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ABSTRACT

The focus of this study is on the manuscript of the *Pimgalāṭreya* 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 *Pimgalāṭreya* 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 *Pimgalāṭreya* 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 *Pimgalāṭreya* 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.
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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 jihvāmūlīya
h upadhmānīya

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

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

The focus of this study is on the manuscript of the Pingalātreya 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 Pingalātreya 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 Pingalātreya sūtra and the (Mūla)sarvāstivāda tradition.

The study is done by, firstly, getting acquainted with the lexical scope and syntactic structures of the Pingalātreya 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 Pingalātreya 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 Pingalātreya 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 Pīṭaka of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins in original language is confirmed. Until recently only a greater part of the Vinaya Pīṭaka and single fragments of the Abhidharma Pīṭaka 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 Routs 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 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 Pimgalātreya 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. 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 Pimgalātreya 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 Pimgalātreya 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 Hinayāna 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 purpose\(^4\) 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 *Pimgalātreyā* 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 *Pimgalātreyā* 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.


\(^6\) 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 Piṅgalātreya sūtra by providing similar textual material;
3) The research that has been done on works where the similar fragments to the text of the Piṅgalātreya 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 Piṅgalātreya 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 Piṅgalātreya sūtra) by the Japanese scholar Kazunobu Matsuda (2006) reveals a number of facts that are of great importance for the study of the Piṅgalātreya 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 Pingalātreya sūtra.

The second category of sources – the ones providing similar text material to the Pingalātreya 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 Pingalātreya 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 Pingalātreya 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 Saṅghabhedaavastu, a text corpus belonging to the Vinaya literature of the Mūlasarvāstivādins provides as much as two thirds of similar textual material to the Pingalātreya sūtra.

The same text fragment as that in Sanskrit from the Saṅghabhedaavastu 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 Pingalātreya 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 Pingalātreya may appear difficult to translate in English.

The instance of similar text piece from the Chinese translation that covers approximately one third of the Pingalātreya sūtra occurs in the Chinese Samyukta Āgama 雑阿含經(zááhánjīng) (the Connected Discourses), T 2, number 99 and is translated by
Guṇabhadra (求那跋陀羅) 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 Pimgalātreya sūtra are found - the Śrāmanyaphala 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 Pimgalātreya is found in the Śrāmanyaphala 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 Pimgalātreya sūtra appears.

As mentioned in the description of the first category of sources, a similar fragment to the Pimgalātreya 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 Pimgalātreya 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)saṃvāstīvādins the Pimgalātreya 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 Śilaskandha 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 Mahāsāṃghika-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. Until the last decade of the 1900s, when the bundle of manuscripts containing the Dīrgahāgama of the (Mūla)sarvāstivādins in Sanskrit was discovered, this collection was not available neither in translations nor in original. Only two versions of the Dīrgahāgama were preserved – the Dīgha Nikāya collection in Pāli of the Theravādins and the collection of the Dīrgahāgama 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 Dīrgahāgama. While there are, for example, 34 suttas in the Pāli Dīgha Nikāya, there are 47 sūtras in the Dīrgahāgama 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. 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.

**Challenges in trying to place the Pimgalātreyā sūtra in Buddhist historical context**

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

---

8 I refer to, for example, the Gāliya sutta in the Dīgha Nikāya and the Pimgalātreyā sūtra in the Dīrgahāgama 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 Dīrgahāgama manuscript in collation with contents of the Dīrgahāgama of the Theravādins, the Chinese Dīrgahāgama 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 Dīrgahāgama 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 Rājagrha 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. 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 away\(^\text{13}\) is traditionally ascribed to a disagreement on particular *vinaya* issues. In order to lessen the contradictory outlook between Lamotte and Frauwalner 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 *Mahāvibhāṣa*, the great commentary, the, they have either united themselves or the one has been eclipsed by the other, for only the name ‘Kaśmīra-vaiḥāśikas’ or simply ‘Vaibhāṣikas’ appear (Takakusu 1905:119). The *Mahāvibhāṣa* has been probably compiled during the 2\(^\text{nd}\) century AD that shows to be in the king Kaniṣṭha’s time (Lamotte 1988:277). The mentioning of the *Mahāvibhāṣa* 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 *Mahāvibhāṣa* 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 Kaniṣṭha’s time, the Vaibhāṣika School is believed to have been already present (Puri 1987:100). Nevertheless, the king Kaniṣṭha 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.\(^\text{14}\) 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-xxii; 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 Mūlasarvāstivāda school 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 Sarvāstivāda school (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 Sarvāstivāda school.

It is stated by several scholars\(^{15}\) 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 ‘Mūlasarvāstivāda’ and the ‘Sarvāstivāda’ 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 Pimgalātreya sūtra and with Buddhist literature generally, since I intend to examine Buddhist texts which could possibly contain similar fragments to parts of the Pimgalātreya 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. Greetham who provides a general survey of textual scholarship aimed at European literature and Shivaganesha R. S. Murthy, 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 change\(^{19}\) (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 difficilest 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 (Kjørup 2005:209f). In the critical editing of the *Pimgalātreya sūtra* 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 *Pimgalātreya sūtra* 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 *Pimgalātreya sūtra* constitutes two and a half folios out of 454 folios. Folio numbers for the *Pimgalātreya sūtra* 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 *Pimgalātreya sūtra* 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 fainted in course of time and/or have become illegible due to abrasion. There is a square-like string hole 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, Pingalātreya, 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 “Pingalātreya” 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 Pingalātreya sūtra**

Among the manuscripts found in Gilgit, two script types whose origin goes back to the Kuśāṇa 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 Pingalātreya 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 Śahi 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 Pingalātreya sūtra.

