvāstivāda’ indicate the contentious status regarding the origin and textual tradition of the Sarvāstivādins and the Mūlasarvāstivādins. Although both traditions go more or less back to the same *Sūtra-* and *Abhidharmapiṭaka*, the *Vinaya* texts differ. Even if contents occasionally may be similar, they represent by no means the exact wording (Melzer 2006:1). As a consequence, there will be made a distinction between these two traditions when referred to them in this work. Yet, it is necessary to provide a context for the differentiation, and for that reason the following is a brief account of main scholarly views regarding the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins.

Unfortunately there are not many sources about the early formation of *nikāyas* (‘schools’ or ‘traditions’), and the main part of them is formulated centuries after the events (Bechert 1985:39). Étienne Lamotte points to the insufficiency of sources and knowledge regarding the history of Buddhist schools. He refers to genealogical trees of schools as legends created by both Chinese and Indian chroniclers due to the lack of material on the subject matter. They are said to have adapted the information they had available according to the prevailing fashion of the moment (Lamotte 1988:529).

Two significant happenings in early Buddhist history in India that affect our understanding of both the development of textual tradition and the formation of various monastic and/or doctrinal schools are the first two Buddhist Councils. There have been many discussions concerning the date, various aspects of and intention with these two happenings. Just to mention some of the most contrasting regarding the First Council: While Lamotte makes use of accounts from traditional Buddhist literature and from Chinese sources, analysing them in order to gain an all-inclusive picture of the First Council held at Rājagṛha where recitations of *Dharma* and *vinaya* must have occurred in order to establish an agreement on the teachings and instructions of the Buddha (1988:124-139), Erich Frauwallner (1956:64) declares this event to be a mere invention by the compilers of Buddhist texts in order to (re)establish an authoritative status of the tradition of monk ordination.¹² It is noted by Lamotte that every school has claimed the recitations to be a compilation of its own text

¹² After the Buddha’s decease, no legitimate authority presided; neither had the Buddha pointed out someone to be in charge of the right employment of Buddhist Law or be in command of the monastic ordination. Therefore, certain schools drew up lists of patriarchs who were said to legitimately have transmitted the Law they claimed to guard (Lamotte 1988:64f).

collections (Lamotte 1988:129). The event of the Second Council held in Vaiśālī approximately 100 years after the Buddha's passing away¹³ is traditionally ascribed to a disagreement on particular *vinaya* issues. In order to lessen the contradictory outlook between Lamotte and Frauwallner mentioned above concerning the First Council, it must be asserted that also Lamotte points out the particular character of both Councils: According to him, all the schools in their records establish direct link between the Councils and formation of their own school as a proof of authenticity and antiquity of their own writings (1988:135-39).

Originally the Sarvāstivādins seem to have formed themselves into two great groups, Kaśmīrian and Gandhārian, but after the compilation of *Mahāvibhāṣā*, the great commentary, the, they have either united themselves or the one has been eclipsed by the other, for only the name 'Kaśmīra-vaibhāṣikas' or simply 'Vaibhāṣikas' appear (Takakusu 1905:119). The *Mahāvibhāṣā* has been probably compiled during the 2nd century AD that shows to be in the king Kaniṣka's time (Lamotte 1988:277). The mentioning of the *Mahāvibhāṣā* is important in this account because it is still used in contemporary scholarship as a source of references regarding the views of the *Vaibhāṣikas*, as well as views of other distinguished Buddhist philosophers mentioned there in accounts of technical aspects of doctrine. This work can, presumably, provide useful information regarding the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins, while the uncertain status of this school is not solved. By reexamining the material in the *Mahāvibhāṣā* in view of new information and ideas acquired in the course of study of the Dīrghāgama manuscript, other conclusions regarding the Sarvāstivādins may be drawn.

When the Second Buddhist Council was held in Kaniṣka's time, the Vaibhāṣika School is believed to have been already present (Puri 1987:100). Nevertheless, the king Kaniṣka is said to have patronized the Sarvāstivāda School (Upasak 1990:220). These two statements seem to be contradicting unless the king patronized the Sarvāstivādins who had not joined the ones becoming the Vaibhāṣikas, or the usage of the names 'vaibhāṣikas' and 'sarvāstivādins' was unclear.

Still, for the present work the subject in concern is the relation, if any, between the Sarvāstivādins and the Mūlasarvāstivādins. In this respect, it is relevant to consider two prevailing views on the origin of the Sarvāstivādins and the Mūlasarvāstivādins or two partly opposing hypotheses – one of Frauwallner and other of Lamotte.¹⁴ These views are based on the examination of the *Vinayas* of these two schools as Frauwallner has pointed out that an

¹³ On discussion of dates see, for example, Cousins 2005:34f

¹⁴ The assumptions of these two great Buddhist scholars have since been discussed and cited. See for example: Gnoli 1978: xvi-xxi; Panglung 1981:xi; Bechert 1985:50; Enomoto 2000:239-249.

essential source of information about the early Buddhist schools is the study of a certain school's *Vinaya*. Consequently, Frauwallner's view is that the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins was the *Vinaya* of Mathurā: an old Buddhist community established in Mathurā from around the first century of Buddhism's existence, while the *Vinaya* of Kaśmīr was the *Vinaya* of the Sarvāstivādins (Frauwallner 1956:26 – 41). Against the view of Frauwallner, Lamotte has claimed that the *Vinaya* of Mathurā was the *Vinaya* that was recited by a monk named Upāli at the Council of Rājagṛha (Lamotte 1988:171 – 179). Nevertheless, Lamotte agrees with Frauwallner regarding the origin of the *Vinaya* of Kaśmīr, namely as the one of the Sarvāstivādins.

It is stated by several scholars¹⁵ that the Sarvāstivāda School is considered to be one of the oldest schools, and therefore also is mentioned in the traditional sources and accounts of Chinese translators. The name 'Mūlasarvāstivāda', though, comes to light late, only from the 7th century onwards (Frauwallner 1956:25). However, both the names 'Mūlasarvāstivādins' and the 'Sarvāstivādins' may denote one and the same school as showed recently by Fumio Enomoto.¹⁶

Birch bark

The inner bark of a tree was used in areas of Buddhist influence as a material for manuscripts until approximately 12th – 13th century AD. A birch bark consists of several thin layers, forty to fifty in a strip. These layers were separated, treated with oil and polished with a smooth stone to make them smooth and hard. They were cut to double the required size, folded into half and kept loose with two wooden boards on either side of a set of sheets (Murthy 1996:31f).

Therefore a written upon manuscript consists of more than one, usually two thin glued together layers of inner birch bark. The sheets, depending on where birch trees grew, could be white or pinky-white outside and reddish inside in the Himalayan slopes, above 30,000 feet high, from Kaśmīr to Sikkhim (1996:32), occasionally also in Japan and Afghanistan, and bluish-purple that could have lighter or darker colour and were used as a writing material in East-Turkistan and Turkistan (Sander 1968:28). With the introduction of paper in about the 12th – 13th century, birch bark lost its place and went out of use in course of time (Murthy 1996:32). The birch sheets for writing were placed on one's lap or on a low stool in front and written on. Tenability of manuscripts depended upon a tree's age and a quality of preparation of birch bark sheets (Sander 1968:28).

¹⁵ See for example Takakusu 1905:67, Upasak 1990:105; Snellgrove 2004:310.

¹⁶ Enomoto 2000.

THEORY

As my concern in this work is both with a concrete Buddhist text – the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra and with Buddhist literature generally, since I intend to examine Buddhist texts which could possibly contain similar fragments to parts of the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra, I would like to define the field of study as Buddhist philology. In this context, *Buddhism* means teachings of the Buddha as expressed in Buddhist literature, while *philology* means the study of literary texts in their original language and in translations. In this way, two branches of philology are involved: *comparative philology* which refers to the study of relationship between the original language and translation languages of a text, and *textual philology* which is concerned with a close study of a text in its context – the set of circumstances or facts that surround it. Another theoretical concept for textual studies is *textual criticism*, which has already been introduced in the chapter “Structure of the thesis”. Yet, before any analytical textual studies can begin, a manuscript has to be transliterated, reconstructed and translated – thus implying *editing*. On account of all tasks and procedures involved in this study, a theoretical approach that is a product of the much broader discipline of philology and has the appellative *textual scholarship* is utilized.

Textual scholarship: Technical apparatus of the theory and method

Textual scholarship is a theoretical approach that encompasses all tasks of this study supplying it with necessary analytical terminology in order to define its constituent parts, and providing a systematic procedure – a *method*, for approaching a text and progressing towards its editing. The study on this manuscript thus implies utilizing the principles of *codicology*, *palaeography*, *textual editing*, *higher* and *lower criticism* from the field of textual scholarship. I have chosen to follow guidelines laid down by two scholars prominent in critical textual studies: David C. Greetham¹⁷ who provides a general survey of textual scholarship aimed at European literature and Shivaganesha R. S. Murthy,¹⁸ Sanskritist and manuscriptologist, whose concern is issues regarding manuscripts in Sanskrit and other Indian dialects. In addition, I have made use of two collections of articles on scholarly editing prepared by the Department of Linguistics and Scandinavian Studies at the University of Oslo.

¹⁷ I have made use of two of Greetham’s works: *Textual Scholarship* (1994) and *Scholarly Editing* (ed.) (1995).

¹⁸ Guidelines for methodology of manuscript editing are quite similar to the ones outlined by Greetham, but Murthy touches issues particular to manuscripts in Sanskrit in his *Introduction to Manuscriptology* (1996).

Study of a manuscript as an artifact, as a material object carrying a text is commonly called *codicology*. This field encompasses *palaeography*, the study of script and handwriting. In practice, though, palaeography is often used to comprise the entire study of a manuscript – writing, individual characteristics, medium – thus partially taking over the sphere of codicology (Greetham 1994:6). There are two approaches to *textual editing*: *diplomatic* and *critical*. The diplomatic approach entails reproducing or deciphering the handwriting and presenting the text without alteration. In the present work this task has been completed under the title ‘transliteration’. Critical editing implies introducing alterations into the text and commenting on each modification. In the critical edition works are viewed as products of individuals and an attempt is made to reconstruct the author’s originally intended text (Tanselle 1995:11). This part is found under ‘reconstruction’ in the present work. However, it is not always possible to define any original form of or the author’s intention with the text. It is especially the case with the cultures where oral transmission of texts has been praxis for centuries. A characteristic in this connection is that a text could not be perceived as a fixed entity, but had to be understood as a process, a raw material in constant alteration – recital after recital or, once script was established – copy after copy. The reason why it is not possible to trace one original text is because it has never existed (Kjørup 2005:200). Since the *codices*, manuscript’s volumes, have come down to us in a chain of successive transmission of copies, a relation between extant codices can unlikely be denied although no copy is identical with its *exemplar*, a pattern to be copied (Murthy 1996:149f). It is possible to apply two expressions characteristic for copyists: *identity of reading* and *common reading*. A scribe copies as it is in the exemplar, and yet, each scribe has characteristics distinctive and peculiar to an individual – *idiosyncrasies*. Nevertheless, it is in corruptions, errors and variants that affinity of codices is established. Omissions, in particular, provide the surest appraisal of affinity (1996:150).

There are several common kinds of scribal errors that can be divided into two groups: *mechanical* errors that are produced by accident, and *determined* errors – intentionally made modifications (Greetham 1994:279). One can distinguish three variants of errors which are typical within the mechanical type:

1. *Misreadings*: a) similarity of letters in certain scripts; b) confusion of two words of similar shape and/or spelling; c) confusion about similar meanings though different spelling; d) transposition – a reversion of order of letters;

2. *Omissions*: a) haplography – omission of similar letters or letter groups that should be repeated in writing; b) homeoteleon – ‘eye-skip’, the same word repeated within a short space, as well as omission of space or omission of an entire line;

3. *Additions*: a) dittography – reduplication of letters by going back too far in the exemplar line.

Also within the determined type it is possible to distinguish several kinds of errors:

1. *Modernization* or *normalization* – to replace the originally used terms/words with contemporary used concepts.

2. *Censorship* or *bowdlerization* – to remove material that is considered objectionable or offensive;

3. *Emphasis* – special stress laid upon a word changing, for example, the degree of comparison by using superlative form instead of positive form;

4. *Idiosyncratic change* – virtually change for the sake of change¹⁹ (1994:280ff).

Generally, the process of critical editing consists of two broad divisions: *lower criticism* and *higher criticism*. While higher criticism is an assessment of a work including description of such literal aspects as style, genre, sources of the work and so on, lower criticism involves mechanical work with focus on the text, not on the work – noting of details, analysis of orthographic peculiarities, gathering of relevant data, comparing and so on. Lower criticism refers in my thesis to transliteration and reconstruction part, as well as finding parallel text pieces to the sūtra. Higher criticism refers to text critics.

There can be distinguished three stages in lower criticism: *heuristics*, *recension*, and *emendation* (Murthy 1996:136-46):

Heuristics (textual determination) encompasses gathering, evaluation and analysis of the available data. Practically, it involves collecting and collating possible copies, parallel versions, translations and commentaries – all closely related material of the text.

Recension is the second stage in editing and requires a judgment on the basis of critical examination of the text and the sources used. *Emendation* refers to the phase where a reading different from the one contained in the text but more plausible in terms of context and grammar may be suggested. Two approaches can be distinguished in critical editing – *positivism* and *pragmatics*. While positivists aim at reconstruction of so close form of the text to the original as possible, in the pragmatic approach, it is regarded to be meaningless to

¹⁹ The presupposition is that scribes would more often replace odd words and hard sayings with more familiar and less controversial ones, than vice versa (Greetham 1994:159). There is a rule in textual editing: *lectio difficilior potior!* It means ‘the more difficult reading is the stronger’.

maintain the original either in reality or as a purpose. The text is seen as a sum of a multitude of versions where each of them has its specific features, are produced for particular purposes and under different conditions. The utmost aspiration in reconstruction in the pragmatic approach is considered to be a reconstruction of certain aspects of the text which have appeared at certain time in a particular version (Kj rup 2005:209f). In the critical editing of the *Piṅgal treya* s tra I have adapted the pragmatic approach.

Higher criticism or textual criticism involves “using a critical attitude to all evidence that a text brings with it” (Greetham 1994:296). In preset thesis this kind of analytical work is done in the chapter of textual criticism where parts of the *Piṅgal treya* s tra are analysed with regard to the information the text brings forward and the material of scholarly research on subject matters involved.

MANUSCRIPT DESCRIPTION

Physical description

The *Piṅgal treya* s tra constitutes two and a half folios out of 454 folios. Folio numbers for the *Piṅgal treya* s tra are 367recto – 369recto. Manuscript material is birch bark leaves. They are 50 cm long and 10 cm high (Melzer 2006:2). The folios are available on paper and digitalized photos where one picture contains both sides of a folio commonly identified as *recto* for the right side and *verso* for the left side; both sides of a folio are written upon. Folios I am working on are among ones which belong to the private collection of Ikuo Hirayama in Kamakura, Japan. The folios of the *Piṅgal treya* s tra comprise eight lines per side with 65 – 69 akṣaras per line. Folios are in a relatively good condition, save for the lines 5 – 8 of 367 recto which have been damaged. The damage is quite small at the end of line 5, and increases from line 6 – 8. It increases diagonally from right to left at the bottom of the folio, resulting in some loss of text in line 6 with most damage in line 8. The damage, affects accordingly the right top corner of 367 verso, resulting in most damage on line 1 and gradually decreasing from line 2 – 6. The same is the case in 368 recto where lines 6 – 8 are damaged on the right lower corner. In addition, 1 akṣara, approximately 8th from the right side on line 6 is completely missing, while akṣaras of both sides of it are partially peeled off. It implies corresponding damage on 368 verso where lines 1 – 5 are damaged with most damage at the end of lines 1 – 3 and gradually less damage on lines 4 – 5. Generally, both sides of

every folio contain a number of akṣaras that have faded in course of time and/or have become illegible due to abrasion. There is a square-like string hole²⁰ located on the left half-side of the folio between lines 3 and 6; in order to accommodate it, a space of about 6 akṣaras is left on all four lines.

The title of the text, *Piṃgalātreya*, is in the manuscript given in the *uddāna* – a verse that lists a key word or a short title for each sūtra. As the whole key word “Piṃgalātreya” was not readable due to two illegible akṣaras at the end of the word, the title is reconstructed according to the name of the main character in the work.²¹

Palaeographic features of the Piṃgalātreya sūtra

Among the manuscripts found in Gilgit, two script types whose origin goes back to the Kuṣāṇa period (ca. 1st to 3rd century AD) are represented: The Round-type (until 6th century AD) and the Protośāradā-type (replaced the Round-type in about 630 AD). The *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra is written in the script of Protośāradā or Gilgit/Bamyan Type II.²² Also the change in the shape of pen used for writing the manuscripts reflects the difference between the two script types. From the 6th century the shape of a pen changed from being with a straight nib used in the Round-type script to a shape of a pen with a diagonal nib allowing making a peculiar twist of the pen between thick and thin lines of akṣaras (Sander 1968:141f). A characteristic of this script is that several variants are possible for an akṣara.²³ The Protośāradā script disappeared likely in connection with the decline of the ruling family Paṭola Śāhi about 740 AD, gradually falling into disuse.²⁴

The name of the scribe is not written in the manuscript which is not strange as it was not a common procedure to write one’s name after copying a text in Indian Buddhist tradition. Moreover, a longer manuscript could often be copied or written down by several different

²⁰ Lore Sander has observed that in the manuscripts written in Protośāradā script the place of the string hole is square-formed (H. von Hinüber 1994:36). It can be confirmed in the case of the manuscript of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra.

²¹ Hartmann 2002. Transliteration of the *uddāna* is given on p. 135. For further discussion of the name *Piṃgalātreya* see pages 139 - 140. It is interesting to pay attention here to the Tibetan title *goñ bu gsum* of the *Piṃgalātreya* mentioned by Hartmann on page 139: While in Sanskrit it is *piṃga-*, in Tibetan the translation is given as for *piṃca-* *goñ bu*.

