

"Contents and Structure of the *Dīrghāgama* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins", *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University* 7, 2004, 119-137.

Contents and Structure of the *Dīrghāgama* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins¹

Jens-Uwe HARTMANN

Due to the political turmoil in Afghanistan, in recent years a tremendous amount of Buddhist manuscripts in Indian languages has found its way from the area of Greater Gandhāra to the Western rare book market. Regrettably, the overwhelming majority of these manuscripts consist only of fragments, and in no case do we know their exact find spot or what their original depository — (cave) monastery, stūpa, etc. — was. Nonetheless these manuscripts are of prime importance for our knowledge of Indian Buddhist literature, since most of them contain texts which were previously unknown or preserved only in Chinese or Tibetan translations. Both Kharoṣṭhī and Brāhmī, the two scripts used side by side for several centuries in that part of the Indian Buddhist world, are represented, and if Richard Salomon's tentative dating to the first half of the first century CE proves correct, some of the birch-bark scrolls written in Kharoṣṭhī now hold the honour of being the oldest Buddhist, and at the same time the oldest Indian, manuscripts known so far. The Brāhmī manuscripts are somewhat younger; the oldest of them — palm-leaf fragments written in Kuṣāṇa Brāhmī — probably go back to the 2nd and 3rd centuries, while the youngest date to the 8th, the time when Buddhism finally began to disappear from the area.

Foremost among the finds written in Brāhmī script is a manuscript first glimpsed in the last years of the nineties when bundles of it, each consisting of 55 to 70 folios, began to reach the Western market. In 1999 a Japanese scholar published a

¹ Thanks are due to the owners of the manuscript for providing excellent reproductions and for permission to study the manuscript. Moreover, I am grateful to various colleagues, notably Lance Cousins, Paul Harrison (who also took care of my English) and Klaus Wille, for useful information and suggestions. Several times I had a chance to present parts of this paper, and I wish to thank all those who participated in the ensuing discussions. The last presentation took place during my stay in Hachioji in the autumn of 2003, and I am happy to take this opportunity to thank my hosts and colleagues there for a splendid period of research, scholarly exchange and, last but by no means least, fun.

photograph which had been made available to him by a manuscript dealer,² and the suspicion that all these bundles belonged to a manuscript containing a Sanskrit version of the *Dīrghāgama*, the “Collection of Long (Discourses of the Buddha)”, was confirmed when the last folio became available for scholarly inspection. It contained a brief colophon, its last sentence stating *samāptaś ca dīrghāgamaḥ*, “and finished is the Long Collection”. At present, approximately 55% of the manuscript is known to have made its way into three private collections, one in Japan, one in Norway and the other in the U.S.A.; the whereabouts of the remaining parts are still a matter of speculation. All three private collectors were willing to oblige scholarly interests and very kindly provided the photographs successively put at our disposal. Based on them it became possible to study the structure of this version of the “Long Collection” and to form an idea of its contents. On two occasions preliminary results of these studies have been published, each describing the contents of a specific section.³

Although some parts of the manuscript are still unavailable, and others are most probably lost forever,⁴ it is now possible to reconstruct the original structure of the collection with such a high degree of probability as to come close to certainty. In the following pages first a survey of all the sūtras contained in the *Dīrghāgama* will be given, and then, second, a specimen edition of a section of one of those sūtras.

1. The structure of the *Dīrghāgama* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins

The manuscript contains a number of *uddānas*, i.e., lists of key words, some of them verse-like and some in prose, which summarize the text titles of the preceding or following section of sūtras. Altogether six *uddānas* are preserved in the available parts of the manuscript. They represent four different lists, since two of them are duplicated. For the existing parts of the manuscript, the particulars given in the *uddānas* can be checked against the texts and the folio numbers; for those parts which are not available so far, we must rely only on the *uddānas* for information on the number, sequence and titles of the sūtras to be expected there. In both cases, however, it is possible to compare, and even verify, the data with another source. The information on the structure of the *Dīrghāgama* (*DĀ*) obtained from the new manuscript reveals that the Sanskrit *DĀ* transmitted in Central Asia must have been virtually identical, as far as contents and structure are concerned. Large parts of the structure of the latter version had previously been laboriously reconstructed from the Central Asian fragments and

² SADAKATA 1999.

³ HARTMANN 2000 and 2002.

⁴ Since fragments of the first 70 folios are already extant in the American and the Norwegian collections, it appears unlikely that still more of it could surface in the future.

from citations and references in Buddhist commentarial literature.⁵ When the new manuscript became accessible, it quickly and pleasantly confirmed the earlier attempts at reconstruction and thereby proved that the manuscript and the Central Asian fragments preserve the same version of the *DĀ*, a version apparently circulated among monks and nuns who observed the Sarvāstivāda or Mūlasarvāstivāda vinaya regulations.

So far, three different versions of the “Long Collection” are known. The only complete one in an Indian language is the *Dīghanikāya* (*DN*) in Pāli of the Theravāda tradition. A second, also complete version is preserved in Chinese translation (T 1); it belongs to the school of the Dharmaguptakas. Like the *Dīghanikāya* and the *Dīrghāgama* in Chinese translation, the *Dīrghāgama* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins is tripartite. Two of its three sections, however, are fundamentally different from those of the *Dīghanikāya* and T 1, and it is impossible to trace them back to a common principle of arrangement. Only the third, named *Śīlaskandha* in Sanskrit and *Śīlakkhandha* in Pāli, shares not only the name, but also the basic arrangement. Since our knowledge of the *DĀ* is largely based on only one manuscript, it should be noted that the folios preserving the transition from the first section to the second are not available at present. While the identity of the last text of the first section, the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (no. 6 in the table below), is beyond doubt, the first text of the second section has to be deduced. The last preserved folio of the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* is 123 or 124 (the folio number is lost), yet it contains text from the beginning of the sūtra (corresponding to section 9 of altogether 51 sections in WALDSCHMIDT’s edition of the Central Asian fragments). The first preserved folio number after the gap is 264 of the *Mahāgovindasūtra*. This leaves a very considerable gap of 140 folios, which raises the question whether more texts should be expected here than those which can be inferred from the next preserved *uddāna*. This *uddāna* presupposes seven sūtras (nos. 7-13) before the *Mahāgovindasūtra* and its folio number 264. The *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* begins on folio 111, and a calculation of its probable length based on the size of WALDSCHMIDT’s edition yields a folio number somewhere around 170 for its ending. This would leave about 90 folios for the following seven texts. Judging from the very diverse length of those sūtras which are preserved it is not impossible that 90 folios leave enough room for another, still unknown and rather short, section. Yet it is equally possible that the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* and the seven texts before the *Mahāgovindasūtra* filled the gap and that this manuscript did not contain more than the 47 sūtras which are found in the list below. At least, there is no indication whatsoever in the Central Asian fragments that further texts should be expected in this version of the *Dīrghāgama*.

⁵ HARTMANN 1992.

1.1. The Sections

1.1.1. *Ṣaṣṣūtrakaniṣāta*⁶, “Six Sūtra Section”

In the manuscript, this section comprises folios 1 to approximately 170 and contains six texts, as indicated by the title. It has no counterpart in the *Dīghanikāya* or the *Dīrghāgama* in Chinese translation. One of the six sūtras, the *Arthavistarāsūtra* (no. 2), is unknown in Pāli; another, the *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra* (no. 4), has no correspondence in the Nikāyas, but only in the Vinaya. While the *Mahāsudassanasuttanta* appears as a separate text in the *Dīghanikāya*, in the *DĀ* it is included in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra* (no. 6).