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

- \( \text{daṇḍa} \) occurs seven times, two times placed wrongly (right: 367v5, 368v6, 369r3, 369r4 two times; wrong: 367r5 and 367v8).
- \( \text{daṇḍa} \) double occurs once and marks the end of the sūtra (369r5).
- \( \text{virāma} \) occurs once in 367v8 together with daṇḍa, 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. 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 Criegern (2002:5).
coincides with unconnected *sandhi*\(^{27}\) between two words, a *daṇḍa* in the form of \(\mid\) 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 \(\text{ṣ}a\)s and in optative case *vadet* (3. person, singular) of the verb root \(\text{v}a\)d.\(^{29}\) 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*<\(\text{t}\)> *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* *adrṣṭa* (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*<\(\text{d}\)> *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 *āyuṣmān* 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* *adrṣṭa* 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 *āyuṣmān* 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 \(\mid\) 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 \(\text{dāt}\) has been previously observed by Melzer (2006:55). There are only two instances of ablative form –\(\text{dāt}\) 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. While the instances where scribe E writes *visarga* and where he does not are irregular and difficult to explain, for example, (367r5, 367r6) *pīngalātreyāḥ* *parivrāja* and (367r7) *mātrṭaḥ pīṭṛtaḥ*, as well as (367v3) *saṃpannaḥ* *sugato* and (367r8) *pūragaḥ sanīghaṇḍu*, in the folio of scribe C (369r5) *visarga* in *pīngalātreyāḥ* *parivrāja*ko 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* – *bhagavān* (367r5, 367v4); *āyuṣmān* (368r3, 368v6); *asmiṃ* (368r5, 368v7); *abhinaṃdyā* (369r5).

Instead of palatal *ṅ* - *saṃramjanīṃ* (367r6); *paṃcāmānāṃ* (367r8).

Instead of velar *ṅ* - *pīngalātreyāḥ* (367r5, 367r6, 369r5); *śaṅk<ɦ>a~* (368v8).

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

Instances with incorrect sandhi:

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

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

*lābhīna > lobhena* (368r1); *eṣā > esa* (368v3); *ātyṣmaṇ > āyuṣmān* (368r5), *ṛṛ<hi>ṇe > grhiṇā* (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: *svasti > nvasti* (367v6); (369r3). *na* instead of *ca* (368v7), *va* instead of *pa* in *varān > paran* (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: \(32\) saddhārant > sa dharmam \((367v4)\); \(33\) saṃmohā > sa mohā \((368r6, 368r1)\); sukhāya > duḥkhāya \((368r7, 368v1)\); \(34\) bhagavatī > bhavatī \((367r7)\); \(35\) adhyāvasatī > adhyāvasatā \((368v8)\). \(36\)

Dittography (going back too far in the exemplar line):
nyāyenāryeṇa > nyāyenārye \((367v2)\); tathā (too many times) \((368r1)\); paṇḍita (too many times) \((368v6)\); yathāpitattad > yathāpitad \((368v6)\); there is an instance of one whole paragraph repeated \((367v1-2)\) āhosvin nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa mohō <'>prahīno
<'>parijñāto yena mohenābhīhūṭaḥ paryāttacitto <'>jñātaiva saṃjñātāh(a)m (asmiṭī va)(v2)ded adraṣṭāva saṃdraṣṭāham asmiṭī vade<]> parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayed yat teṣām syā<d> dīrgharātram <an>arthaḥya <a>hitā(ya) duḥkhā(ya).

Confusion of words of similar shape and/or meaning:

palītaḥ lopita > lapita lāpana \((367v2)\);

Other instances with word confusions:
yadā > evam \((367v1)\); ayām > aham \((367v1)\); tathā > te \((368r2)\); yeṣu > ye \((368r3)\); śrutvā > śraddhāṁ \((368v7)\); śaṅkalikṛtaṁ > śaṅkalikhitam \((368v8)\).

TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Contents and concordance
Although there does not exist an exact parallel to the Pingalātreya 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 duḥkhā are (‘)arthāya, (‘)hitāya, it may have appeared to the scribe that duḥkhā in this line seems to be interrupting the context and he has therefore changed it to sukhā. The instances occur twice, one after another. However, duḥkhā 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 bhokautama brāhmaṇo.
36 Preceding words are sukaram ~ <'>gāram and also words after adhyāvasatā continue to end on m.
38 It may possibly be treated under ‘confusion of words of similar shape and/or meaning’.
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not been preserved in languages they have been composed in, have survived in translations. Therefore the overview of contents of the *Pingalātreya* 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 *Pingalātreya* sūtra can be divided into three parts: Parivrajaka Ātreya’s conversation with the Buddha, the longer version of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict and continuation as in the *Tridānti* 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 Piṅgala 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.

*Pingalātreya* 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.
Pimgalātreya sūtra 2.1 – 2.9


Part 3
The Tathāgata-Predict is not expounded further here, but instead is given reference to the preceding Tridāntisūtra 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 Ātreyā in the first part of the sūtra. Ātreyā is satisfied with the Buddha’s answer, salutes him and leaves.

Pimgalātreya sūtra 3.1 – 3.3


Analysis and commentary

Part 1
Sūtra begins with the formulary evaṁ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye which traditionally is said to confirm a sūtra’s authentic status.39 Whether this phrase indeed legitimates the Pimgalātreya or occurs arbitrary in it, whether it refers to the sūtra’s authorized position in the Śilaskandha section or its position in the Dirghāgama manuscript is generally not easy to conclude considering the fact that there are 18 sūtras in the Dirghāgama 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: evaṁ mayā śrutam ekasmin samaye (Thus I have once heard). (Étienne Lamotte: “The assessment of textual authenticity in Buddhism” (1983-4:6)).