²² Lore Sander has examined these two types of script regarding their characteristics. They are described in detail and compared to each other. The earlier script type is put under the name “Gilgit/Bamyan Type I” and the later one under the name “Gilgit/Bamyan Type II” (1968:141-154). A survey on previous research on the script and its development can be found in H. von Hinüber (1994:37-40).

²³ An account of it is given by Melzer (2006:63)

²⁴ Some Gilgit manuscripts have been found immured in a wall of a stūpa. The change of rulers in power may be the reason why manuscripts were hidden. This suggestion agrees with palaeographic examinations undertaken by Lore Sander where she suggests that Protośāradā could not be introduced in the region of Gilgit/Bamyan much before the 7th century AD. For discussion of that matter see H. von Hinüber 1994:39f.

scribes. Melzer has distinguished seven handwriting styles in the whole Dīrghāgama manuscript and indicated them with letters from A to F. She has described in detail the distinctive marks, and by drawing akṣaras depicted peculiarities regarding the writing style of all seven scribes (Melzer 2006:68-77). Two scribal hands can be distinguished in the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra. Characteristics attributed to scribe E²⁵ correspond to writing style in folios 367 recto – 368 verso. The folio 369 recto bears likeness to features attributed to scribe C.

A peculiarity of the Protośāradā or Gilgit/Bamyan Type II script is that for writing akṣaras *va* and *ba* the sign for *va* is used to depict both. Additionally, an old form of *ya* (from the Round-type or Gilgit/Bamyan Type I) may appear together with the new forms of *ya*. This is one of idiosyncrasies of scribe E. There are three instances where the old form is used in the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra: In 368r7 in the word “āyuṣmataḥ”, in 368v2 again in the word “āyuṣmataḥ”, and in 368v4 in the word “arthāya”. However, it does not indicate any regularity in usage. Although there are two instances of the old style *ya* in “āyuṣmataḥ”, in the word “āyuṣmān” (368r5), that has the same meaning, only different declension (genitive in former and nominative in latter) the *yu* is, on the contrary, written in the new style. The same irregularity can be observed in a third instance where *ya* is written in the old style in the word “arthāya”. There are six more occurrences of the same word in the text (367v7, 368r1, 368r2, 368r7, 368v1, 368v2), but in none of them the old form of *ya* is employed.

Punctuation in the Piṅgalātreya sūtra

In the manuscript following punctuation signs have been employed:

<i>daṇḍa</i>	occurs seven times, two times placed wrongly (right: 367v5, 368v6, 369r3, 369r4 two times; wrong: 367r5 and 367v8).
double <i>daṇḍa</i>	occurs once and marks the end of the sūtra (369r5).
* <i>virāma</i>	occurs once in 367v8 together with <i>daṇḍa</i> , but is wrongly placed in the middle of the word.
· high point	occurs once in 367r7 and, according to the meaning of the sentence is placed right.

Although some signs of interpunctuation are applied, they are not systematic and are used insufficiently.²⁶ In the reconstruction of the present work, words are separated in meaningful semantic entities and punctuation in the form of *daṇḍas* is supplied. When interpunctuation

²⁵ For features of scribe E, see Melzer 2006:74f.

²⁶ An unsystematic punctuation regarding the manuscripts of the Mūlasarvāstivādins has already been pointed out by Gnoli (1977:xv, vol. I), H. von Hinüber (1994:45) and Oliver von Crieger (2002:5).

coincides with unconnected *sandhi*²⁷ between two words, a *daṇḍa* in the form of | will be supplied.²⁸

Orthographic features in the Piṅgalātreya sūtra

A special feature of the manuscript is the almost constant absence of the end-consonant *t* in optative case *syāt* (3. person, singular) of the verb root \sqrt{as} and in optative case *vadet* (3. person, singular) of the verb root \sqrt{vad} .²⁹ It is interesting to note that the consonant *t* in *vadet* disappears when the following word starts with a consonant that is voiceless and unaspirated. For example, *vade<t> parān* (367v7). There are seven instances like that in the example with only one occurrence where *t* does not disappear (368v3). In contrast, when *vaded* ends in *d*, because of the following word which begins with a vowel,³⁰ the end consonant *d* never disappears. For example, *vaded adṛṣṭa* (367v7). There are also seven occurrences of this case, and only once (368r2) *t* occurs wrongly instead of *d*. What concerns *syād*, the final consonant *d* disappears in front of a word which begins with the same consonant. For example, *syā<d> dīrgha* (367v7). All together, *syād* appears in the text six times of which once (368r1) *t* wrongly occurs instead of *d*, and once (368v1) the final consonant *d* is unexpectedly written as it should. There is one instance (368v6) where final *n* in the word *āyusmān* disappears in front of a word which begins with the same nasal consonant – *nāyam*.

What these occurrences lead to think is that the manuscript at some point in its history has been dictated for scribes because, when uttering the word combination *vadet parān*, the *t* before *p* can be difficult to hear as at uttering *t* the air flow stops and produces a glottal stop. That does not happen when uttering the word combination *vaded adṛṣṭa* since the end consonant *d* is clearly heard before the vowel *a*. The disappearance of the end-consonants *d* in *syād* in front of *dīrgha* and *n* in *āyusmān* in front of *nāyam* may be explained by the same reason – when uttering two consonants which sound alike and one who writes it down is not fully fluent in Sanskrit grammar, it can not be easy to hear two consonants, and not one. However, it may be too early to draw any conclusions yet before all the texts of the Dīrghāgama manuscript are edited and the material is available for the further research on ‘errors’.

²⁷ Sandhi - Sanskrit rules for phonetic combinations in and of the words.

²⁸ A *daṇḍa* in the form of | has been introduced by Melzer (2006:iv).

²⁹ An absence of the end-consonant *t* in the ablative declination of an *a-stem* masculine and neuter substantive that ends in *-āt* has been previously observed by Melzer (2006:55). There are only two instances of ablative form *-āt* occurring (369r3 and r5) in the *Piṅgalātreya sūtra*, and in both cases the end-consonant *t* is present.

³⁰ The sandhi rule for combination of final with initial sounds in compounds.

No sign for *avagraha* appears in the manuscript. After *o* is *a* eliminated.

The occurrence of *visarga* is rather arbitrary in folios 367r – 368v contrary to folio 369r where *visargas* appear correctly. It seems that this phenomenon may be attributed to scribes.³¹ While the instances where scribe E writes *visarga* and where he does not are irregular and difficult to explain, for example, (367r5, 367r6) *piṅgalātreya<ḥ> parivrājako* and (367r7) *māṛtaḥ pitṛtaḥ*, as well as (367v3) *saṃpanna<ḥ> sugato* and (367r8) *pāragāḥ sanighaṇḍu*, in the folio of scribe C (369r5) *visarga* in *piṅgalātreyaḥ parivrājako* is put correctly. Other occurrences of *visarga* are clear as well, contrary to scribe E.

The employment of *anusvāra* instead of other five nasals of the class is very frequent: Instead of dental *n* – *bhagavāṃ* (367r5, 367v4); *āyusmāṃ* (368r3, 368v6); *asmim* (368r5, 368v7); *abhinamḍya* (369r5).

Instead of palatal *ñ* – *saṃraṃjanīm* (367r6); *paṃcamānām* (367r8).

Instead of velar *ṅ* – *piṅgalātreyaḥ* (367r5, 367r6, 369r5); *śaṃk<h>a~* (368v8).

Instances where *ṛ* occurs instead of *ri* are few and only related to the number *three*: *trṣu* (367r5) and *trḍaṇḍi* (369r3).

Instances with incorrect sandhi:

yaś ca > yac ca (368r3); *tatrako > tatraiko* (369r3).

Vowel interchange and occurrences where a short vowel appears instead of a long one and reverse are very few and irregular:

lābhina > lobhena (368r1); *eṣā > eṣa* (368r3); *ātyṣman > āyusmān* (368r5), *gṛ<hi>ṇe > gṛhiṇā* (368v8), and an instance which appears twice – *~vijña > ~vijñā* (368r4, 368v6).

There are various instances where a consonantal confusion occurs due to misread akṣaras or by adding a consonant or an akṣara where it ‘seems to suit’ the meaning of a word or context.

Misread akṣaras: *sa* appears instead of *na* and reverse: *svasty > nvasty* (367v6); (369r3). *na* instead of *ca* (368v7), *va* instead of *pa* in *varān > parān* (367v8), *d* instead of *n* as a first consonant in the ligature: *parād vā > parān vā* (368r2); *rva* misread as *nu*: *durarvaboddha > duranuboddha* (368v5).

³¹ Greetham suggests that all scribes have had their own idiosyncratic types of errors which might serve to identify their individual involvement in a text just as effectively as might a consideration of the hand itself (1994:279).

Additions:³² *saddharmaṃ* > *sa dharmaṃ* (367v4);³³ *saṃmoho* > *sa moho* (368r6, 368r1); *sukhāya* > *duḥkhāya* (368r7, 368v1);³⁴ *bhagavaty* > *bhavaty* (367r7);³⁵ *adhyāvasaṃ* > *adhyāvasatā* (368v8).³⁶

Dittography (going back too far in the exemplar line):
nyāyeṇāryeṇa > *nyāyeṇārye* (367v2); *tathā* (too many times) (368r1); *paṇḍita* (too many times) (368v6); *yathāpitattad* > *yathāpitad* (368v6); there is an instance of one whole paragraph repeated (368v1-2) *āhosvin nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa moho* <'>*prahīṇo* <'>*parijñāto yena mohenābhibhūtaḥ paryāttacitto* <'>*jñātaiva saṃjñātāh(a)m (asmīti va)(v2)ded adraṣṭaiva saṃdraṣṭāham asmīti vade*<t> *parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayed yat teṣāṃ syā*<d> *dīrgharātram* <an>*arthāya* <a>*hitā(ya) duḥkhā(ya)*.

Confusion of words of similar shape and/or meaning:³⁷
palitaḥ lopita > *lapita lāpaṇa* (367v2);

Other instances with word confusions:
yadā > *evam* (367v1); *ayām* > *aham* (367v1); *tathā* > *te* (368r2); *yeṣu* > *ye* (368r3); *śrutvā* > *śraddhām* (368v7);³⁸ *śaṃkalīkṛtaṃ* > *śaṅkhalikhitaṃ* (368v8).

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Contents and concordance

Although there does not exist an exact parallel to the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra either in terms of title nor regarding the compositional structure of contents, the textual material is not entirely unknown within the Buddhist literature. Similar passages can be found not only in sūtra literature but also in vinaya corpus of Buddhist scriptures. Additionally, due to spread of Buddhism over large areas of India, Central Asia and China, due to its missionary work resulting in a vastness of Buddhist literature, a rather considerable number of texts that have

³² Greetham calls this kind of errors “contextual additions” (1994:281).

³³ This instance could unlikely be a mere faulty doubling of consonants as there are no other occurrences of wrong doubling of consonants in the text.

³⁴ Here it is possible to argue that the instance is just a misreading of akṣara, but since no sign for avagraha is employed in this manuscript and preceding words before *duḥkha* are (‘)*arthāya*, (‘)*hitāya*, it may have appeared to the scribe that *duḥkha* in this line seems to be interrupting the context and he has therefore changed it to *sukha*. The instances occur twice, one after another. However, *duḥkha* in the same context appears three times before the first change is done (367v7, 368r1, 368r2) and once after the second change (368v4).

³⁵ Preceding words are *bho gautama brāhmaṇo*.

³⁶ Preceding words are *sukaram* ~ <'>*gāram* and also words after *adhyāvasatā* continue to end on *m*.

³⁷ Kind of mistakes pointed out by Greetham (1994:281).

³⁸ It may possibly be treated under ‘confusion of words of similar shape and/or meaning’.

not been preserved in languages they have been composed in, have survived in translations. Therefore the overview of contents of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra in my thesis is presented with an account of corresponding text fragments from the sūtra/sutta and vinaya literature, as well as available text pieces from Chinese translation. The meaningful text portions in concordance with precise references to their parallels are presented in the reconstruction of the text.

The *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra can be divided into three parts: Parivrājaka Ātreya's conversation with the Buddha, the longer version of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict and continuation as in the *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra. At each part references for text location in the reconstruction and for parallel text fragments from Buddhist literature will be given.

Part 1

Activity takes place in the time span of around the 6th and 5th century BC in Rājagṛha, the capital city of the Magadha Empire. The Buddha stays in a bamboo forest called the “Squirrel feeding (place)”. He is approached there by a wandering religious mendicant Ātreya from Piṃgala with whom he engages in a conversation about Brahmins who possess the threefold knowledge. After Ātreya has given a detailed description of a Brahmin who is qualified to be a master of the threefold knowledge the Buddha seems neither impressed nor convinced and states that he would not declare the threefold knowledge in the dharmavinaya like that. The first part ends with Ātreya asking the Buddha how he proclaims the threefold knowledge regarding his teaching.

Piṃgalātreya sūtra 1.1 – 1.11

MN I, no. 24, p. 145.11 – 12 and MN II, no. 95, p. 165.30; AN III, no. 58, p. 163.1 – 163.19; T 2, no. 99, 223c13 – 223c26.

Part 2

Now follows the introduction part to the Tathāgata-Predict where the occurrence of the Buddha in the world is presented. This leads the one who hears the Buddha expounding the Dharma to acquire faith in him and his teaching. Yet, before one acquires faith in the Buddha, he observes the teacher's pureness in three states of mind – greed, hatred, and delusion. After he has acquired faith, he leaves his home, cuts off his beard and hair, proceeds to practicing a life free from impurities, and abstains from taking life.

Piṅgalātreya sūtra 2.1 – 2.9

SBV II, p. 230.11 – 232. 10; AN III, no. 60, p. 168. 24 – 26; AN III, no. 63, p. 180.25 – 29; MN I, no. 27, p. 179.12 – 21; MN I, no. 51, p. 344.27 – 28; MN II, no. 91, p. 144.18 – 20; MN II, no. 95, p. 171.33 – 173.18; MN III, no. 107, p. 2.7 – 9; MN III, no. 112, p. 33.19 – 20; T 2, no. 99, 223c26 – 29.

Part 3

The Tathāgata-Predict is not expounded further here, but instead is given reference to the preceding *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra where it is set forth in detail. Thus, after the teaching is presented in the Tathāgata-Predict, the Buddha gives an answer to the question about what he implies by the threefold knowledge, asked by Ātreya in the first part of the sūtra. Ātreya is satisfied with the Buddha's answer, salutes him and leaves.

Piṅgalātreya sūtra 3.1 – 3.3

SBV II, p. 232.10 – 11; MN II, no. 91, p. 144.18 – 20.

Analysis and commentary

Part 1

Sūtra begins with the formulary *evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye* which traditionally is said to confirm a sūtra's authentic status.³⁹ Whether this phrase indeed legitimates the *Piṅgalātreya* or occurs arbitrary in it, whether it refers to the sūtra's authorized position in the *Śīlaskandha* section or its position in the *Dīrghāgama* manuscript is generally not easy to conclude considering the fact that there are 18 sūtras in the *Dīrghāgama* manuscript which do not have this introduction formulary.⁴⁰ After this opening line, it is customary in the Theravada Buddhism to state a place where the Buddha was residing. Locations are not always accurately stated in texts and are most likely attributed to a sūtra according to a

³⁹ After the Buddha's decease, the disciples became the representatives of proclamation of the Dharma. In order to stress that they limited themselves to transmitting the master's teaching without adding anything themselves, they proceeded with the sacred formula: *evaṃ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye* (Thus I have once heard). (Etienne Lamotte: "The assessment of textual authenticity in Buddhism" (1983-4:6)).

⁴⁰ Gudrun Melzer has pointed out sūtras in the whole *Dīrghāgama* manuscript which do not have this formulary and regarded this phenomenon as remarkable since it does not bring about any obvious consistency (2006:23f). It should, perhaps, be noted here that also in the *Aṅguttara Nikāya* many suttas start without any introduction. It would be interesting to check if sūtras from the *Dīrghāgama* which do not have this introduction formulary would have similarities with any of suttas from the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*.

reciter's own preferences. However, in the *Piṅgalātreya*'s case the place is Rājagṛha (modern Rajgir), the capital city of the kingdom of Magadha in North-East India. The time span can be accommodated around 5th century BC. Closer details about historic context are not easy to state. As the king Ajātaśatru appears is depicted in dialog with the Buddha in the *Śrāmanyaphala* sūtra, the sūtra the *Piṅgalātreya* has the most extensive similar text fragment from, one can deduce that he likely has lived at the same time as the Buddha. Although several dates regarding the rein of Ajātaśatru and his father, the king Bimbisāra are available in different sources, they are rather unreliable as, for the most part, dates regarding that time are assigned based on time for the Buddhas birthday, but, as a matter of fact, there is no consensus about this date. Besides the capital city Rājagṛha, a more detailed location – a bamboo grove (*veṇuvana*) called the “Squirrels’ feeding place” (*kalandakanivāpa*) is given. It is said that the bamboo grove has been given to the Buddha by the king Bimbisāra, and it is considered to be the location of the first monastery in India.⁴¹

The subject matter put forward in the first part of the *Piṅgalātreya* is the threefold knowledge (*traividya*). The Buddha's method of discussion in the sūtras of the Śīlaskandha section can be regarded as rather same in each case. He takes the subject raised by his opponent as the starting point for the discussion, and by inserting an alternative meaning into the subject matter, or by focusing upon the ethical concepts involved, he succeeds, as a rule, in giving his opponent a satisfying answer and/or causes heretical specialists to convert to Buddhism (Norman 1983:32f). In the *Piṅgalātreya* the religious mendicant Ātreya from Piṅgala praises the mastery of the threefold knowledge of Brahmins. It is interesting to note that the name of Brahmin in the first sūtra of the Śīlaskandha section, a sūtra immediately preceding the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra, is *Tridaṇḍin*, as was the name of one of the largest congregations of parivrājakas (wondering mendicants) in the time of the Buddha - the “Tredaṇḍikas” (Lamotte 1988:53). Also the name of the Ātreya could probably refer back to one of the popular writings in the Vedas – the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* or *Aitareya Āraṇyaka* since the subject matter of this sūtra is the praise of Brahmins as masters and preservers of the threefold knowledge or the three Vedas.