1.1.2. *Yuganipāta*, “Section of Pairs”⁷

In the manuscript, this section comprises the folios from ca. 170 to 360 verso, line 2, and contains altogether eighteen texts. It is divided into two sub-sections (*varga*), the first containing ten texts, the second eight. There is no counterpart in the *Dīghanikāya* or the *Dīrghāgama* in Chinese translation. Seven of its sūtras find their Pāli counterparts in various sections of the *Majjhimanikāya* (cf. the table below). The title of one text, *Sarveka* (? No. 8) according to the reading of the *uddāna*, cannot be related to any other parallel version, and since that part of the manuscript is still missing, we do not know the contents of this sūtra. One text, the *Māyājālasūtra* (no. 18), was known so far only from a Tibetan translation⁸ and from some Central Asian Sanskrit fragments (*SHT* IV 33, IV 165, III 883, V 1025); there is no counterpart in Pāli and no Chinese translation of it. The reason for the application of the ordering principle, obviously the arrangement of pairs of sūtras, is not very evident in every case and needs further consideration.

1.1.3. *Śīlaskandhanipāta*, “Section on Ethics”

In the manuscript, this section comprises folios 360 to 454 and contains altogether 23 texts. It is divided into three sub-sections (*varga*), the first containing ten texts, the second seven and the third six. Basically, this section agrees with the *Dīghanikāya* and T 1, although the sequence of the corresponding sūtras is different. In the *Dīghanikāya*, the *Śīlakkhandha* forms the first section and it starts with the *Brahmajālasuttanta*,

⁶ The name is not preserved in the manuscript, but known from a quotation, cf. WALDSCHMIDT 1980: 140 and HARTMANN 1994: 328 with note 10.

⁷ Kazunobu Matsuda kindly informed me that there is also a section entitled *Yuganipāta* (Shuangpin) in the Chinese *Madhyamāgama*, which contains ten sutras (nos. 182 to 191 in 5 pairs), cf. Taishō, vol. 1, pp. 724-740. For its two *uddānas* as quoted in Śamathadeva’s *Abhidharmakośa-ṭīkopāyikā* cf. the reference in HONJŌ 1984: 66-67, no. 4-75.

⁸ For an edition cf. SKILLING 1994: 3-57.

while in contrast the *Śīlaskandha*, being the last section of the *Dīrghāgama*, ends with the Sanskrit version of that sūtra (no. 47). This is striking, and it is difficult to avoid the impression that the order of sections and texts within them has been reversed intentionally, at least in this regard. Only one of the texts, the *Jīvakaśūtra*, has a parallel in the *Majjhimanikāya*, while several others, as, e.g., the *Tridaṇḍi-* (no. 25) and the *Piṅgalātreyaśūtra* (no. 26), are not represented in the Pāli canon. Most amazing is a sequence of altogether five rather short texts in the middle sub-section, starting with *Kāraṇavādin* (no. 37) and ending with a duplication apparently called *Anyatama* in the *uddāna* (no. 41). As far as Pāli parallels exist, they are found in the *Majjhima-* and also in the *Anguttaranikāya*. At present it is difficult to understand and to explain how they came to be included in a collection which is, according to its name, defined by the relative length of the texts it comprises.

1.2. The sequence of the sūtras

With the help of folio numbers, as far as they are preserved, and of the *uddānas* the sequence of texts can be established with certainty. Only for the first section, the *Ṣaṣṭisūtrakaniṣāta*, is additional help needed since no folio numbers are preserved for the second and third sūtras. Their sequence is derived from the Central Asian recension. In Central Asia, the *Ṣaṣṭisūtrakaniṣāta* became especially popular and was also copied separately; therefore this section is by far the best preserved, and the order of the sūtras it contains is well-known.⁹

The *uddānas*

Once a collection of texts becomes fixed, such lists of key words are of utmost importance for its intact preservation, especially during a period of oral transmission. Even after the collection is written down they help in preserving the order and number of texts and are therefore retained. *Uddānas* tend to be in verse which facilitates their memorization, often displaying the metrical licence and the usual liberties with regard to sandhi and word forms which are, at least partly, to be explained by the transformation of texts originally composed in (a) Middle Indic language(s). Therefore it is not clear why the first two of the six *uddānas* available so far are in prose. If the section they refer to was finalized only after the written transmission had already begun, this could explain why the more easily memorized verse form of an *uddāna* had become less important. It could also account for the fact that two different versions of basically the same *uddāna* are found in Central Asia (cf. below). However, in the absence of solid historical information on the genesis of the *Dīrghāgama* this ex-

⁹ Cf. HARTMANN 1994.

planation remains highly speculative.

Uddānas are usually expected either at the beginning or at the end of a section, but in the present case they are found sometimes at the beginning, sometimes at the end, and sometimes at both. Again, the reason for this distribution is unknown, and it is difficult to see a pattern in it.

1.2.1. Folio 299v2-3:¹⁰

*apannakaḥ sarveko [bh]ārgavaḥ śalyo [ca] bhaya[bh]ai[ra]vo ro[ma](harṣa)ṇo
jina[ya]bhaś ca [g]ovindaḥ prāsādikaḥ prasādanī[ye](na ca paścimam* ||
pañcatrayaṃ māyājālaḥ kā)(verso 3)maṭhikaḥ kāyabhāvanā bodhaḥ śaṃkaraś caiva ā
o (tānā)[t]a mahāsamājena bhavati paścimam ||*

This *uddāna* is definitely not metrical. It follows after sūtra 15, sūtra 16 being omitted from the manuscript for unknown reasons, but listed in the *uddāna* and partly extant in the manuscripts from Central Asia. Apparently the *uddāna* consists of two parts, the first summarizing the titles of sūtras 7 to 16, the second — beginning in the gap — listing sūtras 17 to 24. The second part is repeated after sūtra 24, with the variation *samājena* for *mahāsamājena*. For a study of this *uddāna* and a comparison with two Central Asian fragments cf. HARTMANN 2000 (at the time of this publication, the folio containing the repetition had not yet come to light).

1.2.2. Folio 358r1-2:

*pañcatraya māyājālaḥ kāmāṭhikaḥ kāyabhāvanā bodhaḥ śaṃkaraś caiva ātānātā
samājena paścimam || dīrghāgame yuganipāto dvitīyaḥ ||*

This *uddāna* follows after the first part of the *Mahāsamājasūtra*¹¹ (no. 24) and lists the titles of sūtras 17 to 24. It repeats the second half of 1.2.1. Then follows a colophon which concludes the second section.

1.2.3. Folio 360v1-2:

*[||] (tridaṇḍī piṅgalātreyo dve ca lohitya)bhāṣite |
kaivarttī atha [ma](ṇḍīśas tac ca bhikṣu)[ṣ]u bhāṣate |*

¹⁰ Parentheses or round brackets () signify restoration in a gap, square brackets [] damaged akṣaras or uncertain readings, pointed brackets < > an addition without gap, curly brackets { } superfluous akṣaras, double curly brackets {{ }} akṣaras deleted in the manuscript (only in the transliteration), three oblique dashes /// mark the point where the fragment breaks off; a cross + denotes a destroyed akṣara, two dots .. denote an illegible akṣara, one dot denotes an illegible part of an akṣara, the asterisk * denotes the virāma; o stands for the punch hole.