40 Gudrun Melzer has pointed out sūtras in the whole Dirghāgama 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 Anguttara Nikāya many suttas start without any introduction. It would be interesting to check if sūtras from the Dirghāgama which do not have this introduction formulary would have similarities with any of suttas from the Anguttara Nikāya.
reciter’s own preferences. However, in the Pīrīgalātreya’s case the place is Rājagrha (modern Raigir), 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 Pīrīgalātreya 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 Rājagrha, 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 Pīrīgalātreya is the threefold knowledge (traividyā). The Buddha’s method of discussion in the sūtras of the Śilaskandha 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 Pīrīgalātreya the religious mendicant Ātreyya from Pīrīgala 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 Śilaskandha section, a sūtra immediately preceding the Pīrīgalātreya sūtra, is Tridaṃḍin, as was the name of one of the largest congregations of parivrājakas (wondering mendicants) in the time of the Buddha - the “Tredaṃḍikas” (Lamotte 1988:53). Also the name of the Ātreyya could probably refer back to one of the popular writings in the Vedas – the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa or Aitareya Āranyaka 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 Tikannā 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 – Tīkaṇṇa, the ‘Three-Eared or Three Ears’. The name *Tīkaṇṇa* may infer śruti (‘that what is heard’) and in this way refer to the term *traividyā* 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 *Tīkaṇṇa* could possibly have some connection to *Trīdāḍin* as both names may convey some likeness. However, I would like to argue that *Trīdāḍin* and *Piṅgalatreyā* 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 “Tredāḍikas” or texts connected to Brahmins, such as *Aitareya* four Vedas: Ṛg Veda, Sāma Veda, Yajur Veda, and Atharva Veda. The reason why it is referred to the *traividyā* – 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 *Piṅgalatreyā* 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 Ātreyā 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 Ātreyā, ‘pure’ is the key concept in acquiring the knowledge of Brahmins. The ‘pure’ 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 ‘pure’ 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 uṣṭhapraḥatamātrakena na lapita lāpana*), 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 >Ātreyā – can a vrddhi change in the first syllable be possible?
by the Buddha. According to Gombrich (1996:29f) the concept of ‘traividyā’ in Buddhism was intended to “parallel and trump the ‘three knowledges’ of Brahmins”. Traividyā 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 Tikānṇa 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 Dīghāgama manuscript have been studied, one can only draw hypothetical conclusions. Nevertheless, I tend to think that in the process of creation of this Dīghāgama collection, the (Mūla)saṅgītivādins 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 Tridāṇḍī 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 Tridāṇḍī 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 Śīlakhandhaka 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 Dīghāgama 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 Tridāṇḍī sūtra and the Jānussoṇi sutta which may have had one common source text (2006:134).
Samyuktagrama, (‘Connected Discourses’) (Glass 2006:21). This sutra appears to have a very interesting relation with the Pimgalatreya and with a text piece in the Tikanṇa sutta which is parallel to the Pimgalatreya. The Chinese sutra is exactly as long as the first part of the Pimgalatreya with the only difference that in the Chinese sutra the Buddha also, as in the Tikanṇa 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 sutra. 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 sutras in the Chinese collection may have had subject(s) related to and involving the participation of Brahmins. The place name given in this sutra differs from the one in the Pimgalatreya. 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 Pimgalatreya 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 Pimgalatreya is the third line from above in the verse:

悉知心解脫 (xīzhīxīnjiětūō)
‘Be fully aware of liberation of the mind’

This condition is directly equivalent to the idea of elimination of the afflictive hindrances. The significant element here is that akiṃalamāla – the three roots of evil which appear much later in the Pimgalatreya sutra, 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

Pingalātreya sūtra; as for here, it just suffices to say that to create a link in discussion between traṇidyā 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 Pingalātreya 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 introduction 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 Tathāga-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 Śrāmanyaphala sūtra (T 1, vol. 1, pp. 107a-109, partly also from the Chinese version of the Ambāṭṭha sutta, T 1, vol. 1, pp. 83c3-86c15) in comparison with the Pāli Sāmaññaphala sutta and the Sanskrit version of the Śrāmanyaphala sūtra as preserved in the Sanghabhedavastu. As the ‘longer version’ of the Tathāgata-Predict is only found in the Śrāmanyaphala sūtra of the Sanghabhedavastu, 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 Śrāmanyaphala 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 Sanghabhedavastu. One of these three sūtras in the Dīrghāgama manuscript is the Piṅgalātreya 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 Caṇkī sutta of the Majjima Nikāya. While the compositional structure in the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict is identical to lines of the Piṅgalātreya and the Sanghabhedavastu, 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 Piṅgalātreya and the Sanghabhedavastu occurs in their omission of the observance of dveṣa (‘hatred’) within the three evil roots of mind. Moreover, in the Kāmathika sūtra⁴⁸ (number 19 in the Yuga section of the Dīrghāgama) which is the Sanskrit counterpart to the Pāli Caṇkī sutta, as well as in the Lauhitya sūtra (number 27 in the Śīlaskandha section, the next sūtra after the Piṅgalātreya 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 Sanghabhedavastu the omission remains.

As the Piṅgalātreya 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 Piṅgalātreya sūtra. As for the rest of it, it is referred to the Tridāṇḍī sūtra (pūrvavad vistareṇa yathā tṛdaṇḍisūtre). Still, it is not the Tridāṇḍī 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). Despite the Trīdāntī 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 Trīdāntī sūtra as the sūtra forming the Śīlaskandha section of the Dīrghāgama collection, most likely that of the Sarvāstivādins (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 Cāṇāki sūta which constitutes a Pāli parallel to the Pimgalātreyā sūtra in this subject matter. The corresponding text passage in the Cāṇāki sutta is presented in a different context, not as a part of the Tathāgata-Predict. Moreover, the Tathāgata-Predict does not appear in the Cāṇāki 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 Cāṇāki 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; wheather 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 Pimgalātreyā 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 Pimgalātreyā 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 Pīṅgalātreya, 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 part\(^{53}\) 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 Pīṅgalātreya 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 Pīṅgalātreya), 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 (rddhi) that leads one to the highest insight (prajñā).
four stages in a Brahmin’s life. The objective of the ‘longer version’ of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict in the Piṅgalatreyā 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 akuṣalamāla(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 akuṣalamāla(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 Piṅgalatreyā 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 Piṅgalatreyā. However, it is hard to explain why the part about the three akuṣalamāla(s) in the Saṅghabhādavastu is omitted in the translation of 義浄 (Yì-jìng) who translated the Vinayaavastu in 710 AD. The part in question appears in the Tibetan translation. The place where Yì-jìng acquired a manuscript of the Saṅghabhādavastu was the Buddhist monastic university at Nālandā in India 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, and the Saṅghabhādavastu 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 (brahmacārya), second is householder (grāhastha), third is hermit or forest dweller (vanaprastha), and fourth – the renouncer (saṃnyāsa).
55 The complete version of the Vinaya text corpus where the Saṅghabhādavastu 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 characterised as with omissions and inversions ‘even in the translated parts’ in addition to the fact that several sections of the Saṅghabhādavastu were not translated at all (Gnoli 1977:xxiii, vol I).
57 For the account of why ten vastu from the whole corpus of the Vinayaavastu 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 Yi-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 Yi-jìng did not know about it. However, this kind of assumption seems unlikely. Improbable is also that Yi-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 Yi-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 Yi-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 Mūlasarvāstivādins appear only in Yi-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 Piṃgalātreya sūtra, the part in the sūtra where the Śīlaskandha section should start is omitted with a reference to the Tridāṇḍī sūtra. Yet, as if after the Śīlasaskandha section – the Tathāgata-Predict, the Buddha gives answer to the question asked in the beginning of the sūtra about what is traśvīdyā in the Buddhist sense (3.2). The Chinese parallel to the part 1 of the Piṃgalātreya discussed earlier had also a verse where the Buddha gives the answer regarding the traśvīdyā that seems a rather expanded answer because it does not have a Sanskrit counterpart in the corresponding place in the Piṃgalātreya. 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 Piṃgalātreya.
Both verses are displayed and compared here:
pūrvenīvāsāṁ yo vetti svargā (r4) (pā)yāṁś ca paśyati l
atha jātiṅkṣayaṁ prāpto <’>bhijñāvyavasito muniḥ <l>
cittaṁ vimuktāṁ⁵⁹ jānāti muktāṁ rāgeṇa sarvasāḥ <l>
{tad}<tam> ahaṁ vadāmi traividyāṁ na yo lapitapāvakaḥ l