This part of the sūtra is similar to the *Tikaṇṇa* sutta from the Pāli Aṅguttara Nikāya (‘Numerical Discourses’): sets of persons, things or concepts occurring once, twice etc., are grouped together in separate divisions. The subject matter discussed in the first part implies the number three – the threefold knowledge. Number three is also inferred in the name of the

⁴¹ The Buddha is said to have spent there the second, third and fourth rain-retreats, and many early discourses have been expounded there (Keown 2004:325).

main character of the Pāli sutta – Tikaṇṇa, the ‘Three-Eared or Three Ears’. The name *Tikaṇṇa* may infer *śruti* (‘that what is heard’) and in this way refer to the term *traividya* as for ‘hearing’ the three Vedas, hence accenting the connection between Brahmins and the *śruti* tradition of the three Vedas. Kazunobu Matsuda has previously supposed that *Tikaṇṇa* could possibly have some connection to *Tridaṇḍin* as both names may convey some likeness.⁴² However, I would like to argue that *Tridaṇḍin* and *Piṅgalātreya* may infer connection with each other as the texts of both sūtras deal with subjects referring to the early discussions between Brahmins and the Buddha, and thus, both names would likely imply the connection to things associated with Brahmins, such as large congregations of parivrājakas by name “Tredaṇḍikas” or texts connected to Brahmins, such as *Aitareya*⁴³ *Brāhmaṇa*. It is customary to refer to the four Vedas: Ṛg Veda, Sāma Veda, Yajur Veda, and Atharva Veda. The reason why it is referred to the *traividya* – three Vedas can possibly be that the last one, the Atharva Veda, may have here been considered as inferior to the other three as it is less connected with the idea of sacrifice: The purpose of stressing a Brahmin and his knowledge in the *Piṅgalātreya* might be to infer that only Brahmins could carry out the ritual of sacrifice in opposition to, for example, the view that all twice-born could hear and learn the Veda.

After Ātreya has praised the Brahmins as knowers of the threefold knowledge in front of the Buddha (1.5), he tells the Buddha the essentials by means of which one does become a teacher, a holder of mantras, and a master of the three Vedas together with six other traditional learnings (1.7-8). According to Ātreya, ‘purity’ is the key concept in acquiring the knowledge of Brahmins. The ‘purity’ concept pervaded the Vedic oral tradition that determined that only Brahmins could be the guardians of the Vedic knowledge. They heard the Vedas from their teachers and learned them by heart with the help of several developed techniques for this purpose. Writing down the texts was also considered to be a polluting activity. The concept of ‘purity’ has its roots in the idea of polarity between purity and pollution that prevailed in the Vedic social order and contradicted the Buddhist ethic view which placed experience above the established strict regulations of boundaries among groups of people. Therefore the Buddha, in a slightly sarcastic manner, says (1.10) that he would not declare the threefold knowledge in his teaching only in terms of ‘mere lip-service and mere repetitions’ (*na uśṭhaphrahatamātrakeṇa na lapita lāpaṇa*), thus referring to the mechanical techniques for learning texts by heart where understanding has a secondary meaning in opposition to the insight acquired by experience – hence, the way to enlightenment as taught

⁴² See Matsuda 2006:134.

⁴³ Aitareya > Ātreya – can a vṛddhi change in the first syllable be possible?

by the Buddha. According to Gombrich (1996:29f) the concept of ‘*traividya*’ in Buddhism was intended to “parallel and trump the ‘three knowledges’ of Brahmins”. *Traividya* refers in Buddhism to 1) memory of one’s own previous lives, 2) remembering previous lives of others according to their karma, and 3) the Four Noble Truths – a set of attainments, not texts.

However, in the *Piṅgalātreya* the answer to what is implied by the threefold knowledge in Buddhism (1.11) is not given in part 1, but at the end of the Sūtra (3.2). As for now, the parallel text piece from the *Tikaṇṇa* sutta in the Dīgha Nikāya where the answer regarding the threefold knowledge is given by the Buddha ends immediately at this point. The reason why the train of thought stops here in the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra and proceeds with the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict is hard to tell, but as Matsuda (2006:134) has pointed out – both texts have possibly had one common source text.⁴⁴

At this stage of research, while only a few sūtras from the Dīrghāgama manuscript have been studied, one can only draw hypothetical conclusions. Nevertheless, I tend to think that in the process of creation of this Dīrghāgama collection, the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins based themselves on the sūtras they actually possessed and not on text collections systematized after peculiarities of the texts, after the pattern of, for example, the Pāli text collections, where texts displaying a number of sets of concepts or persons are categorized under the Numerous Discourses, longer texts under the Long Discourses, and so on. Keeping in mind that the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra is rather short, the same length as the *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra, with only the insertion of the Tathāgata-Predict making them longer, as well as the fact that they both have parallels in two texts coming after each other in the Aṅguttara Nikāya, it may be possible to assume that the *Piṅgalātreya* and the *Tridaṇḍi* sūtras were deliberately appropriated both to the collection of Long Discourses and the Śīlaskandhaka section by inserting the Tathāgata-Predict. Kazunobu Matsuda refers in his article to Nobuzuki Yamagiva who has earlier pointed out that the Śīlakkhandaka section in the Dīgha Nikāya collection is a conglomerate consisting of sūtras from several Āgama collections that have been constructed by inserting the Tathāgata-Predict (2006:129). Could the same be said about forming the Dīrghāgama collection, too, where 11 sūtras out of 47 sūtras contained in this manuscript have parallels in the Majjima Nikāya and 13 sūtras are unknown?

The Chinese parallel (T 2, no. 99, sūtra no. 886) to the first part of *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra is considered to belong to the *Sarvāstivādins* or the *Mūlasarvāstivādins* and is part of the

⁴⁴ Matsuda refers also to similarities between the *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra and the *Jānussoṇi* sutta which may have had one common source text (2006:134).

Samyuktāgama, ('Connected Discourses') (Glass 2006:21). This sūtra appears to have a very interesting relation with the *Piṅgalātreyā* and with a text piece in the *Tikaṇṇa* sutta which is parallel to the *Piṅgalātreyā*. The Chinese sūtra is exactly as long as the first part of the *Piṅgalātreyā* with the only difference that in the Chinese sūtra the Buddha also, as in the *Tikaṇṇa* sutta, immediately answers the question about the threefold knowledge. However, the name of the Brahmin who talks to the Buddha is not given in the Chinese sūtra. He is merely referred to as 婆羅門(póluómén) – the Brahmin (1.6). In the beginning when this Brahmin approaches the Buddha he is introduced as 異(yì) 'other, different' 婆羅門 Brahmin (1.2). That implies that one or several preceding sūtras in the Chinese collection may have had subject(s) related to and involving the participation of Brahmins. The place name given in this sūtra differs from the one in the *Piṅgalātreyā*. Here it is 舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園 (1.1) (shèwèiguóqíshùjīgūdúyuán) *jetavana anāthapiṇḍada ārāma*. This is a grove called “conqueror’s wood” dedicated to the Buddha by Anāthapiṇḍada. Before becoming the Buddha’s disciple and changing the name to Anāthapiṇḍada meaning the ‘feeder of the poor’, he was a wealthy merchant, living in the city of Śrāvastī, in today’s Gonda district of Uttar Pradesh where he built the Buddha a residence for retreat during rainy seasons. This is said to be the second monastery dedicated to the Buddha after the *veluvana* in Rājagṛha which in the *Piṅgalātreyā* is mentioned as the place where the Buddha stayed.

It is interesting to note that the Buddha’s answer regarding the threefold knowledge is expanded by an additional verse (1.10) in the Chinese parallel. Worthy of attention for the *Piṅgalātreyā* is the third line from above in the verse:

悉知心解脫(xīzhīxīnjiětuō)

‘Be fully aware of liberation of the mind’

This condition is directly equivalent to the idea of elimination of the afflictive hindrances.⁴⁵

一切貪恚癡(yīqiètànhuìchī)

‘All (such hindrances) as greed (lobha), hatred (dveṣa), delusion (moha).

The significant element here is that *akuṣalamūla* – the three roots of evil which appear much later in the *Piṅgalātreyā* sūtra, are mentioned already in this line in the Chinese parallel. The three roots of evil will be examined more in detail in the analysis of the part 2 of the

⁴⁵ *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism..* <http://www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb/>.

Piṅgalātreya sūtra; as for here, it just suffices to say that to create a link in discussion between *traividya* and the three *akuṣalamūla(s)* may have been a common and/or a favourite subject matter. Since this small Chinese sūtra appears to be so similar to the *Piṅgalātreya* in terms of contents, it would be beneficial to have some knowledge about its source text. However, there have been conflicting accounts regarding the source text of the translation. Andrew Glass (2006:20-25) has provided a comprehensive survey of traditional Buddhist accounts and prevailing scholarly views regarding the potential place of origin for the source text. He concludes that the manuscript of this Chinese collection may have been copied in Sri Lanka in around 410-11 AD, although it is difficult to explain how and why a Sarvāstivāda manuscript could be available in Sri Lanka at that time.

Part 2

This can be considered as the main part of the sūtra, since it constitutes two thirds of the text material and present the introduction⁴⁶ to the Tathāgata-Predict which forms an important part in sūtras in the Śīlaskandha section. The introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict starts at 2.1, proceeds until 2.3 where it is interrupted by a longer text passage which Konrad Meisig (1987:56) considered to be a commentary expansion upon how ‘a householder or a householder’s son acquire faith in the Buddha’. Now, twenty years later, when new materials regarding the occurrence of the Tathāgata-Predict are available, comprising first and foremost the present Dīrghāgama manuscript, alternative conclusions can be drawn. As a consequence, Gudrun Melzer (2006:16) has, after examining all the sūtras in the Śīlaskandha section, distinguished between a longer and a shorter version of this introduction part of the Tathāgata-Predict. Meisig carried out his study based on the Chinese version of the *Śrāmaṇyaphala* sūtra (T 1, vol. 1, pp. 107a-109, partly also from the Chinese version of the *Ambaṭṭha* sutta, T 1, vol. 1, pp. 83c3-86c15) in comparison with the Pāli *Sāmaññaphala* sutta and the Sanskrit version of the *Śrāmaṇyaphala* sūtra as preserved in the *Saṅghabhedavastu*. As the ‘longer version’ of the Tathāgata-Predict is only found in the *Śrāmaṇyaphala* sūtra of the *Saṅghabhedavastu*,⁴⁷ the text passage comprising examination of the three roots of evil might have appeared as an annexation to a standard formulary. With reference to Melzer’s

⁴⁶ I choose to call this part where the appearance of the Buddha is described “the introduction part to the Tathāgata-Predict” as did Peter Ramers (1996:7). Gudrun Melzer, however, prefers not to separate this part from the rest of it.

⁴⁷ The *Śrāmaṇyaphala* sūtra in its all available Chinese translations is also studied by Graeme Macqueen (1988), but in none of the four Chinese translations he has examined (the one mentioned above plus additional three – T 22, vol. 1, pp. 270-276; T 124, vol. 2, pp. 762-764; T 1450, vol. 24, pp. 205-206) the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict occurs in the ‘longer version’.

observations, the ‘longer version’ occurs in three sūtras of the Dīrghāgama manuscript in addition to its occurrence in the *Saṅghabhedavastu*. One of these three sūtras in the Dīrghāgama manuscript is the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra. The text passage starts in 2.3.1 and proceeds until 2.3.38. In the reconstruction it is referred to a parallel text passage from the *Caṅkī* sutta of the Majjima Nikāya. While the compositional structure in the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict is identical to lines of the *Piṃgalātreya* and the *Saṅghabhedavastu*, wording and structure of the Pāli parallel differs. Whereas in both Sanskrit versions the combination of interrogative particles *kim...āhosvit* (2.3.2 and 2.3.6; 2.3.20 and 2.3.24) is used, the Pāli version does employ only the simple interrogative particle *kim*. The striking likeness between the *Piṃgalātreya* and the *Saṅghabhedavastu* occurs in their omission of the observance of *dveṣa* (‘hatred’) within the three evil roots of mind. Moreover, in the *Kāmaṭhika* sūtra⁴⁸ (number 19 in the Yuga section of the Dīrghāgama) which is the Sanskrit counterpart to the Pāli *Caṅkī* sutta, as well as in the *Lauhitya* sūtra (number 27 in the Śīlaskandha section, the next sūtra after the *Piṃgalātreya* in the Dīrghāgama collection) the observance of *dveṣa* is also omitted. In the Pāli version, on the contrary, *dveṣa* is examined. It is examined in the Sanskrit version of the *Caṅgī* sūtra⁴⁹ as well. Melzer has already pointed out that there are numerous omissions and abbreviations in the whole Dīrghāgama manuscript which do not convey any regularity and rather witness of a never before read and revised status of this manuscript (2006:22). Yet, the omissions of *dveṣa* do express consistency – in all three tested sūtras of the Dīrghāgama manuscript, as well as in the *Saṅghabhedavastu* the omission remains.

As the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra is the first sūtra in the Śīlaskandha section where a ‘longer version’ of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict occurs, the full length of the Tathāgata-Predict could be expected. However, only the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict appears in the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra. As for the rest of it, it is referred to the *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra (*pūrvavad vistareṇa yathā tridaṇḍisūtre*). Still, it is not the *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra where the complete text of the Tathāgata-Predict is displayed, but it is the *Lauhitya* sūtra that occurs only as the third sūtra in the Śīlaskandha section. Traditionally, the complete Tathāgata-Predict is expected to occur in one of the opening sūtras of the Śīlaskandha section: hence – the *Sāmaññaphala* sutta (the second sūtra in the Pāli Dīgha Nikāya) and the *Ambāṣṭha* sūtra (the first sūtra in the Chinese

⁴⁸ I would like to thank Prof. Hartmann for kindly providing me with a preliminary transliteration of this sūtra.

⁴⁹ Hartmann 2002b:14. For details see the chapter on survey of sources.

Dīrghāgama collection)⁵⁰. Despite the *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra's apparently insufficient state in the present manuscript, Matsuda calls attention to the three commentators Vasubandhu, Yaśomitra, and Śamathadeva who have referred to the *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra as the sūtra forming the Śīlaskandha section of the Dīrghāgama collection, most likely that of the Sarvāstivādins⁵¹ (Matsuda 2006:129).

Now, the question remains, why the observation of the three evil roots of mind in the way that makes it similar to the 'longer version' of the Tathāgata-Predict is presented only in one Pāli sutta, namely, the *Caṅkī* sutta which constitutes a Pāli parallel to the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra in this subject matter. The corresponding text passage in the *Caṅkī* sutta is presented in a different context, not as a part of the Tathāgata-Predict. Moreover, the Tathāgata-Predict does not appear in the *Caṅkī* sutta at all. It could be of assistance to look at the text that comes immediately before the observation of the three evil roots in the *Caṅkī* sutta in order to understand the purpose of its occurrence there: A dialogue takes place between the Buddha and a young Brahmin by name Kāpaṭhika. The theme discussed is preservation of and awakening to the truth. The argument of the Buddha is that by saying: 'such is my truth' one only affirms the fact that a certain truth is preserved. It does not indicate awakening to the truth which is regarded to be of primary importance by the Buddha. The awakening happens gradually after observing pureness in the teacher's mind; whether it is free from *lobha*, *dveṣa*, and *moha*: If the mind is pure, one acquires faith in the teacher which leads one to listen to the teacher's teaching. When teaching is born in one's mind, it is being examined, hence interest is born. Then one enquires into facts and information of the teaching that, by eventually grasping the fourfold set of basic principles, leads to the realization of the highest insight (MN II 1957:362).

The question now is if that what appears in the text of the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra before the examination of the three evil states of mind can be regarded as issue of preservation of truth. As it has been discussed in the textual critics of the part 1 of the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra, Ātreya praises the mastery of the threefold knowledge among Brahmins by stating that the determining aspect in the maintenance of the threefold knowledge is 'pureness of birth'. Then the Buddha describes an appearance of an awakened one in the world in order to contrast it with Ātreya's account regarding Brahmins (2.1 – 2.2). Here the polarity between the idea of

⁵⁰ When discussing the occurrence of the Tathāgata-Predict, Macqueen calls it "Buddha's Discourse" in the Dīgha Nikāya and in the Chinese Dīrghāgama. He points out that the *Sāmaññaphala* sutta and the *Ambāṣṭha* sūtra are always referred to for details when the Tathāgata-Predict is made shorter in any other sūtra (1988:179f).