¹¹ Interestingly enough, the *uddāna* is placed where the Central Asian version of the *Mahāsamājasūtra* ends. After that, a second part of the *Mahāsamājasūtra* follows, which is also preserved in a Tibetan translation, cf. SKILLING 1994: 444 ff.

mamālī śronatāṇḍas ca kūṭatāṇḍyena paścimam ||*

Regrettably, this *uddāna* is only preserved in part. It follows after the second part of sūtra 24 and refers to the next ten texts which form the first sub-section of the *Śīlaskandhanipāta*. It is not repeated after the sub-section, but partly at the end of the whole text, cf. below (the second verse in 1.2.6), whence the first two lines are to be restored. According to the second version, *bhāṣite* in the first line has to be corrected to *bhāṣitau*, and *mamālī* in the third is an obvious writing mistake for *mahallī*. For a corresponding Central Asian fragment cf. HARTMANN 2002: 142 (the discussion there is based on the repetition in folio 454, since folio 360 was not yet available at that time) and for its partial quotation in Śamathadeva's *Abhidharmakośa-tīkopāyikā* cf. HARTMANN 2002: 139f.

1.2.4. Folio [4]10r1-2:

*abamṣṭhaḥ prṣṭha(pālas ca kāraṇavādī ca pudgalā)ḥ
śrutaṃ ma[ha]ll[o]¹² (nya)[ta]ma āna[ndo] bhikṣuśāstariḥ ||*

Again, the *uddāna* precedes the section it refers to, namely the sūtras 35 to 41. It is possible to restore the text in the gaps with the help of its repetition after the section (cf. next). For a discussion of this list and its various problems cf. HARTMANN 2002: 141f.

1.2.5. Folio 430r8:

*[a]ṃ[b]āṣṭha prṣṭhapālas ca kāraṇavādī ca pudgalāḥ
śruta<ṃ> ma(ha)l[o nya]tama anando <bhikṣu>śāstāni ||*

A duplication of the preceding one, following after the section.

1.2.6. Final folio 454v2-5:

*śuka jīvaka rājā ca v<ā>siṣṭhaḥ kāśyapena ca <l>
(bra)hm(a)jā(lena) kṛtvā ca v<a>rgo bhavati samudditaḥ ||
trdaṇḍī piṅgalā(treyo) dv(e) ca lohityabhā(ṣ)i(tau) <l>
k. .e .ī a(tha) maṇḍīśas tac ca bhikṣuṣu bhāṣate ||
mahallī pr(ṣṭhapālas ca) v. ko bhavati sa <l>
(vās)iṣṭhaḥ kāśyapaś caiva brahmajālam anopamā ||*

The first verse lists the six texts in the last sub-section (*varga*) of the *Śīlaskandhanipāta* (sūtras 42-47). The second verse repeats part of the *uddāna* which summarizes the first sub-section (sūtras 25-31, cf. above, 1.2.3). The third verse is puzzling; the

¹² A small piece containing the words *śrutaṃ ma[ha]ll[o]* is sticking to the next folio (observation of Gudrun Melzer).

second title can only be reconstructed as *pr(ṣṭhapāla-)*, but this makes little sense, since *Mahallī* (no. 32) and *Prṣṭhapāla* (no. 36) do not immediately follow each other. The next pāda recalls *v<a>rgo bhavati samudditaḥ*, the end of the first verse, “the section is summarized”, but this, too, would make no sense here. Then follow the last three sūtras of the collection (nos. 45-47), listed differently already in the first verse. In other words, the last *uddāna* lists text 9 of the first sub-section, text 2 of the second and texts 4 to 6 of the third. It is difficult to see a reason behind this peculiar selection. For a discussion of the problem cf. also HARTMANN 2002: 142f.

1.3. Table of the sūtras and their parallels

Based on all the sources of information available so far, the following table of contents can be drawn up. It presents the titles in the form in which they are listed in the *uddānas*; the first six titles, marked by an asterisk, are not preserved in the manuscript and are therefore supplied from the Central Asian fragments. If available, the folio numbers are given or, if possible, at least one folio number preserved for the text is added in square brackets. Next, the number of any corresponding text in the Chinese translation of the *Dīrghāgama (DĀc)* and in the *Dīghanikāya (DN)* or the *Majjhimanikāya (MN)* is given, and, for the Pāli, also the title. Variant titles in the Central Asian manuscripts are referred to in the footnotes. Again, attention should be drawn to the fact that the folios between the *Mahāparinirvāṇa-* (no. 6) and the *Mahāgovindasūtra* (no. 14) are not yet available and that it is impossible to know if another, rather brief, section should be expected here (cf. the discussion above in 1). Nonetheless, for ease of reference the sūtras are counted consecutively in the table.

Uddāna title	Folios	DĀc	DN	MN
1. *Daśottara	?-? [6, 7, 11, 14]	10	34: Dasuttara	
2. *Arthavistara	?-?		∅	
3. *Saṅgīti	?-?	9	33: Saṅgīti	
4. *Catuṣpariṣat	?-88r8 [72 etc.]		∅	
5. *Mahāvadāna	88r8 ¹³ -(111)	1	14: Mahāpadāna	
6. *Mahāparinirvāṇa	(111)-?	2	16: Mahāparinibbāna	

¹³ Only the beginning of line recto 8 is preserved (apparently with an *antaroddāna* of the *Catuṣpariṣatsūtra*), but verso 1 already contains part of the introductory sentence of the *Mahāvadānasūtra* (identified by Takamichi Fukita).

Uddāna title	Folios	DĀc	DN	MN
...				
7. Apannaka	?-?		∅	60: Apanṇaka (?) ¹⁴
8. Sarveka (?) ¹⁵	?-?		∅	
9. Bhārgava	?-?	15	24: Pāṭika	
10. Śalya	?-?		∅	105: Sunakkhatta
11. Bhayabhairava	?-?		∅	4: Bhayabherava
12. Roma(harṣa)ṇa	?-?		∅	12: Mahāsīhanāda
13. Jinayabha ¹⁶	?-?	4	18: Janavasabha	
14. Govinda ¹⁷	?-? (264 etc.)	3	19: Mahāgovinda	
15. Prāsādikaḥ	?-299v2	18	28: Sampasādaniya	
16. [Prasādaniya] ¹⁸ <i>uddāna</i>	- - 299v2-3	17	29: Pāsādika	
17. Pañcatraya	299v3-306r5		∅	102: Pañcattaya
18. Māyājāla	306r5-?		∅	
19. Kāmaṭhika	?-329r4		∅	95: Caṅkī
20. Kāyabhāvanā ¹⁹	329r4-340r2		∅	36: Mahāsaccaka
21. Bodha	340r2-344v4		∅	85: Bodhirāja- kumāra
22. Śaṃkara ²⁰	344v4-348r8		∅	100: Saṅgāra

¹⁴ Cf. IWAMATSU 1990 and HARTMANN 2000: 365, note 20.