1. line
pūrvenīvāsāṁ yo vetti svargā (r4) (pā)yāṁś ca paśyati l
知一切宿命 (zhīyīqièsùmìng) 已生天惡趣 (yīshēngtiānèqù)
Chinese equivalent for nivāsam ‘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 (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)yāṁś in Sanskrit meaning ‘heaven and
destruction’, the corresponding sign in Chinese 天悪趣 (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 jātiṅkṣayaṁ prāpto <’>bhijñāvyavasito muniḥ <l>
得斷生漏盡 (déduànshēnglòujìn) 是為牟尼通 (shīwéimóunítōng)

⁵⁹ In Pāli version - visuddham.
First word in Sanskrit *atha* ‘then’ does not have a counterpart in Chinese. Sanskrit *jātikṣayaṁ* ‘destruction of births’ is denoted exactly by 斷生 (duànshēng) ‘cut off births’; yet, Chinese translation extend ‘the cutting off births’ by 滅盡 (liùjìn) ‘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 *’bhijñavyavasito* ‘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’ – abhijñā. It is interesting to note the use of 是 (shì) which usually is translated as ‘it’, but here it denotes ‘he’. Chinese 卒尼 (móuní) transcription for Sanskrit *muni* ‘sage’ is frequent in Buddhist texts. Consequently, apart from the extension 滅盡 (liùjìn), the Chinese line is an exact translation of Sanskrit.

3. line
cittaṁ vimuktaṁ jāñāti muktaṁ rāgeṇa sarvaśaḥ <1>
悉知心解脱(xīzhīxīnjiětuō) 一切貪恚癡 (yǐqiètānhuíchī)
This line has already been analysed in the textual criticism of part 1.
cittaṁ ‘mind’ – 心 (xīn); vimuktaṁ ‘liberated’ – 解脱 (jiětuō); jāñāti ‘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 (tānhuíchī) – lobha, dveṣa, mohā ‘greed, hatred, delusion’. It is interesting to note that there is *visuddham* ‘purified’ in the Pāli parallel to this line instead of *vimuktaṁ* ‘liberated’ in Sanskrit. *visuddham* is not confirmed by the Chinese translation either, where it is also 解脫 (jiětuō) ‘freed’.

4. line
{tad}<tam> ahaṁ vadāmi traividyāṁ na yo lapitāpāvakaḥ ।
我說是三明(wòshuōshìsānmíng) 非言語所說(fēiyángrúsuǒshuō)
tam ‘it’ – 是 (shì). Again, as in the 2. line 是 (shì) denotes ‘he’; ahaṁ ‘I’ – 我; vadāmi ‘praise’ – 說; traividyāṁ ‘threefold knowledge’ – 三明 (sānmíng). The first part of the line is precise.

---

Second line as well, since \textit{na} ‘not’ – \textit{非(fēi)}; \textit{yo} ‘one who/he who’ – \textit{所(suō)}; \textit{lapitapāvakah} ‘one whose speech is pure’ – \textit{言語所説(yán yü suō shuō)} ‘one whose speech is (mere) words’.

\textbf{TRANSLITERATION}

\textit{367}recto

4 evaṁ māyā .r. +
5 m ekasm[mi .[s].[m]. y. bhagavāṁ rājakṛṣhe viharati | veṣūvōvane kalandakanivāpe atha pīṃgalātreyā parivrājako yena bhagavāṁs tenopa[saṃkrānta] upasasmkrāmya bhagavatā + +
6 saṃmukham saṃmodanāṁ saṃramaṇanāṁ vividhām kathām vyatiśāryaikānte niṣaṇ[ṇ]aḥ ekānta niṣaṇṇaḥ pīṃgalātreyā parivrājako bhagavataḥ puratas tathā[d ud]ānam u[d]ā + +

\textit{367}verso

1 ṭabhānāṁ sākṣaraprabhēdānāṁ itihāsapaṃcāmānāṁ padaśom vyākaro bhirūpo darsanīyaḥ prāsādikāḥ yadā bho gautama vrāhma[ṇ]āṁ traividyo bhavati na khālve ayā[m]ātreyā .. + + + + +
2 trakeṇa na palitāḥ lopitā[ḥ]takenār[y]e dharmavinaye traividyaṁ prajñāpayāmi yan nv aham āryena nyāyenaḥ bhavāṁ dharmavinaye traividyaṁ prajñāpayāmi [y]. thā .. tham bhavāṁ gau[t]. .. + + +
nyāyenārye dharmavina[ye] traṇīḍvyaṁ ṛ. jñāpayati iḥātreya śaśtvā loka
utpadyate tathāgato rhan samyaṅsaṁbhuddho vidyācaraṇasaṁpanna sugato lokavid
anu .. +

puṟusadamyāsārathīḥ [ś]āśtvā devamanasyaṅāṁ buddho o bhagavāṁ saddharmam
desayatā ādau kalyāṇaṁ madhye kalyāṇaṁ paryavāśāne kalyāṇaṁ svartham
svuṣyāmaṁ kevalaṁ paripūrṇam pari .. +

parya .. ..ṃ ra[h]macaryaṁ prakāṣayati | taṁ khalu dharmaṁ śrōṇoti grhapatir
vā grhapatiṇputro vā sa taṁ dharmaṁ śrutvā śāstus trṣu sthāneṣu viṣuddhiṁ
samaneṣate tadyathā lobhadha [me]

dveṣadharme mohaharame kiṁ svasty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa loṁbho prahīṇo pariṇāto
nirodho vāntīkṛto yena lobheṇāḥbhibhūtaḥ paryāttacitto jñātaiva samjñāṭāhama .. .
ti vaded adṛṣṭaiva saṁdṛṣṭaṁh asmīti vade parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayed
yat teṁśyā āṅgahraṭram arthāya hitāya duḥkhāya āhosvin nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ
sa lobho prahīṇo

pariṇāto nirahido vāntīkṛto yena lobheṇāḥbhibhūtaḥ paryāttacitto jñātaiva
sam* | jñāṭāham asmīti vaded adṛṣṭaiva saṁdṛṣṭaṁh asmīti vade varān vā
ta[thā]