⁵¹ The Dīrghāgama collection is preserved only in a number of rather damaged manuscript fragments from Central Asia. No translation in Chinese or Tibetan is available.

awakening to truth or knowledge and the idea of preservation of knowledge unfolds itself: the Buddha appears in the world as awakened one because he has realized the awakening himself and thus is able to be the teacher of both gods and human beings with a teaching which is a ‘completely purified, spotless way of religious life’, whereas the Brahmin declares himself to be “a knower [of the threefold knowledge], though indeed he is not”⁵² (for example 2.3.25), as it is repeated several times in the *Piṅgalātreya*, because he preserves his knowledge through generations with an objective of precise recitations. It is interesting to note that this phrase occurs while observing greed, hatred, and delusion. The annexation of examination of these three *akuṣalamūla(s)* in the introduction of the Tathāgata-Predict may create a transition for one who is concerned with the preservation of knowledge to one’s gradual process of awakening to knowledge, which may be regarded as determining for hearing the Tathāgata-Predict. When a Brahmin praises his own knowledge, he might yet not be ready to hear the threefold *śīlaskandha* part⁵³ in the Tathāgata-Predict. In fact, the Tathāgata-Predict starts only after the faith is acquired – what the formulary ‘a householder or a householder’s son, or someone of inferior birth after hearing the Dharma, acquires faith in the Buddha’ implies. In the *Piṅgalātreya* this formulary is ‘cut in two’ where, to begin with, the Dharma is heard, then the annexation with the examination of the three *akuṣalamūla(s)* appears, and only afterwards the last part of the formulary about acquiring the faith comes. As it reads in the *Caṅkī* sutta: “With faith born he draws close; drawing close he sits down near by; sitting down near by he lends ear; lending ear he hears *dhamma*;” (MN II 1957:362). Étienne Lamotte explains that what one means by ‘drawing close’ or ‘associating’ is states of consciousness which sometimes appear as good (*kusala*), sometimes as bad (*akusala*) depending on connection or association with the three roots of evil (1988:596). The fact that one who hears the Dharma and acquires faith in the formulary is called ‘a householder, a householder’s son or someone of inferior birth’ (the latter does not appear in the *Piṅgalātreya*), shows the neutral wording of the formulary in order to adjust it to various contexts in the sūtras. At the same time, ‘a householder’ infers ‘a Brahmin’ regardless of his pursuit for the time being – be he a *parivrājaka*, a *śramaṇa* etc., as ‘a householder’ is one of

⁵² This phrase actually is thought by a Brahmin regarding the Buddha – if the Buddha would say “I am a knower”. Brahmin’s conclusion is that the Buddha would not say that, and it is, of course, explicit. Therefore it may rather refer back to the Brahmin himself as it is he who praises his knowledge.

⁵³ The objective of the threefold *śīlaskandha* section is to reveal the way of liberation that is accomplished through: 1) observing one’s moral conduct (*śīla*), 2) practicing meditation (*dyāna*), 3) acquiring supernatural abilities (*ṛddhi*) that leads one to the highest insight (*prajñā*).

four stages in a Brahmin's life.⁵⁴ The objective of the 'longer version' of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict in the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra could, consequently, be to build a bridge between the *traividyā* of Brahmins and the *traividyā* of the Buddha. It is also, in the examination of the three *akuṣalamūla(s)* repeatedly stated that "this Dharma is intelligible to the wise" (for example in 2.3.35) and "it is not easy to command it by a delusional one" (for example in 2.3.36). In order to hear the Tathāgata-Predict one should be so minded. Therefore the Brahmin resolves to cut his hair and beard, put on a yellow robe and "go forth from home into homelessness in harmony with faith" at the end of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict (2.6). The Tathāga-Predict starts right after this.

A few words should be said about the Chinese translation of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict. No Chinese translation contains the annexation about the observation of the three *akuṣalamūla(s)*. Although the rest of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict has been translated, it is not included as a parallel fragment in the reconstruction of the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra, in view of the fact that it does not display the material needed (the part about *lobha*, *dveṣa*, and *moha*) in order to illuminate unclear parts of the *Piṅgalātreya*. However, it is hard to explain why the part about the three *akuṣalamūla(s)* in the *Saṅghabhedavastu* is omitted in the translation of 義淨 (Yì-jìng) who translated the *Vinayavastu*⁵⁵ in 710 AD. The part in question appears in the Tibetan translation.⁵⁶ The place where Yì-jìng acquired a manuscript of the *Saṅghabhedavastu* was the Buddhist monastic university at Nālandā in India⁵⁷ which he visited in the 7th century AD and stayed there for eleven years. Since the first references to the Mūlasarvāstivādins occur precisely in Yì-jìng's accounts in the second half of the 7th century AD,⁵⁸ and the *Saṅghabhedavastu* text also belongs to the Mūlasarvāstivādins, the influence of this tradition may have been strong at this university. Connections to the developing Buddhist movement in Tibet were formed, resulting in a number of leading Tibetan monks visiting the university (Keown 2004:186).

⁵⁴ First is the celibate student (*brahmacarya*), second is householder (*gṛhastha*), third is hermit or forest dweller (*vanaprastha*), and fourth – the renouncer (*samnyāsa*).

⁵⁵ The complete version of the Vinaya text corpus where the *Saṅghabhedavastu* is just one part of it.

⁵⁶ Raniero Gnoli describes the Tibetan translation as 'quite literal and extremely accurate', whereas the Chinese version translated by Yì-jìng is characterized as with omissions and inversions 'even in the translated parts' in addition to the fact that several sections of the *Saṅghabhedavastu* were not translated at all (Gnoli 1977:xxiii, vol I).

⁵⁷ For the account of why ten *vastu* from the whole corpus of the *Vinayavastu* translated by Yì-jìng are lost see H. von Hinüber (1994:96).

⁵⁸ Fumio Enomoto has observed that examples of phraseology and style peculiar to the Mūlasarvāstivādins are found in Sanskrit manuscripts dating from as early as the 4th century AD and in the Sarvāstivādin works translated by 玄奘 (Xuán-zàng) in the first half of the 7th century (Enomoto 1986:23).

How Yì-jìng did acquire this manuscript could form a very interesting study and may also answer the question why there are no other Chinese translations of this text, since many texts traditionally are retranslated at a later point. It can be argued that this text was translated into Chinese earlier by somebody else and Yì-jìng did not know about it. However, this kind of assumption seems unlikely. Improbable is also that Yì-jìng would deliberately have made a translation of the *Saṅghabhedavastu* that appears so imprecise and almost careless unless he had a different version of the *Saṅghabhedavastu* than the one Tibetans had at hand. This leads to think that there were two variants of this text – one incomplete and another one worked out in detail. If it is considered that Yì-jìng made his translation in the first decade of the 8th century AD, but the translation of the *Vinayavastu* of Mūlasarvastivādins in Tibetan is dated around the end of the 8th and the beginning of 9th century AD, it is reasonable to conclude that at the time when the *Saṅghabhedavastu* text was available for Yì-jìng, it was not yet accessible as complete as it appeared in the *Vinayavastu* when Tibetans translated it. It leads to a hypothetical conclusion that the reason why the first accounts on the Mūlasarvastivādins appear only in Yì-jìng's descriptions is that the textual tradition of this school may have been in its early development phase at that time. Although it is certainly too early to draw any conclusions regarding this Dīrghāgama manuscript and it should be investigated further, it could not be entirely wrong to explain the never before read and revised status of this manuscript by the same reason.

Part 3

As it has been mentioned previously in the text critics of the part 2 of the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra, the part in the sūtra where the Śīlaskandha section should start is omitted with a reference to the *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra. Yet, as if after the Śīlaskandha section – the Tathāgata-Predict, the Buddha gives answer to the question asked in the beginning of the sūtra about what is *traividyā* in the Buddhist sense (3.2). The Chinese parallel to the part 1 of the *Piṅgalātreya* discussed earlier had also a verse where the Buddha gives the answer regarding the *traividyā* that seems a rather expanded answer because it does not have a Sanskrit counterpart in the corresponding place in the *Piṅgalātreya*. After examining the Chinese translation, it appears that this Chinese verse is a direct or a strikingly similar translation of the final Sanskrit verse of the *Piṅgalātreya*.

Both verses are displayed and compared here:

pūrvēnivāsaṃ yo vetti svargā (r4) (pā)yāṃś ca paśyati |
atha jātikṣayaṃ prāpto <'>bhijñāvyavasito muniḥ <|>
cittaṃ vimuktaṃ⁵⁹ jānāti muktaṃ rāgeṇa sarvaśaḥ <|>
{ tad } <taṃ > ahaṃ vadāmi traividyaṃ na yo lapitapāvakaḥ |

知一切宿命(zhīyīqièsùmìng) 已生天惡趣(yǐshēngtiānèqù)
得斷生漏盡(déduànshēnglòujìn) 是為牟尼通(shìwéimóunítōng)
悉知心解脫(xīzhīxīnjiětuō) 一切貪恚癡(yīqiètànhuìchī)
我說是三明(wǒshuōshìsānmíng) 非言語所說(fēiyányǔsuǒshuō)

1. line

pūrvēnivāsaṃ yo vetti svargā(r4)(pā)yāṃś ca paśyati |

知一切宿命(zhīyīqièsùmìng) 已生天惡趣(yǐshēngtiānèqù)

Chinese equivalent for *nivāsaṃ* 'existence/habitation' is 宿命 (sùmìng). There is no direct equivalent that would denote *pūrve* ('former') in Chinese, such as, for example, 前 (qián) would be, but the meaning is denoted by 一切 (yīqiè) which means 'all/each'; it can also be understood as a kind of plural sign. As an agent in the Chinese Classical or Buddhist grammar is usually omitted and it should be understood from the context, 知 (zhī) refers to *yo vetti* - 'he who knows'. For *paśyati* - 'he sees' in Chinese 已生 (yǐshēng) 'has been born/has existed, lived' has been chosen. It clearly denotes the meaning, and could thus be considered as an equivalent. 見(jiàn) - 'to see' is in Chinese usually used for concrete things one can see, not for what is meant with *paśyati* which in Sanskrit too implies 'experienced good and bad modes of existence'. While one finds *svargā(r4)(pā)yāṃś* in Sanskrit meaning 'heaven and destruction', the corresponding sign in Chinese 天惡趣 (tiānèqù) has maybe a little bit more precise and less abstract meaning: 'heavenly and destructive modes of existence'. Only the conjunctive particle *ca* ('and') does not have any equivalent in Chinese. Thus, the translation of the first verse line in Sanskrit and in Chinese can be considered as precise.

2. line

atha jātikṣayaṃ prāpto <'>bhijñāvyavasito muniḥ <|>

得斷生漏盡(déduànshēnglòujìn) 是為牟尼通(shìwéimóunítōng)

⁵⁹ In Pāli version - visuddham.

First word in Sanskrit *atha* ‘then’ does not have a counterpart in Chinese. Sanskrit *jātikṣayaṃ* ‘destruction of births’ is denoted exactly by 斷生 (duànshēng) ‘cut off births’; yet, Chinese translation extend ‘the cutting off births’ by 漏盡 (lòujìn) ‘extinction of defilement’ that is another way of describing *nirvāṇa*. Chinese 得 (dé) is a traditional equivalent of Sanskrit *prāpto*. For the next Sanskrit compound *’bhijñāvyavasito* ‘perfected by highest knowledge’ the Chinese five characters must be split up in order to point out comprehensive equivalents. Thus 是為 (shìwéi) ‘he becomes’ would denote *vyavasito* and 通 (tōng) ‘completely free and unhindered functional ability’⁶⁰ – *abhiññā*. It is interesting to note the use of 是(shì) which usually is translated as ‘it’, but here it denotes ‘he’. Chinese 牟尼 (móuní) transcription for Sanskrit *muni* ‘sage’ is frequent in Buddhist texts. Consequently, apart from the extension 漏盡 (lòujìn), the Chinese line is an exact translation of Sanskrit.

3. line

cittaṃ vimuktaṃ jānāti muktaṃ rāgeṇa sarvaśaḥ <|>

悉知心解脫(xīzhīxīnjiětuō) 一切貪恚癡(yīqièānhuìchī)

This line has already been analysed in the textual criticism of part 1.

cittaṃ ‘mind’ – 心(xīn); *vimuktaṃ* ‘liberated’ – 解脫(jiětuō); *jānāti* ‘he knows’ – 悉知(xīzhī) ‘knows well’. Second part of the line shows that the Chinese translation is more specific: while in Sanskrit there is *rāgeṇa sarvaśaḥ* ‘every attachment’, in Chinese it is denoted what kind of ‘attachment’, namely 貪恚癡(tānhuìchī) – *lobha, dveṣa, moha* ‘greed, hatred, delusion’. It is interesting to note that there is *visuddham* ‘purified’ in the Pāli parallel to this line instead of *vimuktaṃ* ‘liberated’ in Sanskrit. *visuddham* is not confirmed by the Chinese translation either, where it is also 解脫(jiětuō) ‘freed’.

4. line

{tad}<taṃ> ahaṃ vadāmi traividyaṃ na yo lapitapāvakaḥ |

我說是三明(wǒshuōshìsānmíng) 非言語所說(fēiyányǔsuǒshuō)

taṃ ‘it’ – 是(shì). Again, as in the 2. line 是(shì) denotes ‘he’; *ahaṃ* ‘I’ – 我; *vadāmi* ‘praise’ – 說; *traividyaṃ* ‘threefold knowledge’ – 三明(sānmíng). The first part of the line is precise.

⁶⁰ *Digital Dictionary of Buddhism*. <http://www.buddhism-dict.net/ddb/>.

Second line as well, since *na* ‘not’ – 非(fēi); *yo* ‘one who/he who’ – 所(suǒ); *lapitapāvakaḥ* ‘one whose speech is pure’ – 言語所說(yányǔsuǒshuō) ‘one whose speech is (mere) words’.

TRANSLITERATION

367recto

- 4 evaṃ mayā .r. +
5 m eka[sm]i .[s]. [m]. y. bhagavāṃ rājagr̥he viharati | veṇu○vane
kalandakanivāpe atha piṃgalātreyā parivrājako yena bhagavāṃs
tenopa[samkrānta] upasaṃkramya bhagavatā + +
6 saṃmukhaṃ saṃmodanīm saṃraṃjanīm vividhāṃ kathāṃ
vyati○sāryaikānte niṣaṇ[ṇ]aḥ ekānta niṣaṇṇaḥ piṃgalātreyā
parivrājako bhagavataḥ puratas tasthā[d ud]ānam
u[d]ā + +
7 ti· ity api traivi[d]yā vrā[h]ma[ṇ]. [i]ty a[p]i .[r]aividyā vrāh.aṇā iti [k]iyatātreyā
vrāhmaṇānāṃ traividyo bhavati iha bho gautama vrāhmaṇo bhagavaty u[p]e[t]o
māt. taḥ [p]it. .. + + +
8 grahaṇyā anākṣipto jātivādena [go]travā[d]. na yāvad āsa[ptam]aṃ mātāmahaṃ
paitāmahaṃ yugam upādāyādhyāpako mantradharas trayāṇāṃ vedā .. [p]āragah ..
+ + + +

367verso

- 1 ṭabhānām sākṣaraprabhedānām itihāsapamcamānām padaśom vyākaro bhirūpo
darśanīyaḥ prāsādikaḥ yadā bho gautama vrāhma[ṇā]nām traividyo bhavati na
khalv ayā[m]ātreyā .. + + + + +
2 trakeṇa na palitaḥ lopitamā[tr]akeṇār[y]e dharmavinaye traividyaṃ prajñāpayāmi
yan nv aham āryeṇa nyāyeṇāryeṇa dharmavinaye traividyaṃ prajñāpayāmi [y].
thā .. thaṃ bhavām gau[t]. .. + + +

- 3 nyāyenārye dharmavina[ye] traividyaṃ .r. jñāpayati iḥātreyā śāstā loka
utpadyate tathāgato rhan samyaksambuddho vidyācaraṇasaṃpanna sugato lokavid
anu .. +
- 4 puruṣadamyasārathiḥ [ś]āstā devamanuṣyāṇāṃ buddho o bhagavāṃ saddharmaṃ
deśayaty ādau kalyāṇaṃ madhye kalyāṇaṃ paryavasāne kalyāṇaṃ svarthaṃ
suvyaṃjanaṃ kevalaṃ paripūrṇaṃ pari .. +
- 5 paryaṃ .ra[h]macaryaṃ prakāśayati | taṃ khalu dharmaṃ śṛoṇoti gr̥hapatir
vā gr̥hapatiputro vā sa taṃ dharmaṃ śrutvā śāstus tṛṣu sthāneṣu viśuddhiṃ
samanveṣate tadyathā lobhadha .[me]
- 6 dveṣadharme mohadharme kiṃ svasty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa loḥbho prahīṇo parijñāto
nirodho vāntīkṛto yena lobhenābhibhūtaḥ paryāttacitto jñātaiva saṃjñātāham a ..
- 7 ti vaded adṛṣṭaiva saṃdraṣṭāham asmīti vade parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayed
yat teṣāṃ syā dīrgharātram arthāya hitāya duḥkhāya āhosvin nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ
sa lobho prahīṇo
- 8 parijñāto nirodhito vāntīkṛto yena lobhenābhibhūtaḥ paryāttacitto jñātaiva
sam* | jñātāham asmīti vaded adṛṣṭaiva saṃdraṣṭāham asmīti vade varān vā
ta[thā]

368recto

- 1 tathā tathā pratipādayet teṣāṃ syā dīrgharā[t]ram arthāya hitāya duḥkhāya
tasyaivaṃ bhavati nāsty āyuṣmataḥ sa lobho prahīṇo parijñāto nirodhito
vāntīkṛto yena lābhinābhibhūtaḥ paryā
- 2 ttacitto jñātaiva saṃjñātāham asmīti vadet adraṣṭaiva sa[m]draṣṭā ham asmīti
vade parād vā tathā tathā pratipādayed yat teṣāṃ syā dīrgharātram arthāya
hitāya
dukhāya tat kasya hetos tathā
- 3 hy asyāyuṣmataḥ kāyasaṃskārā vāk[s]aṃskār[ā] yeṣu aḥlubdhasya yaś ca
kaṃcid eṣā vāyuṣmāṃ dharmaṃ bhāṣate saṃkṣiptena vā vistareṇa vā śānto sya
sa dharmāḥ praṇīto gaṃbhīro
- 4 gaṃbhīrāvabhāso dusparśo duranubodhaḥ atarkyo taḥkāvacaraḥ sūk[ṣ]manipuṇa
paṇḍitavijñavedanīya sa cānenāyuṣmatā na sukaram ājñātuṃ yathāpi tad ekānta