¹⁵ This name is strange and does not agree with the remains of the corresponding name preserved in an *uddāna* in a Central Asian manuscript, cf. *SHT* IV 32, fragment 66, recto 5: *uddānam* apanna + + + ntha[k]o bhārgavaś [śa][y]o bhayabhai(rava) ///*. Obviously, *///ntha[k]o* should correspond to what is read here as Sarveka, but at present it appears difficult to reconcile the two names. For various possible reconstructions of the name cf. IWAMATSU 1996: 705; his proposal to reconstruct it as *(nir-gra)nthaka* and to relate it to the *Mahāsaccakasutta* (*MN* 36) has now become obsolete, since *MN* 36 finds its correspondence in the *Kāyabhāvanāsūtra* (no. 20).

¹⁶ For Jinarṣabha; the akṣara read as *ya* is partly damaged, but does not resemble the expected *rṣa*. In a Central Asian manuscript, *SHT* IV 165, fragment 18, the name is preserved as Janarṣabha.

¹⁷ For *Mahāgovinda* in all versions of the *sūtra*.

¹⁸ Evidently this text exists only in the *uddāna*, since the section ends with the *Prāsādikasūtra*, and the manuscript continues with the *Pañcatrayasūtra*; this apparent loss of one *sūtra* is difficult to explain.

¹⁹ The name of the interlocutor is preserved as Sātyakin in the manuscript.

Uddāna title	Folios	DĀc	DN	MN
23. Āṭānāṭa ²¹	348v1-354r4		32: Āṭānāṭiya	
24. Mahāsamāja <i>uddāna</i> Mahāsamāja, 2nd part <i>uddāna</i>	354r5-358r1 358r1-2 358r2-360v1 360v1-2	19	20: Mahāsamaya	
25. Tridaṇḍin	360v2-367r4		∅	
26. Piṅgalātreya	367r4-369r5		∅	
27. Lohitya ²² I	369r5-382r6	29	12: Lohicca	
28. Lohitya II	382r6-386r1		∅	
29. Kaivartin ²³	386r1-390v1	24	11: Kevaddha	
30. Maṇḍīśa I	390v1-391v6		7: Jāliya	
31. Maṇḍīśa II	391v6-8		∅	
32. Mahallin	391v8-396v6		6: Mahāli	
33. Śroṇatāṇḍya ²⁴	396v6-401r1	22	4: Soṇadaṇḍa	
34. Kūṭatāṇḍya ²⁵	401r2-409v8	23	5: Kūṭadanta	
<i>uddāna</i> 35. Ambāṣṭha ²⁶	410r1-2 410r2-416r3	20	3: Ambaṭṭha	
36. Prṣṭhapāla ²⁷	416r3-423(?)v7	28	9: Poṭṭhapāda	
37. Kāraṇavādin	424r4-424v3		∅	
38. Puḍgala ²⁸	424v3-426v1		∅	
39. Śruta	426v1-427v5		∅	
40. Mahalla	427v6-430r7		∅	

²⁰ In the sūtra itself and in a Central Asian manuscript (*SHT* IV 165, fragment 24, verso 4) too, the name is attested as Śāṅkaraka.

²¹ In the Central Asian manuscripts the title is attested as Āṭānāṭika.

²² In all the Central Asian manuscripts the name is attested as Lokecca.

²³ In the Central Asian manuscripts the name possibly reads Kevarta or Kevartin.

²⁴ In the Central Asian manuscripts attested as Śroṇatāṇḍhya (only *SHT* V 1290) or Śroṇatāṇḍya (all others).

²⁵ In one Central Asian manuscript (*SHT* V 1290) the name is attested throughout as Kūṭatāṇḍhya.

²⁶ In the Central Asian manuscripts attested as Ambāṣṭha.

²⁷ In a Central Asian manuscript attested as Prṣṭapā(da) or Prṣṭapā(la), cf. HARTMANN 1992 s.v. (single occurrence so far).

²⁸ For a parallel, cf. *AN* II 205 ff.

Uddāna title	Folios	DĀc	DN	MN
41. Anyatama <i>uddāna</i>	430r7 430r8		∅	
42. Śuka	430r8-433r2		10: Subha	
43. Jīvaka	433r2-(435)r5		∅	55: Jīvaka
44. Rājā	(435)r5-447(?)v2 (three folios [442-444] of the Ambāṣṭha and one [445] of the Brahmajāla are inserted here)	27	2: Sāmaññaphala	
45. Vāsiṣṭha	447(?)v2-451r1	26	13: Tevijja	
46. Kāśyapa	451r2-v8	25	8: Kassapasīhanāda	
47. Brahmajāla <i>uddāna</i>	452r1-454r 454v2-5	21	1: Brahmajāla	

2. A specimen from the *Bodhasūtra*: The five qualities of a strenuous one

In the following, a passage from the *Bodhasūtra*²⁹ is presented in order to illustrate some of the specifics and problems of the manuscript. Fragments of the passage have been known from Central Asian manuscripts in the collections of Berlin, London and St. Petersburg,³⁰ but only now is the restoration of a consecutive text finally possible. The corresponding text in the Pāli canon, the *Bodhirājakumārasutta*, contains the same passage, but in a — as far as the correspondence goes — considerably shorter and sometimes quite different form (*MN* II 94.7-96.20). The topic of this passage is a group of five qualities of a strenuous one (*prādhānikāṅga*, Pāli *padhāniyaṅga*),³¹ namely

²⁹ Bodha is the key word in the *uddāna*, but the full title may also read *Bodharājakumārasūtra* in accordance with the Pāli.

³⁰ Berlin: *SHT* (IV) 33, fragments 22-24 (fragment 21 does not belong to the same folio as fragment 22), *SHT* (IV) 180, fragments 1-2; London: Hoernle 149/280, edited in HARTMANN 1992, no. 12; St. Petersburg: SI B/14, fragments II and III (now it is easy to see that both fragments belong to the same folio, II being the left piece), edited in BONGARD-LEVIN 1989 and BONGARD-LEVIN/VOROB'eva-DESJATOVSKAJA 1990: 247-249.

³¹ The Pāli form has been variously translated as “factor in spiritual wrestling” (T.W. and C.A.F. RHYS DAVIDS *ad DN* III 237), “quality to be striven for” (*PTSD* s.v.), “quality for striving” (I.B. HORNER *ad MN* no. 85), “factor of endeavour” (Maurice WALSH *ad DN* III 237); *prādhānikāṅga* could

being *śrāddha* (P. *saddha*) “trusting”, *aśaṭha* (*asaṭha*) “guileless”, *alpābādha* (*appābādha*) “of good health”, *ārabdhavīrya* (*āraddhavīrya*) “energetic” and *prājña* (*paññāvā*) “intelligent”. The Buddha first illustrates the need for these five basic qualities on the spiritual path with the example of a person who intends to learn the martial arts from prince Bodha, and then goes on to describe them with regard to the noble disciple, the *āryaśrāvaka*. This description, consisting of five sets of stock phrases, is also included in the *Daśottarasūtra* (no. V.1) and in the *Saṅgītisūtra* (no. V.17), and single sets or parts of them occur in various other places in the Sūtrapīṭaka. Despite these various occurrences the Sanskrit text had until now remained extremely fragmentary, mainly because the relevant passages in the *Daśottara-* and *Saṅgītisūtra*, both available only in editions from Central Asian fragments, are very badly preserved. Only now, with the help of the *Bodhasūtra*, is it possible to fill all the gaps. This illustrates once more how close the wording of texts of the same tradition is and how the edition of every new piece works to advance our knowledge and improve the existing editions.