368recto

1 tathā tathā pratipādayet teṁśyā āṅgahraṭ[t]ram arthāya hitāya duḥkhāya
tasyaivaṁ bhavati nāsty āyuṣmataḥ sa lobho prahīṇo pariṇāto nirahido
vāntīkṛto yena lābhānābhibhūtaḥ paryā
ttacitto jñātaiva sanjñāṭāhama asmīti vaded adṛṣṭaiva saṁdrṣṭaṁh asmīti
vade parād vā tathā tathā pratipādayed yat teṁśyā āṅgahraṭram arthāya
hitāya
dukhāya tat kasya hetos tathā

2 h śaḥ āṣāṣmataḥ kāyaṣamśkārā vāk[ś]amśkār[ā] yeṣu aölubdhasya yaś ca
kamcid eṣā vāyuṣmāṁ dharmaṁ bhāṣate samkṣiptena vā vistareṇa vā śānto sya
sa dharmaḥ prāṇīto gambhīro

gambhīrāvabhāso dusparśo duranubodhaḥ atarkyo taṅkāvacaraḥ sūk[ś]manipuṇa
paṇḍitavājñavedanīya sa cāṇeṇāyuṣmatā na sukaram ājñātum yathāpi tad ekānta
368verso

1 dyat teśāṃ syād dirgharātram arthāya hitāya [s]ukhāya āhosvin nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa moho prahīṇο pariṇātaḥ yena mohe[n]ābhībhuṭaḥ paryāttacitto jñā[ti]v[sa]māṃṣatāḥ h. [m]. .. + +


3 pariṇātaḥ nirodhito [v]āṇṭikṛto yena mohenābhībhuṭaḥ[ḥ] paryāttacitto jñātaiva saṃjñātāḥham as.ḥi tu vaded adraśṭaiva saṃdṛ[ṣṭ]āḥ ham asmīti vadat pa[r]āḥ .. vā tathā ..

4 thā pratipādayet teśāṃ syā dirgharātram arthāya ○ hitāya duḥkhāya tat kasya hetoḥ tesyāyuṣmaḥ ..ḥ kāyasam[ṣ]kāṛaye [a]muḍḥasya ya[m] ca ki. c. d eṣāyuṣmān dharmāṃ +

5 śate saṃkṣiptena vā vistaretāḥ vā śanāḥ sya sa ○ dharmah praṇīto ga[m]bhīro gambhīrāvabhāso durdu[r]ṣo durāravabohda atarkyo tarp[ā]khavacaraḥ sūkṣmanipuṇa paṇḍi

6 ta paṇḍita viṇṇavedaṇīya sa cāneyāyuṣmataḥ ○ na sukaram ājñātum yathāpitattad ekāntamūḍhe[n]a amūḍho yam āyuṣmā nāyam āyuṣmā[m] [mū]ḍha iti yā[da] caina
m asmiṃ tṛṣīye mohadharme viśuddham samanupasyati athātākāravat[īṃ] śrutvā [n]iveśayati śraddhājāta idaṃ pratisamcaṣte saṃbādho grhāvasso raja[sā]m āvāso bhyavakāsāṃ na pravra

8 jyā tad idaṃ na sukaram grnegaram adhyāvasam ekāntāsamkalī[kt]am yāvajīvam kevalam pariṁnāṃ pariṣuddham pa[r]yavadātam vrahmacaryam caritum ya .. haṃ keśaṃsārv avatārya kāṣāyāṇi vastrāṇy ācchādya samyag eva ..

369recto

1 .[dh]. yā agārād anagārikāṃ pravrajeyam iti sa idaṃ pratisamkhyaīlpaṃ vā bhoga skandham prahāya prabhūtam vālpam vājñātiparivarttam prahāya pradhūtam vā keśaṃsārv avatārya kāṣāyāṇi vastrāṇyācchādya


3 [na prā]ṇātipātam prahāya prāṇātipātāḥ prativirato o bhavati l nihataandaḥo nihataṇastra pū[ṛ]vavad vi .. reṇa yathā tṛdaṇḍiṣūtre tatrako viśeṣah pūrve nivāsam yo vetti svargā

4 .. yāṃśca paśyati l atha jātiṣṣayaṃ prāpto bhijñā vya o [va]sito muniḥ citam vimuktaṃ jānāti muktaṃ radeṇa sarvasaḥ tad ahaṃ vadāmi traṇidyām na yo [la]pi[t]apāvakaḥ l atha

5 .. gālātreyah parivṛjako bhagavato bhāṣiṣṭam abhināṃḍyānumodya bh[gava]tontikāt prakrāntaḥ ||

**RECONSTRUCTION**

1. 1(367r4) evaṃ mayā (ś)r(uta)(r5)m ekasmī(ṇ) s(ā)m(ā)y(e) bhagavāṃ rājagrhe viharati{l} 61 veṇuvane kalandakanivāpe |

---

61 As mentioned in the chapter 'Punctuation in the Pingalātreya sūtra', the interpunctuation signs are applied insufficiently and unsystematically in this manuscript. Therefore, the supply or cancellation of dantha in the reconstruction will not be commented upon.
Thus have I heard: Once the Lord was staying at Rājaṁgra in a bamboo grove called ‘Squirrel’s feeding place’.