- 5 lu .[dhena] alubdho yam āyusman nāyam āyusmā lubdha o iti yadā cainam
asmiṃ prathame lobhadharme viśuddham samanupaśyaty athainam uttare
samanveṣate dvitīye d[v]eṣadha +
- 6 ṛṭīye mohadharme ki nv asty a[sy]ā .. [ṣm]a[t]a saṃmoho pra^ohīṇo pariñāto
nirodhito vāntīkṛto yena mohenābhibhūtaḥ [pa]ryāttacitto jñātai[v]a
..m[jñā]tā[ha]m as. .. +
- 7 ded adṛṣṭaiva saṃ[d]ra .[t]. ham asmīti vade parān.ā [t]athā pratipā[d]ay[e]d yat
t[e]ṣām syā [d]īrgharātram arthāya hitāya sukhāya āhosvin nāsty asyāyusmataḥ
saṃmoho pra .. + + +
- 8 jñāto nirodhito vāntīkṛto yena mohenābhibhūta[ḥ] paryāttacitto jñātaiva
saṃjñātāham asmīti vaded adṛṣṭaiva saṃdraṣṭāham asmīti va[d]e parā[n] vā
[ta]thā tathā + + +

368verso

- 1 dyat teṣām syād dīrgharātram arthāya hitāya [s]ukhāya āhosvin nāsty
asyāyusmataḥ sa moho prahīṇo pariñāto yena mohe[n]ābhibhūtaḥ paryāttacitto
jñā[t]ai[v]a saṃjñātā h. [m]. .. + +
- 2 ded adraṣṭaiva saṃdra[ṣṭ]ā ham asmīti vad[e] parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayed
yat teṣām syā dī[r]gharātram arthāya hi[tā] .. [d]uḥkh[ā] ..
.. syaivaṃ bhavati nāsty asyāyu[ṣma]ta sa moho prahī ..
- 3 pariñāto nirodhito [v]āntīkṛto yena mohenā^obhi[bh]ū[ta]ḥ paryāttacitto jñātaiva
saṃjñātā ham as.īti vaded adraṣṭaiva saṃdra[ṣṭ]ā ham asmīti vadet
pa[r]ā ..vā tathā ..
- 4 thā pratipādayet teṣām syā dīrgharātram arthāya o hitāya duḥkhāya tat kasya
hetos tesyāyusma ..ḥ kāyasam[skā]rāye [a]mūḍhasya ya[m] ca ki. c. d eṣāyusmān
dharmam +
- 5 ṣate saṃkṣiptena vā vistareṇa vā śānto sya sa o dharmāḥ praṇīto ga[m]bhīro
gambhīrāvabhāso durd[r]śo durarvabodha atarkyo ta[r]kāvacaraḥ sūkṣmanipuṇa
paṇḍi
- 6 ta paṇḍita vijñavedanīya sa cāneyāyusmatā o na sukaram ājñātum yathāpitattad
ekāntamūḍhe[n]a amūḍho yam āyusmā nāyam āyusmā[m] [mū]ḍha iti | ya[dā]
caina

- 7 m asmim tr̥tīye mohadharme viśuddham samanupaśyati athātrākāravat[īm] śrutvā
[n]iveśayati śraddhājātā idam pratisamcaṣṭe samḃādho gr̥hāvāso
raja[sā]m āvāso bhyavakāśam na pravra
- 8 jyā tad idam na sukaram gr̥ṇegāram adhyāvasam ekāntasamkalī[k]ṛtam
yāvajjīvam kevalam paripūrnam pariśuddham pa[r]yavadātam vrahmacaryam
caritum ya .. ham keśāśmaśrv avatārya kāśāyāṇi vastrāṇy ācchādya samyag eva ..

369recto

- 1 .[dh]. yā agārād anagārikām pravrajeyam iti sa idam pratisamkhyāyālpam vā
bhoga skandham prahāya prabhūtam vālpam vājñātiparivarttam prahāya
prabhūtam vā keśāśmaśrv avatārya kāśāyāṇi vastrāṇyācchādya
- 2 [sa]myag eva śraddhayā [a]gārād anagārikām pravraji[t]a [ś]īlavān vihara[t]i
prātimok[ṣ]asa[m]varasamvṛtaḥ ācāragocara[sam]pa[nno ṇu]mātreṣv avadyeṣu
bhayadar[ś]ī samādāya śikṣate śikṣāpadeṣu
- 3 [na prā]ṇātipātam prahāya prāṇātipātāt prativirato o bhavati | nihataḍaḍo
nihataśastra pū[r]vavad vi .. reṇa yathā ṭṛdaḍdisūtre tatrako viśeṣaḥ pūrve
nivāsam yo vetti svargā
- 4 .. yāmśca paśyati | atha jātikṣayam prāpto bhijñā vya o [va]sito muniḥ citam
vimuktam jānāti muktam radeṇa sarvaśaḥ tad aham vadāmi traividyaḥ na yo
[la]pi[t]apāvakaḥ | atha
- 5 .. galātreyaḥ parivrājako bhagavato bhāṣi o tam abhinamdyānumodya
bh[gava]ntikāt prakrāntaḥ ||

RECONSTRUCTION

1. 1(367r4) evam mayā (ś)r(uta)(r5)m ekasmi(n) s(a)m(a)y(e) bhagavām rājagrhe
viharati{ }⁶¹ veṇuvane kalandakanivāpe |

⁶¹ As mentioned in the chapter ‘Punctuation in the *Piṅgalātreya sūtra*’, the interpunctuation signs are applied insufficiently and unsystematically in this manuscript. Therefore, the supply or cancellation of *daḍa* in the reconstruction will not be commented upon.

Thus have I heard: Once the Lord was staying at Rājagṛha in a bamboo grove called 'Squirrel's feeding place'.

Cf. MN I, no. 24, p. 145. 14 – 15

Evam me sutam. Ekam samayaṃ Bhagavā Rājagahe viharati Veḷuvane Kalandakanivāpe.

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c13 – 14

如是我聞。一時。佛住舍衛國祇樹給孤獨園。

1. 2

atha piṅgalātreya<ḥ>⁶² parivrājako yena bhagavāṃs tenopasaṃkrānta<ḥ |>

Then the religious mendicant Piṅgalātreya approached the Lord.

Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 3 – 4

Atha kho Tikaṇṇo brahmaṇo yena Bhagavā ten'upasaṅkami.

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c14

時。有異婆羅門來詣佛所。

1. 3

upasaṃkramaṃ bhagavatā (sārdham) (r6) saṃmukhaṃ saṃmodanīṃ saṃraṃjanīṃ vividhāṃ
kathāṃ vyatisāryaikānte niṣaṇṇaḥ <|>

After approaching him and having engaged in an amiable, delightful and manifold conversation, he sat down to one side, face to face with the Lord.

Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 4 – 5

Upasaṅkamitvā Bhagavantam saddhiṃ sammodi. Sammodanīyaṃ katham sārāṇīyaṃ
vītisāretvā ekamantaṃ nisīdi.

⁶² Regarding the use of *visarga* see the chapter on orthography.

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c15

與世尊面相慰勞。慰勞已 退坐一面。

1. 4

ekāntaniṣaṇṇaḥ piṅgalātreyā<ḥ> parivrājako bhagavataḥ puratas tasthād udānam
udā(naya)(r7)ti |

The religious mendicant Piṅgalātreyā who sat on one side stood up in front of the Lord and made a solemn utterance:

Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 5 – 6

Ekamantaṃ nisinno kho Tikaṇṇo brāhmaṇo Bhagavato sammukhā tevijjānaṃ sudam
brāhmaṇānaṃ vaṇṇaṃ bhāsati:

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c15

而作是說

1. 5

ity api traividyā brāhmaṇ(ā) ity api (t)raividyā brāh(m)aṇā iti <|>

Indeed, knowers of the threefold knowledge are Brahmins! Indeed, knowers of the threefold knowledge are Brahmins!

Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 7

- Evam pi tevijjā brāhmaṇā, iti pi tevijjā brāhmaṇā ti.

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c16

此則婆羅門三明。此則婆羅門三明。

1.6

kiyatātreya brāhmaṇānāṃ traividyo bhavati |

Ātreya, by means of what does one become a knower of the /threefold knowledge among Brahmins?

Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 8 – 9

Yathākathaṃ pana brāhmaṇa brāhmaṇā brāhmaṇaṃ tevijjaṃ paññāpentī ti?

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c16 – 17

爾時。世尊告婆羅門言。云何名為婆羅門三明。

1.7

iha bho gautama brāhmaṇo bha{ga}vaty upeto māt(r)taḥ pit(r)taḥ saṃsuddho) (r8)
grahaṇyā anākṣipto jātivādena gotravād(e)na yāvad āsaptamaṃ mātāmahaṃ paitāmahaṃ
yugam upādāyādhyāpako mantradharas trayāṇāṃ vedā(nāṃ) pāragah
(sanighaṇḍukai)(367v1)ṭabhānām⁶³ sāksaraprabhedānām⁶⁴ itihāsapamcamānāṃ padaśo{ṃ}
vyākaro

Here, sir Gautama, a Brahmin is well born on mother's and father's side, is of completely pure descent, not reproached speaking of his birth- or his family name which extends as far as to the seventh generation of grandmothers and grandfathers; he is a teacher, a holder of mantras, a master of the three Vedas, together with the glossary and the ritual science, together with the phonology, and the legendary lore as the fifth that he explains word by word.

Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 10 – 14

Idha bho Gotama brāhmaṇo ubhato sujāto hoti mātito ca pitato ca saṃsuddhagahaṇiko yāva
sattamā pitāmahāyugā akkhitto anupakkuṭṭho⁶⁵ jātivādena ajjhāyako mantadharo tiṇṇaṃ

⁶³ In MW *nighaṇṭu* “name of a Vedic glossary”; in BHSD also *nighaṇṭu*, but as “etymology”; in PTSD as in the *Piṃgalātreya sūtra nighaṇḍu* “explanation, vocabulary”. In Chinese parallel 物類名字 (wùlèimíngzì) denotes meaning “vocabulary, glossary”.

⁶⁴ In PTSD *akkharapabheda* can also be translated as “etymology”.

⁶⁵ Ph. *anupakuṭṭho*; omitted in *Divyāvadāna*, p. 620. Compare below, 59. 1. (ed.).

vedānaṃ pāragū sanighaṇḍukeṭubhānaṃ sākkharappabhedānaṃ itihāsapañcamānaṃ padako
veyyākaraṇo

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c18 – 21

婆羅門白佛言。瞿曇。婆羅門父母具相。無諸瑕穢。父母七世相承。無諸譏論。世世
相承。常為師長。辯才具足。誦諸經典。物類名字。萬物差品。歷世本末。字類分
合。此五種記。

1.8

'bhirūpo darśanīyaḥ prāsādikaḥ <|>

A Brahmin is of perfect form, handsome and lovely.

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 165. 31

abhirūpo dassanīyo pāsādiko

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c22

悉皆通達。容色端正

1.9

{yadā} <evam>⁶⁶ bho gautama brāhmaṇānām traividyo bhavati <|>

Sir Gautama, thus is for the Brahmins the knower of the threefold knowledge.

Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 15 – 16

Evaṃ kho bho Gotama brāhmaṇā brāhmaṇaṃ tevijjaṃ paññāpentī ti.

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c22

是名。瞿曇。婆羅門三明。

⁶⁶ The beginning of this Sanskrit line was reconstructed according to Pāli parallel as *yadā* did not suit to the context. There is 'I' 我 (wǒ) in Chinese.

1. 10

na khalv{ayām} <aham>⁶⁷ ātreya (uṣṭhaprahatamā)⁶⁸(v2)trakeṇa na {palitaḥ}
<lapita>{lopita}<lāpaṇa>⁶⁹mātrakeṇārye dharmavinaye traividyam prajñāpayāmi yan nv
aham āryeṇa nyāyenārye{ṇa} dharmavinaye traividyam prajñāpayāmi <|>

*Ātreya, indeed neither with a mere lip service, nor with a mere repetition I would declare the
threefold knowledge in the holy Dharmavinaya, but I would declare the threefold knowledge
in the holy Dharmavinaya with the holy method.*

Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 17 – 18

Aññathā kho brāhmaṇa brāhmaṇā brāhmaṇam tevijjam paññāpentī, aññathā ca pana ariyassa
vinaye tevijjo hotī ti.

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c23 – 25

佛告婆羅門。我不以名字言說為三明也。賢聖法間說真要實三明。謂賢聖知見。賢聖
法律真實三明

1. 11

y(a)thā (ka)tham bhavām gaut(amāryeṇa) (v3) nyāyenārye dharmavinaye traividyam
(p)r(a)jñāpayati <|>

*How then, venerable Gautama, can the knower of the threefold knowledge in the holy
Dharmavinaya be declared with the holy method?*

⁶⁷ There is also confusion between *ayam* and *aham* in the SBV II, p. 27.1.

⁶⁸ The end of the line 1 was so damaged that it was not possible to reconstruct until I found a similar place in MN I, no.26, Ariyapariyesana sutta, p.164, line 4 – 5: *So kho aham bhikkhave tāvataken' eva oṭṭhapahatamattena lapitalāpanamattena*. Then could a remainder of damaged *u* be recognized in the manuscript.

⁶⁹ As *palitaḥ lopita* does not have any distinct semantic meaning, this combination of words was also reconstructed according to the Pāli line in footnote 68. Yet, in the reconstruction 3.2 in the last line of the verse which is similar in terms of context, there is *lapitapāvakaḥ* that means “speech that is pure”; *palitaḥ lopita* may thus be also reconstructed as *lapitapāvaka*, since *palitaḥ lopita* can be considered as misreading for both *lapitalāpana* and *lapitapāvaka*.

Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 19 – 21

Yathākathaṃ pana bho Gotama ariyassa vinaye tevijjo hoti. Sādhū me bhavaṃ Gotamo tathā dhammaṃ desetu yathā ariyasse vinaye tevijjo hotī ti.

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c25 – 26

婆羅門白佛。云何。瞿曇。賢聖知見。賢聖法律所說三明。

2. 1

ihātreya śāstā loka utpadyate tathāgato 'rhan samyaksambuddho vidyācaraṇasaṃpanna<ḥ>
sugato lokavid anu(ttara)<ḥ> (v4) puruṣadamyasārathiḥ śāstā devamanuṣyāṇāṃ buddho
bhagavāṃ <|>

Here, Ātreya, a teacher arises in the world – a Tathāgata, an Arahant, a Fully Awakened One, perfect in knowledge and practice, a Wellfarer, a World-knower, an excellent Charioteer of human beings to be tamed, a Teacher of gods and human beings, a Buddha, a Lord.

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 11 – 13

iha mahārāja śāstā loka utpadyate tathāgato 'rhan samyaksambuddhaḥ vidyācaraṇasaṃpannaḥ
sugato lokavid anuttaraḥ puruṣadamyasārathiḥ śāstā devamanuṣyāṇāṃ buddho bhagavān,⁷⁰

Cf. AN III, no. 60, p. 168. 26 – 28

Idha Tathāgato loke uppajjati araham sammāsambuddho vijjācaraṇasaṃpanno sugato
lokavidū anuttaro purisadammasārathi satthā devamanussānaṃ buddho Bhagavā.

2. 2

sa {d}dharmam deśayaty ādau kalyāṇam madhye kalyāṇam paryavasāne kalyāṇam svarthaṃ
suvyaṃjanaṃ kevalam paripūrṇam pari(śuddham) (v5) parya(vadāta)m (b)rahmacaryam
prakāśayati |

⁷⁰ In this formulary the phrase “So imaṃ lokam sadevakam samārakam sabrahmakam sassamaṇabrāhmaṇim pajam sadevamanussam sayam abhiññā sacchikatvā pavedeti”, that usually is a part of description of the Buddha in Pāli texts is omitted in the *Piṅgalātreya* and in SBV.

He teaches the Dharma which is beautiful in the beginning, beautiful in the middle, and beautiful in the end in spirit as well as in letter⁷¹; he reveals the only one, completely purified, spotless way of religious life.

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 14 – 16

sa dharmam deśayati, ādau kalyāṇam, madhye kalyāṇam, paryavasāne kalyāṇam, svartham, suvyañjana, kevalam, paripūrṇam, pariśuddham paryavadātam; brahmacaryam praśāsayati;

Cf. AN III, no. 63, p. 180. 27 – 30

So dhammam deseti ādi kalyāṇam majjhe kalyāṇam pariyosānakalyāṇam sāttham savyañjanaṃ kevalapariṇaṃ pariśuddham brahmacariyaṃ pakāseti.

2. 3

taṃ khalu dharmam śṛṇoti gṛhapatir vā gṛhapatiputro vā <|>

A householder or a householder's son heard this Dharma indeed.

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 16 – 17

taṃ dharmam śṛṇoti gṛhapatir vā gṛhapatiputro vā;

Cf. MN I, no. 51, p. 344. 28 – 29

Taṃ dhammam suṇāti gahapati vā gahapatiputto vā aññatarasmim vā kule paccājāto.

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c26 – 29

婆羅門聞佛所說。

2. 3. 1

sa taṃ dharmam śrutvā śāstus tṛṣu sthāneṣu viśuddhiṃ samanveṣate tadyathā lobhadha(r)me (v6) dveṣadharme mohadharme <|>

⁷¹ This is the traditional translation of *svartham suvyañjanaṃ* in order to express clearly the contrast between *artha* 'meaning' and *vyañjana* 'sign' in the *Dharma*.

After he has heard this Dharma, he examines the teacher's pureness concerning three states, as here follows – the nature of greed, the nature of hatred and the nature of delusion.

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 17 – 19

sa taṃ dharmam śrutvā śāstuḥ triṣu⁷² sthāneṣu viśuddhiṃ samanveṣate, yaduta lobhadharme, dveṣadharme, mohadharme;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 171. 34 – 172. 3

... tīsu dhammesu samannesati, lobhaniyesu dhammesu dosaniyesu dhammesu mohaniyesu dhammesu:

2. 3. 2

kiṃ {sv} <nv> asty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa lobho 'prahīṇo 'parijñāto 'nirodho 'vāntīkṛto yena lobhenābhībhūtaḥ paryāttacitto

Is this greed not overcome, not understood, not suppressed, not rejected by which the venerable's mind is subdued and overwhelmed?