The sūtra deals at length with Prince Bodha’s newly built palace Kokanada and with his invitation to the Buddha and the Saṃgha as its auspicious first visitors. After offering them a meal, the prince begins a conversation with the Buddha, which consists of two parts. At first he states that in his opinion happiness (*sukha*) is not gained by happiness, but by suffering (*duḥkha*), and this offers the Buddha an occasion to relate part of his autobiography, as it were: the story of leaving the palace, of his ascetic practices and of finally reaching enlightenment. In the *Bodhasūtra*, this story is abbreviated by a reference to the immediately preceding *Kāyabhāvanāsūtra* (*vistareṇa yathā kāyabhāvanāsūtre*, fol. 342r7) where it is found in full. Then follows the second question of prince Bodha, and this is where the specimen sets in.

First, a transliteration of the manuscript will be given, then a structured restoration of the text with a modest application of European punctuation, and finally a translation of the restored text.

be understood as “primary quality”, but the Central Asian text of the *Daśottarasūtra* has *prādhānikasyāṅgam*, (cf. MITTAL 1957: 65), and in connexion with the *Saṅgītiparyāya*, the commentary on the same passage of the *Saṅgītisūtra* (cf. STACHE-ROSEN 1968: 147), this leads to the understanding as “strenuous (one)” (cf. MITTAL 1957: 65 “Eigenschaft eines Strebsamen”); cf. also Sv III 1028.33-34 (*ad DN III 237*) *Padhāniyassa bhikkhuno aṅgāni ti padhāniy’ aṅgāni*.

2.1. Transliteration of fols. 342v2–344r2

342 verso

- 2 ṇāya pṛccha bo[dha] d eva yad yad evākām[kṣa]si k. tibhi[r bhadam]tāṃgaiḥ
sama[nv]āgata āryaśrā .. [k]. + + + + .[m].ṃ dha[rm]. + n. ye āsraṅkṣayam
anuprāpnoti tena hi bodha tvām eva pra [t].
- 3 kṣamate thainam vyākuru kiṃ manyase bodha kuśalas tvam ○ pitrye śilpasthāna-
karmasthāne ta[d]y[athā] hasti + + .āyām aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau dhanuṣy apa-
yāne niryāṇe aṃkuśagr. .. [ś]. grahe
- 4 toramaragrahe lipigaṇananyasanasamkhyāmu ○ drāyām tathyam aham bhadanta
kuśalaḥ pitrye śilpasthānakarmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyām aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe
sarau dhanuṣy apayā
- 5 ne niryāṇe aṃkuśāgrahe to[mara]grahe lipi ○ gaṇananyasanasamkhyāmudrāyām
atha puruṣa āgacchet tasyaivam syāt kuśalo bata bodho rājakumāraḥ pi[t]rye
śilpasthānaka
- 6 rmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyā[m a]śvapṛṣṭhe rathe ○ sarau dhanuṣy apayāne
niryāṇe aṃkuśagrahe pāśagrahe tomaragrahe lipigaṇananyasanasamkhyā-
mudrāyām yanv aham a
- 7 syāntikād anyatamānyatama śilpasthānam anvāgamayeya[m] i[ti sa ca] syād
aśrāddha{ {syā} }h kiṃ manyase bodha ya tac chrāddhena prāptavyam prāpnuyāt
saḥ no bhadanta sa ca syāc chaṭhaḥ kiṃ manyase bo
- 8 dha yat tadṣaṭhīna prāptavyan prāpnuyāt sa no bhadanta sa ca syād duṣprajña
kiṃ manyase bodha yat tat prājñena prāptavyam prā[pn]u[y]ā[t sa] no bhadanta
ekaikena tāvad bhadanta ito na samanvāgatena tena

343 recto

- 1 puruṣeṇa na sukaram mamāntikād anyatamānyatama śilpasthānakarmasthānam
anvāgamayitum kaḥ punar vādaḥ sarvai dvitīyo .ā puruṣa āgacchet tasyaivam
syāt kuśalo ta bodho rājakumāra pitrye
- 2 śilpasthānakarmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyām aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau
dhanuṣy apayāne niryāṇe aṃkuśagrahe pāśagrahe tomaragrahe
lipigaṇananyasanaṃ samkhyāmudrāyām yanv aham asyāntikād anyatamā
- 3 nyatamaśilpasthānakarmasthāna{ {karmasthāna} }m anvāgamye ○ yam iti sa
ca syāc chrāddhaḥ kiṃ manyase bodha yat tac chrāddhene prāptavyam prāpnu-
yāt sa evam bhadanta sa ca syā śaṭhaḥ kiṃ manyase bodha
- 4 yat tad aśaṭhena prāptavyam prāpnuyāt sa evam bhadanta sa ○ ca syād alpā-
bādhaḥ kim manyase bodha yat tad alpābādheṇa prāptavyam prāpnuyāt saḥ
evam bhadanta sa ca syād ārabdhavīryaḥ kiṃ manyase
- 5 bodha yat tad ārabdhavīryeṇa prāptavyam prāpnuyāt sa evam bha ○ danta sa ca

- syāt prājñāḥ kiṃ manyase bodha yat tat prājñena prāptavyaṃ prāpnuyāt sa evaṃ
 bhadanta ekaikena tāvad bhadanta ito ṅgena
 6 samanvāgatena tena puruṣeṇa sukaraṃ mamāntikā o d anyatamānyatamac
 chilpasthānakarmasthāna samanvāgamayituṃ kaḥ punar vādaḥ sarvair evam eva
 bodha [pa]ṃcabhiḥ prādhā
 7 nikāṃgais samanvāgata āryaśrāvakaḥ kṣipram evā[sm]iṃ dharmavinaye āsrava-
 kṣayam anuprāpnoti katamaiḥ paṃcabhir iha bodha āryaśrāvakasya tathāgatasyo
 ntike śraddhābhini .. + + +
 8 timūlajātā pratiṣṭhitā a[sa]ṃhāryā śramaṇena vā brāhmaṇena vā devena vā
 māreṇa vā brahmaṇā vā kena cid vā punar loke sahadharmatamanena pratha-
 mena prādhānikenāṃ[g]. [n]. + + ..

343 verso

- 1 gato [bhavat]y [ā]rya[śrā]va[k]. puna bodha [ā] [k]o śaṭhī bhavaty
 amāyāvī rju rjukajātīyaḥ sa yathābhūtam ātmānam āviṣkaroti śāstur antike
 vijñānāṃ ca sa[bra] + + +
 2 nena dvitīyena prādhānikenāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvaka [p]unar
 aparaṃ āryaśrāvaka alpābādho bhavaty arogajātīyaḥ samayāpacanyāgrahaṇyā
 samanvāgato .. [tyu] + +
 3 nātiśītayā avyābādhayā ṛtusukhāyā yayāpy a o śītapītakhaditāsvāditāni samyak-
 sukhena paripakaṃ gacchati anena ṛtīyena prādhānikāṃgena samanvāgato
 bhavaty ā
 4 bhavaty āryaśrāvakaḥ punar aparaṃ bodha āryaśrāva o kaḥ ārabdhavīryo
 viharati sthāmavāṃ vīryavā{{ṃ}}n utsāhī dṛḍhaparākramo nikṣiptadhuraḥ
 kuśaleṣu dharmeṣu kāmam tvak snāyv asthi
 5 cāvatiṣṭhatāṃ pariśuṣyatu śarīrān māṃsaṣoṇi o tam atha ca punar yat tad
 ārabdhavīryeṇa prāptavyaṃ sthāmavatā vīryavatā utsāhinā dṛḍhaparākrameṇā-
 nikṣiptadhureṇa kuśa
 6 leṣu dharmeṣu tad vata nāprāpyāntarād vīryasya sraṃ o sanam bhaviṣyaty anena
 caturthena prādhānikenāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvakaḥ punar
 aparaṃ bodhāryaśrāvaka
 7 prajñāvān viharati lokasyodayāstaṃgaminyā prajñayā samanvāgataḥ āryayā
 nairyāṇikayā nairvedhikayā niryāti tat kasya hetoḥ samyagduḥkṣayāya
 duḥkṣasyāntakriyayai
 8 anena paṃ[ca]m[e]na prādhānikenāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvakaḥ
 ebhir bodha paṃcabhiḥ prādhānikāṃgais samanvāgataḥ āryaśrāvakaḥ kṣipram
 evāsmiṃ dharmavinaye āsrava