Cf. MN I, no. 24, p. 145. 14 – 15
Evaṁ me sutaṁ. Ekaṁ samayaṁ Bhagavā Rājaṁgrahe viharati Veļuvane 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 piṅgalātreyaḥ⁶² parivrājako yena bhagavāṁs tenopasaṁkrāntaḥ

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
upasaṁkramya bhagavatā (sārdham) (r6) saṁmukham saṁmodaniṁ saṁraṁjanīṁ vividhāṁ
kathāṁ vyatisāryaikānte niśaṇṇāḥ

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 Bhagavantaḥ saddhiṁ sammodi. Sammodaniṁ kathāṁ sārāṇiṁ yāṁ
vītisāretvā ekamantaṁ nisīdi.

⁶² Regarding the use of visarga see the chapter on orthography.
The religious mendicant Pimagalātreya who sat on one side stood up in front of the Lord and made a solemn utterance:

Ekāntaniṣṭhaṃ pimagalātreyaḥ parivrajaḥ brahmaṇaḥ puratāḥ puratāḥ udānām udā(naya)(r7)ti l

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

Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 5 – 6
Ekamantam nisinno kho Tikṣṇo brahmaṇo Bhagavato sammukhā tevijjānaṃ sudaṃ brahmaṇaṇānaṃ vaṇṇaṃ bhāsatī:

1. 5
ity api traividyā brahmaṇ(ā) ity api (t)raividyā brāh(m)aṇāḥ iti <l>

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 brahmaṇā, iti pi tevijjā brahmaṇā ti.

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c16
此則婆羅門三明。此則婆羅門三明。
1. 6
kiyatātreya brāhmaṇāṇāṃ 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 brāhmaṇā brāhmaṇāṃ tevijjaṃ paññāpenti 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}vty upeto māt(ṛ)taḥ pit(ṛ)taḥ saṃśuddho (r8) grahan ya aṇāksipta jātivādena gotravād(e)na yāvad āsaptamaṃ mātāmaḥ paitāmaḥ yugam upādāyādhyāpakā mantradharas trayāṣaṃ vedā(naṃ) pārāgāḥ (sanighaṇḍukai)((367v1)tabhānām63 sāksarakrabhedānām64 itihāsapaṃcamāṇāṃ padaśo{m} 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 saṃśuddhagahaṇaṇiko yāva sattamaṃ pitāmahāyugā akkhitto anupakkuṭṭhō65 jātivādena ajjhāyako mantadharo tiṇṇaṃ

---

63 In MW nigantu “name of a Vedic glossary”; in BHSD also nighantu, but as “etymology”; in PTSD as in the Pīngalātreya sūtra nighantu “explanation, vocabulary”. In Chinese parallel 物類名字 (wùlèimíngzi) denotes meaning “vocabulary, glossary”.
64 In PTSD akkharapabheda can also be translated as “etymology”.
65 Ph. anupakutţhō; omitted in Divyāvadāna, p. 620. Compare below, 59. 1. (ed.).
A Brahmin is of perfect form, handsome and lovely.

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

---

66 The beginning of this Sanskrit line was reconstructed according to Pāli parallel as yadā did not suit to the context. There is ‘T’ 我 (wǒ) in Chinese.
1. 10

na khalv{ayām} <aham>\(^{67}\) ātreya (uṣṭhaprahatamā)\(^{68}\)(v2)trakeṇa na {palitah}
<lapita>{lopita}<l pa m\(^{69}\)mātrakenārye dhamavinaye traividyam praṇāpayāmi yan nv
aham āryena nyāyenāryeṇa{ṇa} dhamavinaye traividyam praṇāpayāmi <\>  

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

Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 17 – 18

Aññathā kho brāhmaṇa brāhmaṇaṃ tevijjaṃ paññāpenti, aññathā ca pana ariyassa vinaye tevijjo hoṭī ti.

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c23 – 25

佛告婆羅門。我不以名字言説為三明也。賢聖法聞説真要實三明。謂賢聖知見。賢聖法律真實三明

1. 11

(ya)thā (ka)tham bhavām gaut(ama)ryena) (v3) nyāyenārye dhamavinaye traividyam
(p)r(a)jñāpayati <\>

How then, venerable Gautama, can the knower of the threefold knowledge in the holy Dhamavinaya 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 oṣṭhapahatamattena lapitalāpanamattena. Then could a remainder of damaged u be recognized in the manuscript.

\(^{69}\) As palitah 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 lapitapāvakah that means “speech that is pure”; palitah lopita may thus be also reconstructed as lapitapāvaka, since palitah lopita can be considered as misreading for both lapitalāpana and lapitapāvaka.
Cf. AN III, no. 58, p. 163. 19 – 21
Yathākathāṃ pana bho Gotama ariyassa vinaye tevijjo hoti. Sādhu 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。瞿昙。賢聖知見。賢聖法律所說三明。

2. 1
ihātreyā sāstā loka utpadyate tathāgato ’rhan samyaksambuddho vidyācaraṇasampannaḥ
sugato lokavid anu(ttara)ḥ (v4) puruṣadamyasārathiḥ sāstā devamanuṣyāṇāṁ buddho
bhagavāṁ <\>

Here, Ātreyā, 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 sāstā loka utpadyate tathāgato ’rhan samyaksambuddhaḥ vidyācaraṇasampannaḥ
sugato lokavid anuttaraḥ puruṣadamyasārathiḥ sāstā devamanuṣyāṇāṁ buddho bhagavān;\1

Cf. AN III, no. 60, p. 168. 26 – 28
Idha Tathāgato loke uppaţati arahaṃ sammāsambuddho vijācaraṇasampanno sugato
lokavidū anuttaro purisadamasārathi satthā devamanussānaṁ buddho Bhagavā.

2. 2
sa {d}harmaṃ deśayaty ādau kalyāṇaṁ madhye kalyāṇaṁ paryavaśāne kalyāṇaṁ svarthaṁ
svuṣyaṁjanaṁ kevalaṁ paripūrṇaṁ pari(śuddhaṁ) (v5) parya(vadāta)m (b)rahamacaryam
prakāṣayati |

\70 In this formulary the phrase “So imaṁ lokam sadevakaṁ samārakaṁ sabrahmakaṁ sasamaṇabrāhmaṇiṁ
pajam sadevamanussaṁ sayam abhiṁñā sacchikatu pavedeti”, that usually is a part of description of the
Buddha in Pāli texts is omitted in the Pimgalātreyā 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 letter\textsuperscript{71}; he reveals the only one, completely purified, spotless way of religious life.