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 19 – 21

kiṃ nv asty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa lobhaḥ aprahīṇaḥ, aparijñātaḥ, anirodhiṭaḥ, avāntīkṛtaḥ, yena lobhenābhībhūtaḥ paryāttacitto

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 3 – 5

Atthi nu kho imass' āyasmato tathārūpā lobhaniyā dhammā yathārūpehi lobhaniyehi dhammehi pariyādinnaṭṭo⁷³

2. 3. 3

'jñātaiva saṃjñātāham a(smī)(v7)ti vaded

⁷² It is not sure if it has not been *trīṣu* in the original which Gnoli has changed without giving a note on that, because there has been *trīṣu* in the SBV I, p. 114. 28 which has been changed to *triṣu*, but there is a note on that.

⁷³ Sk. Bm -ṇṇ- (ed.).

(So that) he would say: “I am a knower”, though indeed he is not;

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 21

’jānaka eva san jānako ’smīti vadet,

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 5

ajānaṃ vā vadeyya jānāmīti,

2. 3. 4

adr̥ṣṭaiva saṃdraṣṭāham asmīti vade<t>

(or) he would say: “I am a seer”, though indeed he is not.

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 21 – 22

apaśyaka eva san paśyako smīti vaded;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 5 – 6

apassaṃ vā vadeyya passāmīti,

2. 3. 5

parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayed yat teṣāṃ syā<d> dīrgharātram <an>arthāya
<a>hitāya duḥkhāya

Or would he thus incite others to misfortune, disadvantage and suffering that may last a long time for them?

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 22 – 23

parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayet, yat teṣāṃ syāt dīrgharātram anarthāya, ahitāya,
duḥkhāya;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 6 – 7

paraṃ vā tathattāya⁷⁴ samādapeyya yaṃ paresaṃ assa dīgharattaṃ ahitāya dukkhāyāti?

2. 3. 6

āhosvīn⁷⁵ nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa lobho 'prahīṇo (v8) 'parijñāto 'nirodhito 'vāntīkṛto
yena lobhenābhibhūtaḥ paryāttacitto

Or is not this greed not overcome, not understood, not suppressed, not rejected by which the venerable's mind is subdued and overwhelmed?

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 23 – 25

ahosvīn nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa lobhaḥ aprahīṇaḥ, aparijñātaḥ, anirodhitāḥ, avāntīkṛtaḥ, yena lobhenābhibhūtaḥ paryāttacittaḥ

2. 3. 7

'jñātaiva saṃ{j}ñātāham asmīti vaded

(So that) he would say: "I am a knower", though indeed he is not;

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 25 – 26

Ajānaka eva san jānako 'smīti vadet,

2. 3. 8

adr̥ṣṭaiva saṃdraṣṭāham asmīti vade<t>

(or) he would say: "I am a seer", though indeed he is not.

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 26

apaśyaka eva san paśyako 'smīti vadet,

⁷⁴ Bm tadatthāya (ed.).

⁷⁵ Pāli version does not use this combination of interrogative particles *kim...āhosvit*.

2. 3. 9

{va}<pa>arān vā tathā (368r1) tathā {tathā} pratipādayet teṣāṃ syā<d> dīrgharātram
<an>arthāya <a>hitāya duḥkhāya

Or would he thus incite others to misfortune, disadvantage and suffering that may last a long time for them?

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 26 – 28

parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayet, yat teṣāṃ syāt dīrgharātram anarthāya, ahitāya,
duḥkhāya;

2. 3. 10

tasyaivaṃ bhavati nāsty āyuṣmataḥ sa lobho 'prahīṇo 'parijñāto 'nirodhito 'vāntīkṛto yena
{lā}<lo>bh{i}<e>nābhibhūtaḥ paryā(r2)ttacitto

Thus indeed is the venerable one's (mind) that there does not exist this greed that is not overcome, not understood, not suppressed, not rejected (and) by which the venerable's mind is subdued and overwhelmed.

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 28 – 30

tasyaivaṃ bhavati: nāsty āyuṣmataḥ sa lobhaḥ aprahīṇaḥ, aparijñātaḥ, anirodhitaḥ,
avāntīkṛtaḥ, yena lobhenābhibhūtaḥ paryāttacittaḥ

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 7 – 10

Tam enam samannesamāno evaṃ jānāti: Na 'tthi kho imass' āyasmato tathārūpā lobhaniyā
dhammā yathārūpehi lobhaniyehi dhammehi pariyādinnaṃ

2. 3. 11

'jñātaiva saṃjñātāham asmīti vade{t}<d>

(So that) he would say: “I am a knower”, though indeed he is not;

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 30

ajānaka eva san jānako ’smīti vadet,

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 10

ajānaṃ vā vadeyya jānāmīti,

2. 3. 12

adraṣṭaiva samdraṣṭāham asmīti vade<t>

(or) he would say: “I am a seer”, though indeed he is not.

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 30 – 31

apaśyaka eva san paśyako ’smīti vadet,

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 10 – 11

apassaṃ vā vadeyya passāmīti,

2. 3. 13

parā{d}<n> vā tathā tathā pratipādayed yat tesāṃ syā<d> dīrgharātram <an>arthāya
<a>hitāya du<ḥ>khāya <l>

Or he would thus incite others to misfortune, disadvantage and suffering that may last a long time for them.

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 31 – 32

parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayet, yat tesāṃ syād dīrgharātram anarthāya, ahitāya, duḥkhāya.

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 11 – 12

paraṃ vā tathattāya samādapeyya yaṃ pasesaṃ assa dīgharattaṃ ahitāya dukkhāyāti.

2. 3. 14

tat kasya hetoḥ <|>

For what reason?

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 32 – 33

tat kasya hetoḥ?

2. 3. 15

{tathā}<te> (r3) hy asyāyūṣmataḥ kāyasaṃskārā vāksaṃskārā {yeṣu}<ye> alubdhasya

Because as is the venerable one's conduct of body, as is his conduct of speech, so it is not that of a greedy one.

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 33 – 231. 1

te hy asyāyūṣmataḥ kāyasaṃskārāḥ, vāksaṃskārāḥ, manaḥsaṃskārāḥ alubdhasya;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 12 – 14

Tathā⁷⁶ kho pan' imass' āyasmato kāyasamācāro, tathā vacīsamācāro, yathā taṃ aluddhassa.

2. 3. 16

ya{ś}<c> ca {kaṃ}<kiṃ>cid eṣ{ā}<a> {v}⁷⁷āyūṣmāṃ dharmāṃ bhāṣate saṃkṣiptena vā vistareṇa vā

And whenever this venerable speaks Dharma in brief or in detail

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 1 – 2

⁷⁶ Bm (bis) tathārūpo (ed.).

⁷⁷ Cancellation made according to the line 2. 3. 34 in the reconstruction as the latter seems to contain right reading.

ayam ca eṣa dharmam bhāṣate saṃkṣiptena vā vistareṇa vā;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 14 – 15

Yam kho pana ayam āyasmā dhammaṃ deseti,

2. 3. 17

sānto 'sya sa dharmah praṇīto gaṃbhīro (r4) gaṃbhīrāvabhāso du<ḥ>sparśo duranubodhaḥ
atarkyo 'tarkāvacaraḥ sūkṣmanipuṇa paṇḍitavijñ{a}<ā> vedanīya<ḥ |>

It is appeasing, excellent, has an appearance of depth and profundity that is difficult to be perceived, difficult to be understood, surpassing thought, beyond logic, perfectly subtle; his (teaching of) this dharma is intelligible to the wise.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 2 – 4

sānto 'sya dharmah, praṇītaḥ, gaṃbhīro, gaṃbhīrāvabhāsaḥ, durdṛśaḥ, duranubodhaḥ,
atarkyaḥ, 'tarkāvacaraḥ sūkṣmanipuṇapaṇḍitavijñavedanīyaḥ;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 15 – 16

gaṃbhīro so dhammo duddaso duranubodho santo paṇīto atakkāvacaro nipuṇo
paṇḍitavedaniyo,⁷⁸

2. 3. 18

sa cānenāyuṣmatā na sukaram ājñātum yathāpi tad ekānta (r5) lu(b)dhana alubdho 'yam
āyuṣ{ma}<mā>n nāyam āyuṣmā<n> lubdha iti <|>

And when it (Dharma) is (taught) by this venerable one, then it is indeed not easy to command it by a greedy one.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 4 – 6

⁷⁸ Si p-īyo. (ed.).

sa cānenāyuṣmatā na sukaram ājñātum, yathāpitad ekāntalubdhena; alubdho 'yam āyuṣmān;
nāyam āyuṣmān lubdhaḥ;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 16 – 17
na so dhammo sudesiyo⁷⁹ luddhenāti.

2. 3. 19

yadā cainam asmiṃ prathame lobhadharme viśuddham samanupaśyaty athainam uttare
samanveṣate dvitīye dveṣadha(rme) (r6) tṛtīye mohadharme <|>

And when he observes that he (the venerable one) is purified regarding the nature of greed as first, then he further examines (him) regarding the nature of hatred as second and the nature of delusion as third.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 6 – 8

yadā cainam asmin prathame lobhadharme viśuddhiṃ samanupaśyaty; athainam uttare
samanveṣate, dvitīye dveṣadharme, tṛtīye mohadharme;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 17 – 19

Yato naṃ samannesamāno visuddhaṃ lobhaniyehi dhammehi samanupassati, tato naṃ
uttariṃ samannesati dosaniyesu dhammesu:

2. 3. 20

ki<ṃ> nv asty asyā(yu)ṣmata<ḥ> sa{ṃ} moho⁸⁰ 'prahīṇo 'parijñāto 'nirodhito 'vāntīkṛto
yena mohenābhibhūtaḥ paryāttacitto

*Is this delusion not overcome, not understood, not suppressed, not rejected by which the
venerable's mind is subdued and overwhelmed?*

⁷⁹ So; Si; Sk sudesā; Bm sudesanīya (ed.).

⁸⁰ The whole section about the *dveṣadharmā* is omitted in the *Piṅgalātreyā* and in SBV, but not in Pāli.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 8 – 10

kiṃ nv asty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa mohaḥ aprahīṇaḥ, aparijñātaḥ, anirodhitāḥ, avāntīkṛtaḥ, yena mohenābhibhūtaḥ, paryāttacittaḥ

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 3 – 5

Atthi nu kho imass' āyasmato tathārūpā mohaniyā dhammā yathārūpehi mohaniyehi dhammehi pariyādinnaṅcitta

2. 3. 21

'jñātaiva (sa)ṃjñātāham as(mīti va)(r7)ded

(So that) he would say: "I am a knower", though indeed he is not;

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 10

ajānaka eva san jānako 'smiti vadet;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 5

ajānaṃ vā vadeyya jānāmīti,

2. 3. 22

adrṣṭaiva saṃdra(ṣ)ṭ(ā)ham asmīti vade<t>

(or) he would say: "I am a seer", though indeed he is not.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 10 – 11

apaśyaka eva san paśyako 'smīti vadet;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 5 – 6

apassaṃ vā vadeyya passāmīti,

2. 3. 23

parān (v)ā tathā pratipādayed yat teṣāṃ syā<d> dīrgharātram <an>arthāya <a>hitāya
{su}⁸¹<duh>khāya

Or would he thus incite others to misfortune, disadvantage and suffering that may last a long time for them?

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 11 – 12

parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayet, yat teṣāṃ syāt dīrgharātram anarthāya, ahitāya, duḥkhāya;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 6 – 7

param vā tathattāya samādapeyya yaṃ paresaṃ assa dīgharattaṃ ahitāya dukkhāyāti?

2. 3. 24

āhosvin⁸² nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa{ṃ} moho 'pra(hīṇo 'pari)(r8)jñāto 'nirodhito 'vāntīkṛto
yena mohenābhibhūtaḥ paryāttacitto

Or is not this delusion not overcome, not understood, not suppressed, not rejected by which the venerable's mind is subdued and overwhelmed?

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 12 – 14

āhosvin nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa mohaḥ aprahīṇaḥ, aparījñātaḥ, anirodhitāḥ, avāntīkṛtaḥ, yena mohenābhibhūtaḥ, paryāttacittaḥ,

2. 3. 25

'jñātaiva saṃjñātāham asmīti vaded

(So that) he would say: "I am a knower", though indeed he is not;

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 14 – 15

ajānakaḥ san jānako 'smīti vadet,

⁸¹ About cancellation of *su* see the chapter on orthography.

⁸² Pāli version does not use this combination of interrogative particles *kim...āhosvit*.

2. 3. 26

adr̥ṣṭaiva sam̐draṣṭāham asmīti vade<t>

(or) he would say: "I am a seer", though indeed he is not.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 15

apaśyaka eva san paśyako 'smīti vadet,

2. 3. 27

parān vā tathā tathā (pratipādaye)(368v1)d yat teṣāṃ syād dīrgharātram <an>arthāya
<a>hitāya {su}<duḥ>khāya

(Or) would he thus incite others to misfortune, disadvantage and suffering that may last a long time for them?

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 15 – 17

parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayet, yat teṣāṃ syāt dīrgharātram anarthāya, ahitāya,
duḥkhāya;

{āhosvin nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa moho 'prahīṇo 'parijñāto yena mohenābhibhūtaḥ
paryāttacitto 'jñātaiva sam̐jñātāh(a)m (asmīti va)(v2)ded adraṣṭaiva sam̐draṣṭāham asmīti
vade<t> parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayed yat teṣāṃ syā<d> dīrgharātram <an>arthāya
<a>hitā(ya) duḥkhā(ya)⁸³

2. 3. 28

⁸³ This is a repetition that does not fit into a pattern used earlier in the text. See more in the chapter on orthography.

ta)syaivaṃ bhavati nāsty asyāyuṣmata<ḥ> sa moho 'prahī(ṇo)
(v3) 'parijñāto 'nirodhito 'vāntīkṛto yena mohenābhibhūtaḥ paryāttacitto

Thus is indeed the venerable one's (mind) that there does not exist this delusion that is not overcome, not understood, not suppressed, not rejected by which the venerable's mind is subdued and overwhelmed.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 17 – 19

tasyaivaṃ bhavati: nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa mohaḥ aprahīṇaḥ, aparijñātaḥ, anirodhitāḥ, avāntīkṛtaḥ, yena mohenābhibhūtaḥ, paryāttacittaḥ,

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 7 – 10

Tam enam samannesamāno evaṃ jānāti: Na 'tthi kho imass' āyasmato tathārūpā mohaniyā dhammā yathārūpehi mohaniyehi dhammehi pariyādinnacitto

2. 3. 29

'jñātaiva saṃjñātāham as(mī)ti vaded

(So that) he would say: "I am a knower", though indeed he is not;

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 19

ajānaka eva san jānako 'smīti vadet,

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 10

ajānaṃ vā vadeyya jānāmīti,

2. 3. 30

adraṣṭaiva saṃdraṣṭāham asmīti vadet

(or) he would say: "I am a seer", though indeed he is not.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 19 – 20
apaśyaka eva san paśyako 'smīti vadet;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 10 – 11
apassaṃ vā vadeyya passāmīti,

2. 3. 31

parā(n) vā tathā (ta)(v4)thā pratipādayet teṣāṃ syā<d> dīrgharātram <an>arthāya <a>hitāya
duḥkhāya <|>

Or he would thus incite others to misfortune, disadvantage and suffering that may last a long time for them.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 20 – 21

parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayet, yat teṣāṃ syāt dīrgharātram anarthāya, ahitāya, duḥkhāya;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 11 – 12

paraṃ vā tathattāya samādapeyya yaṃ paresaṃ assa dīgharattaṃ ahitāya dukkhāyāti.

2. 3. 32

tat kasya hetoḥ <|>

For what reason?

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 22

tat kasya hetoḥ?

2. 3. 33

te <hy a>syāyuṣma(ta)ḥ kāyasaṃskārā <vāksaṃskārā> ye amūḍhasya <|>

Because as the venerable one's conduct of body is, as his conduct of speech is, so it is not that of a delusional one.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 22 – 23

te hy asyāyusmataḥ kāyasaṃskārāḥ, vāksaṃskārāḥ, manaḥsaṃskārāḥ amūdhasya;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 12 – 14

Tathā⁸⁴ kho pan' imass' āyasmato kāyasamācāro, tathā⁸⁵ vacīsamācāro, yathā taṃ amūlhasa.

2. 3. 34

ya{m}<c> ca ki(m)c(i)d eṣa āyusmān dharmam (bhā)(v5)ṣate saṃkṣiptena vā vistareṇa vā

And whenever this venerable speaks Dharma in brief or in detail

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 23 – 24

ayam caiṣa dharmam bhāṣate saṃkṣiptena vā vistareṇa vā;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 14 – 15

Yaṃ kho pana ayam āyasmā dhammaṃ deseti,

2. 3. 35

śānto 'sya sa dharmah praṇīto gambhīro gambhīrāvabhāso durdṛṣo dura{rva}<nu>bodha
atarkyo 'tarkāvacaraḥ sūkṣmanipuṇa paṇḍi(v6)ta{paṇḍita} vijñ{a}<ā> vedanīya<ḥ>

It is appeasing, excellent, has an appearance of depth and profundity that is difficult to be perceived, difficult to be understood, surpassing thought, beyond logic, perfectly subtle; his (teaching of) this dharma is intelligible to the wise.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 24 – 26

⁸⁴ Bm tathārūpo (ed.).

⁸⁵ Sk omits ; Bm tathārūpo (ed.).