344 recto

- 1 kṣayam anuprāpnoti atha bodho rājakumāraḥ pūrvam kāyam abhyunnamayya dakṣiṇam bāhum abhiprasāryāttamanāttamanā udānam udānayati aho buddha aho dharma aho saṃ{{ghaś ca}} sya
- 2 svākhyātātā ya[tr]edā[n]iṃ pañcabhiḥ prādhānikāṃgena samanvāgata ārya-śrāvakaḥ kṣipram evāsmiṃ dharmavinaye āsravakṣayam anuprāpnotī •

2.2. Restoration

1. “pṛccha Bo(dha) {d eva} yad yad evākāṃkṣasi.”
2. “k(a)tibhir bhadaṃtāṃgaiḥ samanvāgata āryaśrā(va)k(aḥ kṣipram evās)m(i)ṃ dharm(avi)n(a)ye āsravakṣayam anuprāpnoti?”
3. “tena hi Bodha tvām eva pra³² (yathā) t(e) (v3) kṣamate ’thainam vyākuru! kiṃ manyase Bodha kuśalas tvam pitrye śilpasthānakarmasthāne tadyathā hasti(grīv)āyām aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau dhanuṣy apayāne niryāṇe aṃkuśagr(ahe pā)ś(a)grahe (v4) to{ra}maragrahe lipigaṇananyasanasamkhyāmudrāyām?”
4. “tathyam aham bhadanta kuśalaḥ pitrye śilpasthānakarmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyām aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau dhanuṣy apayā(v5)ne niryāṇe aṃkuśagrahe toma(ra)grahe lipigaṇananyasanasamkhyāmudrāyām.”
5. “atha puruṣa āgacchet tasyaivaṃ syāt: kuśalo bata Bodha rājakumāraḥ pitrye śilpasthānaka(v6)rmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyām aśvapṛṣṭhe rathe sarau dhanuṣy apayāne niryāṇe aṃkuśagrahe pāśagrahe tomaragrahe lipigaṇananyasanasamkhyāmudrāyām. yanv aham a(v7)syāntikād anyatamānyatama-śilpasthāna<karmasthāna>m anvāgamayeyam iti
6. sa ca syād aśrāddhaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha: ya<t> tac chrāddhena prāptavyam prāpnuyāt saḥ?”
“no bhadaṃta.”
7. “sa ca syāc chaṭhaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bo(v8)dha: yat tad{ṛ} śaṭhīna³³ prāptavyam prāpnuyāt sa?”
“no bhadanta.”
8. ³⁴<“sa ca syād bahvābādhaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha: yat tad alpābādhenā prāpta-

³² Most likely to be restored to *pracchāmi* for *pṛcchāmi*, cf. *MN* II 94,11-12 *Tena hi, rājakumāra, taṃ yev’ ettha paṭipucchissāmi. Yathā te khameyya tathā taṃ vyākareyyāsi.*

³³ Correct to *tac chaṭhena*.

³⁴ Apparently the correspondences for *alpābādha* and *ārabdhavīrya* are dropped in the manuscript, most likely due to a haplography in this highly repetitive passage, but they are found in the Central Asian fragments. Therefore, the following two sections are reconstructed; *bahvābādha* is taken from *SHT* IV 180, fragment 1, recto 4, *anārabdhavīrya* is speculative, but highly probable.

- vyam prāpnuyāt saḥ?”
 “no bhadanta.”
9. “sa ca syād anārabdhavīryaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha: yat tad ārabdhavīryeṇa prāptavyam prāpnuyāt sa?”
 “no bhadanta.”>
10. “sa ca syād duṣprajña<ḥ>; kiṃ manyase Bodha: yat tat prājñena prāptavyam prāpnuyāt sa?”
 “no bhadanta; ekaikena tāvad bhadanta ito <’ṅge>na samanvāgatena tena (343r1) puruṣeṇa na sukaram mamāntikād anyatamānyatama<ṃ> śilpasthāna-karmasthānam anvāgamayitum; kaḥ punar vādaḥ sarvai<ḥ>.”
11. “dvitīyo .ā³⁵ puruṣa āgacchet tasyaivam syāt: kuśalo <ba>ta Bodho rājā-kumāra<ḥ> pitrye (r2) śilpasthānakarmasthāne tadyathā hastigrīvāyām aśva-prṣṭhe rathe sarau dhanuṣy apayāne niryāṇe aṃkuśagrahe pāsagrahe tomaragrahe lipigaṇananyasana{ṃ}saṃkhyāmudrāyām. yanv aham asyāntikād anyatamā(r3)nyatamac chilpasthānakarmasthānam anvāgamayeyam iti.
12. sa ca syāc chrāddhaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha yat tac chrāddhena prāptavyam prāpnuyāt sa?”
 “evam bhadanta.”
13. “sa ca syā<d a>śaṭhaḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha: (r4) yat tad aśaṭhena prāptavyam prāpnuyāt sa?”
 “evam bhadanta.”
14. “sa ca syād alpābādhaḥ; kim manyase Bodha: yat tad alpābādhena prāptavyam prāpnuyāt saḥ?”
 “evam bhadanta.”
15. “sa ca syād ārabdhavīryaḥ; kiṃ manyase (r5) Bodha: yat tad ārabdhavīryeṇa prāptavyam prāpnuyāt sa?”
 “evam bhadanta.”
16. “sa ca syāt prājñāḥ; kiṃ manyase Bodha: yat tat prājñena prāptavyam prāpnuyāt sa?”
 “evam bhadanta; ekaikena tāvad bhadanta ito ’ṅena (r6) samanvāgatena tena puruṣeṇa sukaram mamāntikād anyatamānyatamac chilpasthānakarmasthāna{sa}m anvāgamayitum; kaḥ punar vādaḥ sarvair.”
17. “evam eva Bodha paṃcabhiḥ prādhā(r7)nikāṃgais samanvāgata āryaśrāvakaḥ kṣipram evāsmiṃ dharmavinaye āsraṃkṣayam anuprāpnoti; katamaiḥ paṃcabhir?
- 18.1. iha Bodha āryaśrāvakasya tathāgatasya<ā>ntike śraddhābhini(viṣṭā bhava)(r8)ti mūlajātā pratiṣṭhitā asaṃhāryā śramaṇena vā brāhmaṇena vā devena vā māreṇa

³⁵ The reconstruction of this akṣara remains uncertain.