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 14 – 16

sa dharma deśayati, ādu kalyāṇam, madhye kalyāṇam, paryavasāne kalyāṇam, svartham, suvyañjana, kevalam, paripūrṇam, pariśuddham paryavadātam; brahmaçaryam praśāsayati;

Cf. AN III, no. 63, p. 180. 27 – 30

So dharmam deseti ādi kalyāṇam majjhe kalyāṇam pariyosānakalyāṇam sātthaṃ savyañjanaṃ kevalaparipūṇam pariśuddham brahmaçariyaṃ pakāseti.

2. 3
taṃ khalu dharmam śrṇoti grhapatir vā grhapatiputro vā </>

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

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 16 – 17

taṃ dharmaṃ śrṇoti grhapatir vā grhapatiputro vā;

Cf. MN I, no. 51, p. 344. 28 – 29

Taṃ dhammaṃ suṇāti gahapati vā gahapatiputto vā aññatarasmiṃ vā kule paccājāto.

Cf. T 2, no. 99, 223c26 – 29

婆羅門聞佛所說。

2. 3. 1

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

\textsuperscript{71}This is the traditional translation of svartham suvyamjanam in order to express clearly the contrast between artha ‘meaning’ and vyāñjana ‘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 dharmaṃ śrutvā sāsthuḥ triṣuṃ sthāneṣu viśuddhiṃ samanveṣate, yaduta lobhadharme, dveṣadharme, mohadharme;

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

… tīsu dhammesu samanvesati, lobhaniyesu dhammesu dosaniyesu dhammesu mohaniyesu dhammesu:

2. 3. 2

kim {sv} <nv> asty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa lobho 'prahīṇo 'parijñāto 'nirodho 'vāntīkṛto yena lobhenābhibhūtaḥ 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

kim nv asty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa lobhaḥ aprahīṇaḥ, aparijñātaḥ, anirdhitaḥ, avāntikṛtaḥ, yena lobhenābhibhūtaḥ paryāttacitto

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 3 – 5

Atthi nu kho imass’ āyasmato tathārūpā lobhaniyā dhammad yathārūpehi lobhaniyehi dhammehi pariyādinacitto

2. 3. 3

'jñātaiva saṃjñātāham a(smi)(v?7)ti vaded

---

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

73 Sk. Bm -نى- (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
ajānaṁ vā vadeyya jānāmīti,

2. 3. 4
adrṣṭaiva samādraṣṭāham asmīti vadeṛ

(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
apassāṁ vā vadeyya passāmīti,

2. 3. 5
parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayet yat teṣāṁ syāṛ dirgharātram <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 teṣāṁ syāt dirgharātram anarthāya, ahitāya, duḥkhāya;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 6 – 7
paraṁ vā tathattāya⁷⁴ samādapeyya yaṁ paresaṁ assa dīgharattāṁ ahitāya dukkhāyāti?

2. 3. 6
āhosvin⁷⁵ nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa lobho ’prahīno (v8) ’parijñāto ’nirodhito ’vāntikṛto yena lobhenābhībhūtaḥ 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
ahosvin nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa lobhaḥ aprahīnaḥ, aparijñātaḥ, anirodhitaḥ, avāntikṛtaḥ, yena lobhenābhībhūtaḥ paryāttacittah

2. 3. 7
’jñātaiva saṁ{1}jñātāham 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
adṛṣṭaiva saṁdṛṣṭāham asmīti vade<

*(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

tasyai\vmaṃ bhavati nāṣty āyuṣmataḥ sa lobho 'prahīṇo 'parijñāto 'nirodhito 'vāntīkṛto yena
{lā}<lo>bhi\{i}<e>nābhībhūtaḥ 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

tasyai\vmaṃ bhavati: nāṣty āyuṣmataḥ sa lobhāḥ aprahīṇah, aprajñātāḥ, anirodhitaḥ, avāntīkṛtāḥ, yena lobhenābhībhūtaḥ paryāttacitāḥ

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 7 – 10

Tam enam samannesamāno evarī jānāti: Na 'tthi kho imass' āyasmato tathārūpā lobhāniyā
dhammā yathārupehi lobhāniyehi dhammehi pariyādinnacitto

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
ajānārī vā vadeyya jānāmīti,

2. 3. 12
adraṣṭāiva saṃdraṣṭāham 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
apassarī vā vadeyya passāmīti,

2. 3. 13
parā{d}<n> vā tathā tathā pratipādayet yat tesāṃ syā</d> dīrgharātram <an>arthāya <a>hitāya du<ā>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
parān vā tathattāya samādapeyya yaṃ paresarī assa dīgharattaṃ ahitāya dukkhāyāti.
2. 3. 14

tat kasya hetoh

_For what reason?_

Cf. SBV II, p. 230. 32 – 33
tat kasya hetoh?

2. 3. 15

{tathā}\text{(r3) hy asyāyuṣmataḥ kāyasamśkārā vāksamśkārā} {yeṣu}\text{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 asyāyuṣmataḥ kāyasamśkārāḥ, vāksamśkārāḥ, manaḥsamskārāḥ alubdhasya;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 12 – 14
Tathā\text{76} kho pan’ imass’ āyasmato kāyasamācāro, tathā vacīsamācāro, yathā taṁ aluddhassa.

2. 3. 16

\text{yaś} ca {kaṁ}{kīṁ}cid eṣ{ā}\text{v} \text{77}āyuṣmāṁ dharmaṁ bhāṣate saṃkṣiptena vā vistareṇa vā

_And whenever this venerable speaks Dharma in brief or in detail_

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 1 – 2

\text{76} Bm (bis) tathārūpo (ed.).
\text{77} Cancellation made according to the line 2. 3. 34 in the reconstruction as the latter seems to contain right reading.
ayaṁ ca eṣa dharmam bhāṣate sāṃkṣiptena vā vistareṇa vā;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 14 – 15
Yaṁ kho pana ayam āyasmā dharmam deseti,

2. 3. 17
śānto 'syā sa dharmaḥ prāṅito gambhīro (r4) gambhīrāvabhaśo duḥsparśo duranubodhaḥ atarkyō 'tarkāvacaraḥ sūkṣmanipuṇa paṇḍitavijñiḥ (a) <ā> vedanīyaḥ (i)>