śānto 'sya dharmah praṇītaḥ, gambhīraḥ, gambhīrāvabhāsaḥ, durdṛśo, duranubodhaḥ,
atarkyaḥ, atarkāvacaraḥ, sūkṣmanipuṇapaṇḍitavijñavedanīyaḥ;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 15 – 16

gambhīro so dhammo duddaso duranubodho santo paṇīto atakkāvacaro nipuṇo
paṇḍitavedaniyo,

2. 3. 36

sa cānenāyusmatā na sukaram ājñātum yathāpita{tta}d ekāntamūḍhena amūḍho 'yam
āyusmā<n> nāyam āyusmāṃ mūḍha iti |

*And when it (Dharma) is (taught) by this venerable one, then it is indeed not easy to command
it by a delusional one.*

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 26 – 28

sa cānena āyusmatā na sukaram ājñātum, yathāpitad ekāntamūḍhena; amūḍho 'yam
āyusmān; nāyam āyusmān mūḍhaḥ;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 16 – 17

na so dhammo sudesiyo mūḍhenāti.

2. 3. 37

yadā caina(v7)m asmiṃ tṛtīye mohadharme viśuddh{a}<i>ṃ samanupaśyati athātra
ākāravatīṃ {śrutvā}<śraddhāṃ> niveśayati <|>

*And when he observes that he (the venerable one) is purified regarding the nature of delusion
as third, then he in this way reposes faith in all aspects there (in the teacher).*

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 28 – 30

yadā cainam asmiṃ tṛtīye mohadharme viśuddhiṃ samanupaśyati; athātra ākāravatīṃ
śraddhāṃ abhinivedayati;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 17 – 19

Yato naṃ samannesamāno visuddhaṃ⁸⁶ mohaniyehi dhammehi samanupassati, atha tamhi saddhaṃ niveseti,

2. 3. 38

śraddhājātā idaṃ pratisaṃcaṣṭe <|>

In this way, it is said that faith is born.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 30

śraddhājātāḥ idaṃ pratisaṃśikṣate:

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 19

saddhājāto upasaṅkamanto...

2. 4

saṃbādho gṛhāvāso rajasām āvāso 'bhyavakāśaṃ {na} <ca> pravra(v8)jyā <|>

The householder's life is confined and dark, and mendicant's life is an open space.

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 30 – 31

saṃbādho gṛhāvāsaḥ, rajasām āvāsaḥ; abhyavakāśaṃ ca pravrajyā;

Cf. MN I, no. 27, p. 179. 13– 14

Sambādho gharāvāso rajāpatho, abbhokāso pabbajjā,

2. 5

⁸⁶ Sk adds lobhaniyehi dhammehi visuddhaṃ dosaniyehi dhammehi visuddhaṃ (ed.).

tad idaṃ na sukaraṃ gṛ{ṇe}<hiṇā> 'gāraṃ adhyāvasa{ṃ}<tā>
ekānta{śaṃkalīkṛtaṃ}<śaṅkhalikhitaṃ>⁸⁷ yāvajjīvaṃ kevalaṃ paripūrṇaṃ pariśuddhaṃ
paryavadātaṃ brahmacaryaṃ caritaṃ <|>

*It is not easy for one who possesses a house to practice the holy life entirely fulfilled and
entirely pure, perfect like a conch-shell.*⁸⁸

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 31 – 232. 2

tad idaṃ na sukaraṃ gṛhiṇā agāraṃ adhyāvasatā ekāntaśaṅkhalikhitaṃ, yāvajjīvaṃ, kevalaṃ,
paripūrṇaṃ, pariśuddhaṃ, paryavadātaṃ, brahmacaryaṃ caritaṃ;

Cf. MN I, no. 27, p. 179. 14 – 16

na-y-idaṃ sukaraṃ agāraṃ ajjhāvasatā ekantaparipuṇṇaṃ ekantapariśuddhaṃ
śaṅkhalikhitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ caritaṃ,

2. 6

ya(n nv a)haṃ keśaśmaśrv avatārya kāśāyāṇi vastrāṇy ācchādya samyag eva
śra(369r1)(d)dh(a)yā agārād anagārikāṃ pravrajeyam iti <|>

*But, having cut off hair and beard, having put on a yellow robe, I should go forth from home
to homelessness in harmony with complete faith.*

Cf. SBV II, p. 232. 2 – 3

yannv ahaṃ keśaśmaśrūṇy avatārya, kāśāyāṇi vastrāṇy ācchādya, samyag eva śraddhayā
agārād anagārikāṃ pravrajeyam;

Cf. MN I, no. 27, p. 179. 16 – 18

Yan - nūnāhaṃ kesamassuṃ ohāretvā kāśāyāṇi vatthāṇi acchādetvā agārasmā anagāriyaṃ
pabbajeyyanti.

⁸⁷ There has been *ekāntaśaṅkhālīkṛtaṃ* in the manuscript of SBV II which has been changed by Gnoli to the
right form *ekāntaśaṅkhalikhitaṃ*, see footnote 2, p. 231.

⁸⁸ In MW “perfect in its kind, faultless”. P. V. Bapat analyses and describes all possible meanings of
śaṅkhalikhita (Bapat 1942).

2.7

sa idam pratisaṅkhyāyālpam vā bhogaskandham prahāya prabhūtam vālpam vā
jñātiparivarttam prahāya prabhūtam vā keśasmasrūny avatārya kāsāyāṇi vastrāṇy ācchādya (r2)
samyag eva śraddhayā agārād anagārikām pravrajita <|>

Thus having reflected, he goes forth from home to homelessness with complete faith after getting rid of wealth, be it small or great, after getting rid of the circle of relations, be it small or great, having cut off hair and beard, (and) having put on a yellow robe.

Cf. SBV II, p. 232. 3 – 7

sa idam pratisaṅkhyāya prabhūtam vā alpam vā dhanaskandham prahāya, prabhūtam vā alpam
vā jñātiparivartitam prahāya, keśasmasrūṇy avatārya, kāsāyāṇi vastrāṇy ācchādya, samyag
eva śraddhayā agārād anagārikām pravrajati;

Cf. MN I, no. 27, p. 179. 18 – 22

so aparena समयena appaṁ vā bhogakkhandhaṁ pahāya mahantaṁ vā bhogakkhandhaṁ
pahāya, appaṁ vā nātiparivaṭṭaṁ pahāya mahantaṁ vā nātiparivaṭṭaṁ pahāya kesamassuṁ
ohāretvā kāsāyāṇi vatthāṇi acchādetvā agārasmā anagāriyaṁ pabbajati.

2.8

śīlavān viharati prātimokṣasaṁvarasaṁvṛtaḥ ācāragocarasampanno 'ṇumātreṣv avadyeṣu
bhayadarśī samādāya śikṣate śikṣāpadeṣu <|>

He lives possessed with a good disposition, occupied with observing restraint, perfect in conduct and personal associations,⁸⁹ seeing peril in the slightest faults, training in the rules of moral commandments after making (faults).

Cf. SBV II, p. 232. 7 – 9

sa evam pravrajitaḥ san śīlavān viharati, prātimokṣasaṁvarasaṁvṛtaḥ, ācāragocarasampannaḥ,
aṇumātreṣv avadyeṣu bhayadarśī, samādāpayati, śikṣate śikṣāpadeṣu;

⁸⁹ Translation for *ācāragocara* from BHSD.

Cf. MN III, no. 107, p. 2. 7 – 9

... pātimokkhasamvarasamvuto viharāhi ācāragocarasampanno, aṇumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvī samādāya sikkhassu sikkhāpadesūti.⁹⁰

2. 9

(r3){na} <sa> prāṇātipātam prahāya prāṇātipātāt prativirato bhavati⁹¹ |

After he has rejected to take life, he is abstaining from taking of life.

Cf. SBV II, p. 232. 9 – 10

sa prāṇātipātam prahāya, prāṇātipātāt prativirato bhavati;

Cf. MN III, no. 112, p. 33. 20 – 21

... pāṇātipātam prahāya pāṇātipātā paṭivirato ahoṣim...

3. 1

nihatadaṇḍo nihataśāstra pūrvavad vi(sta)reṇa yathā tṛdaṇḍisūtre <|> tatr{a}<ai>ko viśeṣaḥ <|>

The stick laid aside, the knife laid aside, as previously in detail in the Tṛdaṇḍisūtra; there is one difference.

Cf. SBV II, p. 232. 10 – 11

nyastadaṇḍaḥ, nyastaśāstraḥ...⁹²

3. 2

pūrvenivāsam yo vetti svargā (r4) (pā)yāmś ca paśyati |
atha jātikṣayaṃ prāpto <'>bhijñāvyavasito munīḥ <|>

⁹⁰ So Si ; Sy sikkhāpadehīti ; Sk sikkhāpadādehīti (ed.).

⁹¹ Here only one of several skills concerning taming of sense-organs that are presented in the *Gaṇakamoggallānasutta* is mentioned.

⁹² Here ends the agreement between Sanskrit of SBV and *the Piṅgalātreyā*.

cittam vimuktaṃ⁹³ jānāti muktaṃ rāgeṇa sarvaśaḥ <|>
{ tad } < tam > ahaṃ vadāmi traividyam na yo lapitapāvakaḥ |

*He who knows his former habitation(s) sees also heaven and destruction,
has attained destruction of births, is perfected by highest knowledge, a sage,
He knows that his mind is liberated, freed from every attachment.
I praise one who (possesses) this threefold knowledge, not the one whose speech is
pure.*

Cf. MN II, no. 91, p. 144. 19 – 21
Pubbenivāsaṃ yo vedī⁹⁴ saggāpāyaṃ ca passati,
Atha jātikkhayaṃ patto, abhiññā vosito muni.⁹⁵
Cittam visuddham jānāti muttam rāgehi sabbaso

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 224a1 – 6
爾時。世尊即說偈言
一切法無常 持戒寂靜禪
知一切宿命 已生天惡趣
得斷生漏盡 是為牟尼通
悉知心解脫 一切貪恚癡
我說是三明 非言語所說⁹⁶

3.3

atha (r5) (piṃ)galātreyāḥ parivrājako bhagavato bhāṣitam abhinaṃdyānumodya
bhagavato 'ntikāt prakrāntaḥ ||

*Then the mendicant Piṃglātreyā, pleased, saluted in front of the Lord to the speech of the
Lord and left.*

⁹³ In Pāli version *visuddham*.

⁹⁴ So Bm ; Sk (her&in no.98) Sī vedī (ed.).

⁹⁵ f. no.98, S. N. p. 423 (ed.).

⁹⁶ This is not an exact parallell to Sanskrit verse, but expresses the meaning of *traividyā* in Buddhist sense: T 2, no. 99, 223c26 – 29 佛告婆羅門。有三種無學三明。何等為三。謂無學宿命智證明。無學生死智證明。無學漏盡智證明。如上經廣說。

CONCLUSION

The study of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra has rather lead to questions than conclusions. Besides, the research work on the Dīrghāgama collection would unlikely benefit from drawing any certain conclusions before the material from study of each and every sūtra is available. On the contrary, the reflection over challenges, assumptions, and not least, unanswerable questions can at this stage point to the directions and indicate subject matters for further investigation. Therefore, in the conclusion I would like to bring forward some of my concerns involved in and caused by the examination of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra.

What at the first glance seemed to be a sūtra consisting of three separate parts with no mutual connection, after a thorough examination has showed itself to be a sūtra with a comprehensive inner structure and with a strong train of thought that pervades the whole sūtra and is not interrupted by the Tathāgata-Predict or more concretely, the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict. On the contrary, the sūtra achieves its conceptual development through the ‘longer version’ of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict. The concept of *traividya* in the Brahmanic sense is transformed into the Buddhist *traividya*. However, owing the parallel text piece from the *Caṅkī* sutta to the corresponding text fragment in the *Piṃgalātreya*, any certainty about the ‘longer version’ as a part of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict decreases, as the analogue text passage in the *Caṅkī* sutta is not a part of the Tathāgata-Predict and the sutta does not contain it at all. What is this ‘longer version’, and what function does it serve? Can it be a device used for conceptual transformation as it seems to be in the *Piṃgalātreya*’s case? Why is it not found in the Chinese translations and is not a part of the Tathāgata-Predict in the Pāli suttas? Can the connection be drawn to the comparatively late appearance of historical evidence of the Mūlasarvāstivādins and, consequently, also alternative uses of available text material, since the ‘longer version’ occurs as a part of the Tathāgata-Predict only in the *Saṅghabhedavastu* and in the present manuscript of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra? Moreover, what about the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra itself of which nothing was heard until the find of this Dīrghāgama collection? In order to answer these questions the key word could possibly be ‘text family’. While determining thematically related texts and considering their peculiar features, such as, for example, taking into account text collections they belong to, as well as omissions, it would perhaps be possible to deduce some historical relations among them, too. It has been mentioned in the theory chapter that omissions, in

particular, provide the surest test of affinity. It has showed to be the case regarding the examination of *dveṣa* in the chapter on text critics. By collating all available similar fragments containing the text passage in concern, two fragments appeared to be deviant from those containing omission. Thus affinity between the tested sūtras in the Dīrghāgama manuscript and the *Saṅghabhedavastu* could be established.

The next step in inquiry into the ‘text family’ could be carried out by taking a closer look at the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama collection where the parallel text passage to the *Piṅgalātreya* sūtra was found. It is possible that the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama could shed light on other unknown sūtras in the Dīrghāgama manuscript, since this Chinese text collection is considered to be either of the Sarvāstivādins or the Mūlasarvāstivādins. It may also be beneficial to reconsider the issue of the place of origin for the source text of the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama in case additional unknown sūtras from the Dīrghāgama would happen to have similar text passages in this collection, since the settlement for the Sarvāstivādins or the Mūlasarvāstivādins in Sri Lanka in the 5th century AD seems rather accidental.

Speaking about Chinese translations, the translation of the *Saṅghabhedavastu* by Yì-jìng should be mentioned since the *Saṅghabhedavastu* can in many ways be connected to the Dīrghāgama as one of the closest kindred works from Buddhist literature. The reason why Tibetans chose to translate exactly the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins may be that this *Vinaya* must have somehow distinguished itself around the 7th and the 8th century AD. It is otherwise hard to explain why no other translator but Yì-jìng spotted the same *Vinaya* and translated it almost at the same time – in the end the the 7th century AD. The Buddhist University of Nālandā is said to be a very old and famous university and it might have been a question of prestige to have the scriptures of one’s tradition read there. As mentioned in the chapter on challenges in trying to place the *Piṅgalātreya* in Buddhist historical context, Frauwallner has suggested that the *Vinaya* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins can be considered as old as being recited in Mathurā. In this connection the question of why nobody did recognize and translate this *Vinaya* before the 7th century AD raises. Another aspect not easy to explain is why Yì-jìng’s translation differs so considerably from the Tibetan translation. Why does the Tibetan translation contain the ‘longer version’ of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict, while it is omitted in the Yì-jìng’s translation? Yì-jìng was at Nālandā eleven years. One could expect him to produce rather reliable translations after such a long period of learning language. The explanation of the remarkable differences may be that the exemplar that Yì-jìng’s translation was based on was different from the one Tibetans had at hand one century

after. Although it is not possible to prove or further investigate now, at the present study, the assumption that may be considered to be at odds with earlier research done on the problematics of the Mūlasarvāstivāda, but I would like to argue that the textual tradition of the Mūlasarvāstivādins was in its early phase of development in the middle of the 7th century AD. My assumption is also based on the supposition introduced by Gudrun Melzer that this Dīrghāgama manuscript appears to be never before read and revised. It is, however, also possible to interpret the unfinished appearance of the manuscript as being in a formative phase where not everything is settled. To put forward a few examples of problematics discussed in the chapter of text critics: There are some sūtras which do not begin with the traditional formulary *evaṃ mayā śrutam*; although the *Tridaṇḍi* sūtra, as showed by Kazunobu Matsuda, has the status of being more famous and is, indeed, placed as the first sūtra in the Śīlaskandha section, the sūtra containing the complete Tathāgata-Predict is the *Lauhitya* sūtra. Moreover, the manuscript, according to kind of errors it contains, does not appear to be the original exemplar of this Dīrghāgama collection, but a copy. As showed in the chapter on orthography of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra, it comprises errors which can be a result of copying, and errors which seem to be of oral-aural nature. It implies that the present Dīrghāgama manuscript is at least second or third, if not even later, in the line of successive copies. The question that arises in this connection is why it was copied so hastily before it was revised and before the collection acquired a completed status. It is probably one of those questions which the gap in time makes almost unanswerable. The same applies to the question about the purpose with this manuscript.

Nevertheless, enquiries into kindred issues, not the least from different angles and perspectives, can in many cases lead to quite close answers. One of such issues for further study based on peculiar features of compositional structure of the Śīlaskandha section in view of text collections containing parallel fragments to the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra could be an investigation of following question: Is there any consistency in and consensus about criteria for calling a text collection ‘the Dīrghāgama’? Can one assume that a monastic community possessing a text collection called ‘Dīrghāgama’ could expect to be more highly regarded in its contemporary Buddhist milieu than the ones not possessing it? In such a case one can expect to find text collections called ‘Dīrghāgama’ of various length and contents in different historical settings. If, on the contrary, there might have existed common criteria for naming a text collection ‘Dīrghāgama’ like, for example, a text’s considerable length, the answer to the question why the Dīrghāgama which the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra is a part of contain several rather

short texts which are expanded by annexation of the Tathāgata-Predict may show itself to be an intriguing challenge. Moreover, if additional texts from the Śīlasakandha section could appear in the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama in their original form without the Tathāgata-Predict being yet added, as the Chinese sūtra number 886 which seems to be a translation of a Sanskrit original very close to the first part of the *Piṃgalātreya*, could it confirm the assumption that the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins formed the Dīrghāgama collection using the sūtras they actually possessed, not regarding their length? That would explain the fact that their Dīrghāgama encompasses sūtras which, according to the Pāli scriptures, can be placed within the Numerical and Middle Length Discourses and other sūtras like the *Piṃgalātreya* of which we hear for the first time from this manuscript.