- vā brahmaṇā vā kenacid vā punar loke sahadharmatam³⁶; anena prathamena prādhānikenāṃgen(a samanvā)(**343v1**)gato bhavaty āryaśrāvaka(a)<ḥ>.
- 18.2. puna(r aparaṃ)³⁷ .. Bodha ā(ryaśrāva)ko 'śaṭhī bhavaty amāyāvī rju<ko> rjukajātīyaḥ sa yathābhūtam ātmānam āviṣkaroti śāstur antike vijñānāṃ ca sabra(hmacārīṇām a)(**v2**)nena dvitīyena prādhānikenāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvaka<ḥ>.
- 18.3. punar aparaṃ āryaśrāvaka alpābādho bhavaty arogajātīyaḥ samayā pācanyā³⁸ grahaṇyā samanvāgato (nā)tyu(ṣṇayā) (**v3**) nātīśītayā avyābādhayā ṛtusukhāyā yayāpy aśītapītakhaditāsvāditāni samyaksukhena paripākaṃ gaccha<n>ti; anena ṛtīyena prādhānikāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty ā(**v4**){bhavaty ā}ryaśrāvakaḥ.
- 18.4. punar aparaṃ Bodha āryaśrāvakaḥ ārabdhavīryo viharati sthāmavāṃ vīryavān utsāhī dṛḍhaparākramo 'nikṣiptadhuraḥ kuśaleṣu dharmeṣu: kāmāṃ tvak snāy v asthi (**v5**) cāvatiṣṭhatāṃ, pariśuṣyatu śārīrān māṃsaṣoṇitam. atha ca punar yat tad ārabdhavīryeṇa prāptavyaṃ sthāmavatā vīryavatā utsāhinā dṛḍhaparākrameṇānikṣiptadhureṇa kuśa(**v6**)leṣu dharmeṣu tad vata nāprāpyāntarād³⁹ vīryasya sraṃsanāṃ bhaviṣyaty; anena caturthena prādhānikenāṃgena samana-vāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvakaḥ.
- 18.5. punar aparaṃ Bodhāryaśrāvaka<ḥ> (**v7**) prajñāvān viharati lokasyodayāstaṃ-gaminyā prajñayā samanvāgataḥ āryayā nairyāṇikayā nairvedhikayā niryāti tatka<raḥ> {sya hetoḥ}⁴⁰ samyagduḥ<kha>kṣayāya duḥkhasyāntakriyāyai; (**v8**) anena pañcamena prādhānikenāṃgena samanvāgato bhavaty āryaśrāvakaḥ.
19. ebhir Bodha pañcabhiḥ prādhānikāṃgais samanvāgataḥ āryaśrāvakaḥ kṣipram evāsmiṃ dharmavinaye āsrava(**344r1**)kṣayam anuprāpnoti.”
20. atha Bodho rājakumāraḥ pūrvāṃ kāyam abhyunnamayya dakṣiṇāṃ bāhum abhiprasāryāttamanāttamanā udānam udānayati: “aho buddha aho dharma aho saṃ<gha aho dharma>sya (**r2**) svākhyātātā, yatedānīm pañcabhiḥ prādhānikāṃ{gena}<gaiḥ> samanvāgata āryaśrāvakaḥ kṣipram evāsmiṃ dharmavinaye āsravakṣayam anuprāpnotīti!”

³⁶ Correct to *sahadharmataḥ*.

³⁷ The gap contained at least one more akṣara, but it is difficult to guess what it could have been, apart from a writing mistake.

³⁸ The parallel passages seem to suggest a correction to *samapācanyā*, cf. *Avś* I 168.10 *samapākayā grahaṇyā samanavāgata* and *DN* II 177.27-28, III 166.15 *sama-vepākiniyā gahaṇiyā samannāgato*, but WALDSCHMIDT *ad MPS* 34.23 (reconstructed) refers to *Mvy* 7039 *samayā pācanyā grahaṇyā samanvāgataḥ*.

³⁹ Or *nā<nanu>prāpya*°; the parallels are not unequivocal in that point, cf. *SHT* V 1103 recto 3-4 with note 4 (p. 98).

⁴⁰ For the correction from *tat kasya hetoḥ* to *tatkaraḥ* and for the whole formula cf. *SWTF* s.v. *tat-kara*.

2.3. Translation

1. “Ask, Bodha, whatever you like.”
2. “Possessed of how many qualities, revered sir, does a noble disciple in this law and discipline quickly reach the cessation of the depravities?”
3. “Well then, Bodha, I will ask you a question in return. Answer it as you think fit! What do you think, Bodha, are you skilled in the matters of (military) arts and the matters of (military) techniques, as (riding) on an elephant’s neck, (going) on horseback, (driving) a chariot, sword, archery, marching away, marching forth, handling an elephant-driver’s hook, handling a noose, handling a lance, writing, counting, painting, mental and manual arithmetic?”⁴¹
4. “It is true, revered sir, that I am skilled in the matters of (military) arts and the matters of (military) techniques, as (riding) on an elephant’s neck, (going) on horseback, (driving) a chariot, sword, archery, marching away, marching forth, handling an elephant-driver’s hook, handling a lance, writing, counting, painting, mental and manual arithmetic.”
5. “Now a person might come and think: ‘Prince Bodha is indeed skilled in the matters of (military) arts and the matters of (military) techniques, as (riding) on an elephant’s neck, (going) on horseback, (driving) a chariot, sword, archery, marching away, marching forth, handling an elephant-driver’s hook, handling a noose, handling a lance, writing, counting, painting, mental and manual arithmetic. I would like to learn one or the other art and technique from him.’
6. If he were lacking in trust, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is trusting?”
“No, revered sir.”
7. “If he were crooked, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is guileless?”
“No, revered sir.”
8. “If he were sickly, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one with good health?”
“No, revered sir.”
9. “If he were lazy, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is energetic?”
“No, revered sir.”

⁴¹ The translation of this stock phrase largely follows that of VOGEL/WILLE 1992: 85.

10. “If he were unintelligent, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by an intelligent one?”

“No, revered sir. It would not be easy for him to learn one or the other craft and art from me, revered sir, if he were possessed of even one such quality, let alone all of them.”
11. “(Now) a second person might come and think: ‘Prince Bodha is indeed skilled in the matters of (military) arts and the matters of (military) techniques, as (riding) on an elephant’s neck, (going) on horseback, (driving) a chariot, sword, archery, marching away, marching forth, handling an elephant-driver’s hook, handling a noose, handling a lance, writing, counting, painting, mental and manual arithmetic. I would like to learn one or the other craft and art from him.’
12. If he were trusting, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is trusting?”

“Yes, revered sir.”
13. “If he were guileless, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is without guile?”

“Yes, revered sir.”
14. “If he were of good health, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one of good health?”

“Yes, revered sir.”
15. “If he were energetic, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by one who is energetic?”

“Yes, revered sir.”
16. “If he were intelligent, what do you think, Bodha: could he attain whatever is won by an intelligent one?”

“Yes, revered sir. It would be easy for him to learn one or the other craft and art from me, revered sir, if he were possessed of even one such quality, let alone all of them.”
17. “In the same way, Bodha, a noble disciple possessed of the five qualities of a strenuous one will in this law and discipline quickly reach the cessation of the depravities. Which five?
- 18.1. “Here, Bodha, the trust of a noble disciple in the Realized One becomes persevering, deep-rooted, firm, not legitimately to be diverted by a recluse, a brahmin, a god, a Māra, a Brahma, or anybody else in the world. Possessed of this first quality of a strenuous one he becomes a noble disciple.

- 18.2. “Again, Bodha, a noble disciple is guileless, not deceitful, straight, straightforward; he shows himself as he really is to the teacher and the learned among his fellow-students. Possessed of this second quality of a strenuous one he becomes a noble disciple.
- 18.3. “Again, a noble disciple is healthy, of a healthy nature, endowed with an even and efficient digestion, neither overheated or underactive, free of disorders and comfortable with any season, by which the things eaten, drunk, chewed and tasted are digested with complete ease. Possessed of this third quality of a strenuous one he becomes a noble disciple.
- 18.4. “Again, Bodha, a noble disciple is energetic, powerful, full of energy, persevering, of strong courage, persevering in the wholesome dharmas: Let the flesh and blood dry up from the body and (only) skin, sinew, bone remain, rather than that, not having attained what can be attained by one who is energetic, powerful, full of energy, persevering, of strong courage, persevering in the wholesome dharmas, there will be a slackening of energy. Possessed of this fourth quality of a strenuous one he becomes a noble disciple.⁴²
- 18.5. “Again, Bodha, a noble disciple is intelligent, possessed of the insight into the rise and disappearance of the world, that is noble, conducive to deliverance, penetrating; activating that, he leaves for the right cessation of suffering, for the termination of suffering.⁴³ Possessed of this fifth quality of a strenuous one he becomes a noble disciple.
19. “Possessed of these five qualities of a strenuous one, Bodha, a noble disciple will in this law and discipline quickly reach the cessation of the depravities.”
20. Then prince Bodha lifted his upper body, stretched out his right arm and greatly delighted uttered a solemn utterance: “Oh the Buddha, oh the doctrine, oh the community, oh how well taught is the doctrine whereby now a noble disciple, possessed of five qualities of a strenuous one, will quickly reach the cessation of the depravities in this law and discipline!”

⁴² Cf. *SHT* V 1103 recto 3-4 with note 4 (p. 98).

⁴³ For parallel passages cf. *SWTF* s.v. *tat-kara*.

Abbreviations

- Avś* = *Avadānaśataka*, ed. J.S. SPEYER, St. Petersburg 1902-1909 (Bibliotheca Buddhica, 3).
- DN* = *The Dīgha Nikāya*, ed. T.W. RHYS DAVIDS, J. ESTLIN CARPENTER, 3 vols., London 1890-1911 (Pali Text Society).
- MN* = *Majjhima-Nikāya*, ed. V. TRENCKNER, Robert CHALMERS, 3 vols., London 1888-1899 (Pali Text Society).
- MPS* = *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, Teil I-III, ed. Ernst WALDSCHMIDT, Berlin 1950-1951 (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1949,1, 1950,2-3).
- Mvy* = *Mahāvvyutpatti*, ed. Ryōzaburō SAKAKI, 2 vols., Kyōto 1916-1925.
- PTSD* = *The Pali Text Society's Pali-English Dictionary*, ed. T.W. RHYS DAVIDS, William STEDE, London 1921-1925.
- SHT* = *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil 1-8, ed. Ernst WALDSCHMIDT, Lore SANDER, Klaus WILLE, Wiesbaden 1965-2000 (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, X,1-8).
- Sv* = *The Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī, Buddhaghosa's Commentary on the Dīghanikāya*, ed. W. Stede, T.W. Rhys Davids and J. Estlin Carpenter, 3 vols., London 1889-1932.
- SWTF* = *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, begonnen von Ernst Waldschmidt, hrsg. von Heinz BECHERT, bearbeitet von Georg von SIMSON und Michael SCHMIDT, Lieferung 1-15, Göttingen 1973ff.

Bibliography

- BONGARD-LEVIN, G.M.
1989 "Three New Fragments of the Bodharājakumārasūtra from Eastern Turkestan," *JAOS* 109, 509-512.
- BONGARD-LEVIN, G.M., and M.I. VOROB'EVA-DESJATOVSKAJA
1990 *Pamjatniki indijskoj pis'mennosti iz central'noj azii*. Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarij, vypusk 2, Moskva (Bibliotheca Buddhica, 34).
- HARTMANN, Jens-Uwe
1989 "Fragmente aus dem Dīrghāgama der Sarvāstivādins," *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen u. Neueditionen*, 1, Göttingen 1989 (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 2), 37-67.
1992 *Untersuchungen zum Dīrghāgama der Sarvāstivādins*, Göttingen (still unpublished Habilitation thesis).
1994 "Der Ṣaṣṣūtraka-Abschnitt des in Ostturkistan überlieferten Dīrghāgama," *XXV. Deutscher Orientalistentag, Vorträge*, ed. Cornelia WUNSCH, Stuttgart (ZDMG, Supplementum, 10), 324-334.
2000 "Bemerkungen zu einer neuen Handschrift des Dīrghāgama," *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka. Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, ed. Christine CHOJNACKI, J.-U. HARTMANN u. Volker M. TSCHANNERL, Swisttal-Odendorf (Indica et Tibetica, 37), 359-367.
2002 "Further Remarks on the New Manuscript of the Dīrghāgama," *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies* 5, 133-150.
- HONJŌ Yoshifumi

- 1984 *A Table of Āgama-Citations in the Abhidharmakośa and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā*, Part I, Kyoto.
- IWAMATSU Asao
- 1990 “Bonbun Agon-gyō zasso,” *Sankō Bunka Kenkyūjo Nempō* 22, 127-153.
- 1996 “A Supplementary Comment on the *SHT* Cat. Nos. 32, 33” [in Japanese], *Indian Thoughts and Buddhist Culture, Essays in Honour of Professor Junkichi Imanishi on His Sixtieth Birthday*, Tokyo, 708-694 (241-255).
- MITTAL, Kusum
- 1957 *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus. I: Fragmente des Daśottarasūtra aus zentralasiatischen Sanskrit-Handschriften*, Berlin.
- SADAKATA Akira
- 1999 “Girugitto syahon: Tenson-kyō danpen no kaidoku” [“The Gilgit Manuscript: Deciphering the Mahagovindasūtra Fragment”], *Daihōrin*, January 1999, 30-35.
- SKILLING, Peter
- 1994 *Mahāsūtras. Great Discourses of the Buddha. Vol I: Texts. Critical editions of the Tibetan Mahāsūtras with Pāli and Sanskrit counterparts as available*, Oxford (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, 44).
- STACHE-ROSEN, Valentina
- 1968 *Dogmatische Begriffsreihen im älteren Buddhismus. II: Das Saṅgītisūtra und sein Kommentar Saṅgītiparyāya*, Teil 1-2, Berlin.
- VOGEL, Claus and Klaus WILLE
- 1992 “Some more Fragments of the Pravrajyāvastu Portion of the Vinayavastu Manuscript Found Near Gilgit,” *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen und Neueditionen II*, Göttingen (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 4), 65-109.
- WALDSCHMIDT, Ernst
- 1980 “Central Asian Sūtra Fragments and Their Relation to the Chinese Āgamas,” *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung* (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, II), ed. Heinz BECHERT, Göttingen (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 117), 136-174 (= Ernst WALDSCHMIDT, *Ausgewählte Kleine Schriften*, ed. Heinz BECHERT, Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ, Stuttgart 1989, 370-408).