The above mentioned questions and assumptions have risen while studying the structure of the *Piṃgalātreya* and the parallel text fragments of the sūtras in other Buddhist text collections. They are as well based on the difficulty of placing the *Piṃgalātreya* in a larger context because of the uncertainty regarding the Mūlasarvāstivādins.

The present study can be regarded as a contribution to a basic work that is needed to be done in order to gradually create a more clear and complete picture of what the Dīrghāgama of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins is. Not the least, this kind of study can also elucidate the obscure aspects of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins themselves. The examination of the *Piṃgalātreya* sūtra has showed to be beneficial for setting premises and pointing directions for further research on the Dīrghāgama manuscript.

APPENDIX

The Tibetan text is corrected only in places where mistakes interrupt with the meaning. There seems, however, to be certain conventions appropriated to the writing mode as, for example, a constant use of *rtog* instead of *brtog* or *gzhan* for *bzhan*. These cases are left as they are.

Vol. 42, p. 126, folios 246b:5 – 248a:7 occur

246b:6 rgyal 246b:7 po ce<n po> ‘di la ston ba / de bzhin gshegs pa dgra bcom pa yang dag
par rdzogs pa’i sangs rgyas rig pa dang zhabs su ldan pa / bde bar gshegs ba / ‘jig rten
mkhyen ba skyes bu ‘dul ba’i kha lo sgyur ba bla na med pa / lha dang mi rnams kyi ston pa /
246b:8 sangs rgyas bcom ldan ‘das ‘jig rten du byung ste / des chos bshad pa ni / thog mar
dge ba bar du dge ba / tha mar dge ba / don bzang po chig ‘bru bzang po / ma ‘dres pa yongs
su rdzogs pa yongs su dag pa / nram par byang ba / tshangs 247a:1 par spyod pa rab tu ston te
/ chos de khyim bdag gam / khyim bdag gi bus mnyan te / de chos de thos nas gnas gsum bo
‘di lta ste / chags pa’i chos dang / zhe sdang gi chos dang / gti mug gi chos la ston pa’i /
247a:2 nram par dag pa chol bar byed de/ ci tshe dang ldan pa ‘di la / chags pa gang gis zil
gyis {gno na}<gnon> cing sems la khyab na mi shes ba bzhin ni kho nar shes so zhes smra /
ma mthong bzhin kho nar mthong ngo // zhes smra zhing bzhan dag la yang gang de dag la /
yun ring 247a:3 por gnod pa dang / phan pa ma yin pa dang / sdug bsngal par ‘gyur ba de lta
de ltar ston pa’i chags pa ma spangs pa dang / yongs su ma shes pa dang / ma bkag pa dang /
ma gsal ba’i chags pa de yod dam / ‘on te tshe dang ldan pa ‘di la 247a:4 chags pa gang gis zil
gyis non cing sems la khyab na mi shes <ba> bzhin kho nar shes so zhes smra / ma mthong
bzhin kho nar mthong ngo zhes smra zhing bzhan dag la yang gang de dag la yun ring por
gnod pa dang / phan pa ma yin ba dang / sdug bsngal par ‘gyur ba 247a:5 de lta de ltar ston
pa’i chags pa ma spangs pa dang / yongs su ma shes pa dang / ma bkab(g) pa dang / ma gsal
ba’i chags pa de med snyam na / de ‘di snyam du sems te /tshe dang ldan pa ‘di la chags pa
gang gis zil gyis non cing / sems la khyab 247a:6 na mi shes bzhin kho nar shes so zhes smra /
ma mthong bzhin kho nar mthong ngo zhes smra zhing bzhan dag la yang gang de dag la yun
ring por gnod pa dang / phan pa {gad} <ma> yin ba dang / sdug bsngal bar ‘gyur ba de lta de
ltar ston pa’i chags pa ma spangs pa dang / 247a:7 yongs su ma shes pa dang / ma bkabg pa
dang / ma gsal ba’i chags pa de med de // de ci’i phyir zhen / ma chags pa’i lus kyi ‘du byed
dang / ngag ga <gi>‘du byed dang / yin kyi ‘du byed gang dag yin pa de ngag tshe dang ldan
pa ‘di la yod la / ‘di chos 247a:8 gang mdor sdus pa’am / rgyas par ‘chad kyang rung ‘di’i

chos ni zhi ba / gya nom pa / zab pa zab par snang ba / mthong bar dka' ba / rtog par dga' ba /
 rtog par bya ba ma yin pa / rtog ge'i sbyod yul ma yin pa / zhib mo rtags pa'i 247b:1 mkhas
 pa dang 'dzangs pas rig par bya ba yin na / de yang 'di ltar tshe dang ldan pa 'di cig tu chags
 pas shes par sla ba ma yin pas tshe dang ldan pa 'di ma chags pa yin te / tshe dang ldan pa'i
 'di ni chags pa ma yin no snyam mo // gang gi tshe 'di dang po chags 247b:2 pa'i chos la
 rnam par dag par mthong nas de'i 'og tu gnyis pa zhe sdang gi chos dang / gsum pa gti mug gi
 chos la chol bar byed de / ci tshe dang ldan pa 'di la gti mug gang gis zil gyi non cing sems la
 khyab na mi shes ba zhin kho nar shes so // zhes smra / ma 247b:3 mthong bzhin kho nar
 mthong ngo // zhes smra zhing bzhan dag la yang gang de dag la yun ring por gnod pa dang /
 phan pa ma yin pa dang / sdug bsngal bar 'gyur ba de lta de ltar ston pa'i gti mug ma spangs
 pa dang / yongs su ma shes pa dang / ma bkag pa dang / 247b4 bsal pa'i gti mug de yod dam /
 'on te tshe dang ldan pa 'di la gti mug gang {gang} gis zil gyi non cing sems la khyab na mi
 shes <ba> bzhin kho nar shes so zhes smra / ma mthong bzhin kho nar mthong ngo zhes smra
 zhing bzhan dag la yang gang de dag 247b:5 {ma}<la> yun ring por gnod pa dang / phan pa
 ma yin pa dang / sdug bsngal bar gyur pa de lta de ltar ston pa'i gti mug ma spangs pa dang /
 yongs su ma shes pa dang / ma bkag pa dang / ma bsal ba'i gti mug de med snyam na / de 'di
 snyam 247b:6 du sems te / tshe dang ldan pa 'di gti mug gang gis zil gyis non cing sems la
 khab na mi shes bzhing kho nar shes so zhes smra / ma mthong bzhin kho nar mthong ngo
 zhes smra zhing gzhan dag la yang gang dag ? de dag la yun ring por gnod pa dang / phan
 247b:7 pa ma yin pa dang / sdug bsngal bar 'gyur ba gal te de ltar ston pa'i gti mug spangs pa
 dang / yongs su ma shes pa dang / ma bkag pa dang / ma bsal ba'i gti mug de med da do // de
 ci'i phyir zhen / gti mug med pa'i lus kyi 'du byed dang / 247b:8 ngag ga <gi> 'du byed dang
 / yid kyi 'du byed gang dag yin pa de ngag/dag tshe dang ldan pa 'di la yod la / 'di chos gang
 mdor sdus pa 'am / rgyas par 'chad kyang rung // 'di'i chos ni zhi pa / gya nom pa / zab ba
 zab par snang ba / mthong bar dka' ba 248a:1 rtog(s) par dka' ba / rtog bar bya ba ma yin pa /
 rtog ge'i spyod yul ma yin pa / zhib mo rtag<s la> pa'i mkhas pa dang / (m)dzangs pas rig par
 bya ba yin na / de yang 'di ltar tshe dang ldan pa 'di 248a:2 gcig {bu}<tu> gti mug pas ni
 shes par sla ba ma yin bas tshe dang ldan pa 'di gti mug ba ma yin te / tshe dang ldan pa 'di ni
 gti mug med pa yin no snyom mo // gang gi tshe 'di <dang po> gsum pa gti mug gi chos la
 rnam par dag par mthong nas de'i 'og tu 'di la rnam 248a:3 pa dad ldan ba'i dang ba skyed
 bar byed do // dad ba skyes nas 'di ltar slob par byed de / khyim na gnas ba ni gnod pa can
 dang / dur khrod na gnas pa yin la / rab tu byung ba ni mngon par skabs yod ba yin te / khyim
 pa khyim na gnas pas ni ji srid 'tsho'i 248a:4 bar du gcig tu las gyis dag par tshangs par spyod

pa yongs su rdzogs pa / yongs su dag pa rnam par byang ba ' ba' zhig po 'di la spyod par sla
ba ma yin pa sma la bdag skra dang kha spu bregs te gos ngur smrig ba gos nas dang ba yang
dag pa kho nas khyim 248a:5 nas khyim med par rab tu 'gyur bar bya'o snyam ste / des de ltar
thag bcad nas nor gyi tshogs mang bo 'am / nyung ngu spangs te nye du'i 'khor mang po 'am
nyu ngu spangs des skra dang kha spu gregs te gos ngur smrig ba gos nas dang pa yang dag pa
kho nas khyim nas khyim med bar 248a:6 rab tu byung ngo / de de ba ni na ngu/du rab tu
byung nas de tshul khriims dang ldan ba la gnas pa yin / so sor thar pa'i sdom pas bsdams pa
yin / spyod pa dang / spyod yul phun sum tshogs pa yin / kha na ma tho ba / phra mo la 'jigs
par lta ba yin / bslab pa'i 248a:7 gzhi rnams blangs te la slob pa yin no / de srog {b}<g>cod
ba spangs nas srog {b}<g>cod pa las slar log pa yin te / chad pa spangs pa yin / mtshon cha
spangs pa yin /

363b

Handwritten text on a palm leaf manuscript strip, oriented vertically. The text is densely packed and appears to be in an ancient script, possibly Tamil or Grantha. The leaf shows signs of age and wear, with some fraying at the edges.

367a

Handwritten text on a palm leaf manuscript strip, oriented vertically. The text is densely packed and appears to be in an ancient script, possibly Tamil or Grantha. The leaf shows signs of age and wear, with some fraying at the edges.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bapat, P. V.: “Sankha-Likhita Brahmachariya. Its Pali interpretation confirmed in Chinese texts” in *Annals of the Bhandarkar Orient Research Institute*, vol. 23, pp. 61 – 66, 1942.

Bareau, André: *Les Sectes Bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule*, École Française d’Extrême-Orient, Paris, 1955.

Bechert, Heinz: *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, Teil 1 und 2, (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III, 1), Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, 1985.

Bechert, Heinz: “Notes on the Formation of Buddhist Sects and the Origins of Mahāyāna” in Paul Williams (ed.): *Buddhism. Critical Concepts in Religious Studies*, vol. 2, Routledge, Taylor&Francis Group, London, 2005.

Boucher, Daniel: “Review of the Schøyen Collection vol I”, in *Indo-Iranian Journal*, vol. 45, pp. 245 – 259, 2002.

Brekke, Torkel: “The Caṃgīsūtra of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins” in *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, vol. I, pp. 53 – 62, 2000.

Chalmers, Robert (ed.): *Majjima-Nikāya*, vol I, II, III, Oxford University Press, London, 1896–98.

Cousins, Lance S.: “The ‘Five Points’ and the Origins of the Buddhist Schools” in Paul Williams (ed.): *Buddhism. Critical Concepts in Religious Studies*, vol. 2, Routledge, Taylor&Francis Group, London, 2005.

Crieger, Oliver: *Das Kūṭatāṇḍasūtra*, (unpublished MA Thesis, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München), 2002.

Dietz, Siglinde: “The Language of the Turfan and Gilgit Buddhist Sanskrit Texts” in *Studien zur Indologi und Buddhismuskunde. Festgabe des Seminars für Indologi und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert*, Indica et Tibetica Verlag, Bonn, 1993.

Edgerton, Franklin: *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary. Grammar and Dictionary*, vol II: *Dictionary*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi, 2004.

Enomoto, Fumio: “On the Formation of the Original Texts of the Chinese Āgamas” in *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 19-27, 1986.

Enomoto, Fumio: “‘Mūlasarvāstivādin’ and ‘Sarvāstivādin’” in *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, Christine Chojnacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Volker M. Tschannerl (eds.), pp. 239-249, 2000.

Flood, Gavin: *An Introduction to Hinduism*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1996.

Frauwallner, Erich: *The Earliest Vinaya and the Beginnings of Buddhist Literature*, Is. M. E. O., Roma, 1956.

Gnoli, Raniero (ed.): *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu. Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*, vol. I, II, Istituto Italiano Il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, Roma, 1977-78.

Greetham, D. C.: *Textual Scholarship. An Introduction*, Garland Publishing, INC, London, 1994.

Greetham, D. C. (ed.): *Scholarly Editing. A Guide to Research*, The Modern Language Association of America, New York, 1995.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe: “Zu einer neuen Handschrift des Dīrghāgama” in *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, Christine Chojnacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Volker M. Tschannerl (eds.), 2000.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe: “Further Remarks on the New Manuscript of the *Dīrghāgama*” in *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies*, vol. 5, pp. 98 – 118, 2002a.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe: “More Fragments of the *Caṅgīsūtra*”, in *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection*, Jens Braarvig (ed.), vol. II, pp. 1 – 17, 2002b.

Hartmann, Jens-Uwe: “Contents and Structure of the *Dīrghāgama* of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins”, in *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University*, pp. 119 – 137, Tokyo, 2004.

Hinüber, Haiyan Hu von: *Das Poṣadhavastu. Vorschriften für die buddhistische Beichtfeier im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins*, Dr. Inge Wezler Verlag für Orientalische Fachpublikationen, Reinbek 1994.

Hinüber, Oskar von: *A Handbook of Pāli Literature*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin 1996.

Horner, I. B.: *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings (Majjima Nikāya)*, vol. I, II, III, Luzac & Company, LTD, London, 1954-59.

Keown, Damien: *Oxford Dictionary of Buddhism*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2004.

Kjørup, Søren: “Kap. 10: Den riktige text” in *Menneskevidenskaberne. Problemer og tradisjoner i humanioras videnskapsteori*, pp. 189 – 211, 1997.

Lamotte, Étienne: “The Assessment of Textual Authenticity in Buddhism” in *Buddhist Studies Review*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 4 – 14, 1983-4.

Lamotte, Étienne: *History of Indian Buddhism. From the Origins to the Śāka Era*, Université Catholique de Louvain, Institut Orientaliste Louvain-la-Neuve, 1988.

Macqueen, Graeme: *A Study of the Śrāmanyaphala- Sūtra*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1988.

- Matsuda**, Kazunobu: “Bonbun zyōagon no *Tridaṇḍi*-sūtra ni tsuite” in *Indogaku-Bukkyōgaku-kenkyū*, vol. 54, no. 2, pp. 129 – 136, 2006.
- Meisig**, Konrad: *Das Śrāmaṇyaphala-Sūtra. Synoptische Übersetzung und Glossar der chinesischen Fassungen verglichen mit dem Sanskrit und Pāli*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1987.
- Melzer**, Gudrun: *Ein Abschnitt aus dem Dīrghāgama*, Teil I, II, (unpublished Inaugural Dissertation, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München), 2006.
- Monier-Williams**, Monier: *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, Delhi, 2002.
- Morris**, Richard (ed.): *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, Part 1: Ekanipāta, Dukanipāta, and Tikanipāta, Oxford University Press, London, 1885.
- Murthy**, Shivaganesha R. S.: *Introduction to Manuscriptology*, Sharada Publishing House, Delhi, 1996.
- Norman**, Kenneth Roy: *Pāli Literature. Including the Canonical Literature in Prakrit and Sanskrit of All the Hīnayāna Schools of Buddhism*, Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1983.
- Panglung**, Jampa L.: *Die Erzählstoffe des Mūlasarvāstivāda-Vinaya Analysiert auf Grund der Tibetischen Übersetzung*, the Reiyukai Library, Tokyo, 1981.
- Ramers**, Peter: Die “Drei Kapitel Über Die Sittlichkeit” im Śrāmaṇyaphala-Sūtra. Die Fassungen des Dīghanikāya und Saṃghabhedavastu, verglichen mit dem Tibetischen und Mongolischen, Rheinischen Friedrich-Wilhelms Universität, Bonn, 1996.
- Rhys Davids**, T. W.: *Dialogues of the Buddha*, vol. 1, Oxford University Press, London, 1899.
- Rhys Davids**, T. W. and William Stede: *The Pali Text Society’s Pali-English Dictionary*, Routledge & Kegan Paul LTD, London, 1972.

Sander, Lore: *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung*, Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, Wiesbaden, 1968.

Simson, Georg von: *Zur Diktion Einiger Lehrtexte Des Buddhistischen Sanskritkanons*, Kitzinger, München, 1965.

Simson, Georg von: “Stil und Schulzugehörigkeit buddhistischer Sanskrittexte” in *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur. (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III,1)*, Heinz Bechert (ed.), vol. I, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, Göttingen, pp. 76-94, 1985.

Snellgrove, David: *Indo-Tibetan Buddhism. Indian Buddhists and Their Tibetan Successors*, Orchid Press, Bangkok, 2004.

Takakusu, Junjiro: “On the Abhidharma Literature of the Sarvāstivādins” in *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*, Henry Frowde, Oxford University Press, pp. 67-146, 1905.

Tanselle, Thomas G.: “The Varieties of Scholarly Editing” in *Scholarly Editing. A Guide to Research*, D. C. Greetham (ed), The Modern Language Association of America, New York, pp. 9 – 33, 1995.

Upasak, Chandrika S.: *History of Buddhism in Afghanistan*, Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, Sarnath, India, 1990.

Wille, Klaus: *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Stuttgart, 1990.

Williams, Paul (ed.): *Buddhism. Critical Concepts in Religious Studies*, vol. II, Routledge, Taylor&Francis Group, London, 2005.

Wynne, Alexander: “The Oral Transmission of Early Buddhist Literature” in *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies (JIABS)*, vol. 27, no. 1, pp. 97-127, 2004.