*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
śānto 'syā dharmah, pranītaḥ, gambhīro, gambhīrāvabhāṣah, durdrśaḥ, duranubodhaḥ, atarkyaḥ, 'tarkāvacaraḥ sūkṣmanipuṇāpaṇḍitavijñāvedanīyaḥ;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 15 – 16
gambhīro so dhammo duddaso duranubodho santo paṇṭito atakkāvacaro nipuṇo paṇḍitavedaniyo,78

2. 3. 18
sa cānenāyuṣmatā na sukaram ājñātum yathāpi tad ekānta (r5) lu(b)dhaṇa 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.).
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 viśuddham samanupaśyat\(\text{y}\) \(\text{a}h\)\(\text{in}\) samanveṣate dvitīye dvēsadhar\(\text{me}\) (r6) τ\(\text{t}\)\(\text{t}\)\(\text{i}\)ye mohadharme;

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 sudes\(\text{a}\); Bm sudesan\(\text{y}\) (ed.).
80 The whole section about the \(\text{dvēsadharma}\) is omitted in the \(\text{Pimgalātreya}\) and in SBV, but not in Pāli.
2. 3. 21

’Suṣṭha (sa)mjñatāham as(mīti va)(ṛ7)ded

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

2. 3. 22

adrṣṭaiva saṃdraṣṭāḥam asmīti vade(t)

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

2. 3. 23
parāṁ (v)ā tathā pratipādayed yat teṣām syā<duḥ> dirgharātram <an>arthāya <a>hitāya
{su}81<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. 11 – 12
parāṁ vā tathā tathā pratipādayet, yat teṣām syāt dirgharātram anarthāya, ahitāya, duḥkhāya;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 6 – 7
parāṁ vā tathattāya samādapeyya yaṁ paresaṁ assa dīgharattam ahitāya dukkhāyāti?

2. 3. 24
āhosvin82 nāsty asyāyuṣmataḥ sa{ṃ} moho ’pra(hīṇo ’pari)(r8)jñāto ’nirodhito ’vāntīkṛto
yena mohenābhībhūtaḥ 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 aprāhīṇaḥ, aparijñāṭaḥ, anirodhitaḥ, avāntīkṛtaḥ, yena
mohenābhībhūtaḥ, paryāttacittaḥ,

2. 3. 25
‘jñātaiva samjñātāham asmīti vaded

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

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 14 – 15
ajānakāḥ 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
adṛṣṭaiva saṃdraṣṭāham 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>hiṭāya {su}<duḥ>kāya

(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 mohenābhībhūtaḥ
paryāttacitto ’jñātaiva saṃjñātāḥ(a)m (asmīti va)(v2)ded adraṣṭaiva saṃdraṣṭāham asmīti
vade<
t> parān vā tathā tathā pratipādayed yat teṣāṃ syā<
d> dīrgharātram <an>arthāya
<a>hiṭā(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.
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*

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. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 7 – 10*

That is not a seer, though indeed he is not.

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

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

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 19

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

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

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

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

So that he would say: “I am a knower”, 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
apassāṁ vā vaḍeyya passāṁti,

2. 3. 31
parā(n) vā tathā (ta)(v)thā pratipādayet teṣām syāḥ 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 teṣām syāt dīrgharātram anarthāya, ahitāya, duḥkhāya;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 172. 11 – 12
paraṁ vā tathattāya samādapeyya yāṁ paresāṁ assa dīgharattāṁ ahitāya dukkhayāti.

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 <vākṣaṃskārā> 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 asyāyuṣmataḥ kāyasamskārāḥ, vākṣaṃskārāḥ, manahṣaṃskārāḥ amūdhasya;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 12 – 14
Tathā84 kho pan’ imass’ āyasmato kāyasamācāro, tathā85 vacīsamācāro, yathā taṁ amūḷhassa.

2. 3. 34
ya{m}<c> ca ki(m)c(i)d eṣa āyuṣmān dharmaṁ (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 dharmaṁ bhāṣate saṃkṣiptena vā vistareṇa vā;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 14 – 15
Yarī kho pana ayam āyasmā dhammaṁ deseti,

2. 3. 35
śānto ’syā sa dharmāḥ praṇīto gambhīro gambhīrāvabhāso durdṛśo durvānu<rv>desati bodha atarkyo ’tarkāvacaḥ sūkṣmanipuṇa paṇḍīta{v6}ta{paṇḍita}vijñ{a}<ā> vedanīyaḥ

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 dharmaḥ praṇītaḥ, gambhīraḥ, gambhīrāvabhāsaḥ, durdṛśo, duranubodhaḥ, atarkyaḥ, atarkāvacaraḥ, sūkṣmanipuṇapāṇḍitavijñavedanīyaḥ;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 15 – 16

gambhīro so dhammo duddaso duranubodho santo paṇīto atakkāvacaro nipuṇo paṇḍitavedaniyo,

2. 3. 36

sa cânenaśūṣmatā na sukaram ājñātum yathāpita(tta)d ekāntamūḍhena amūḍho 'yam āyūsmā<\n> nāyam āyūsmāṁ 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 cânena āyūsmatā na sukaram ājñātum, yathāpita ekāntamūḍhena; amūḍho 'yam āyūsmān; nāyam āyūsmān mūḍhaḥ;

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 16 – 17

na so dhammo sudesiyo mūḍhenāti.

2. 3. 37

yadā caina(v7)m asmiṁ tṛtiye mohadharman viśuddhaṁ<\i>m samanupaśyati athātra ākāravatīṁ {śrutvā}<śraddhāṁ> 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 asmin tṛtiye mohadharmaṁ viśuddhim samanupaśyati; athātra ākāravatīṁ śraddhāṁ abhinivedayati;
Yato nari samannesamāno visuddhaṁ mohaniyehi dhammehi samanupassati, atha tamhi saddhāṁ niveseti,

2. 3. 38
śraddhājātā idaṁ pratisamāṣṭe <\>

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

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 30
śraddhājātāḥ idaṁ pratisamśikṣate:

Cf. MN II, no. 95, p. 173. 19
saddhājāto upasamāṁkamanto…

2. 4
saṁbādho grhāvāso rajāsāṁ āvāso 'bhyavakāsaṁ {na} <ca> pravra(8)jyā <\>

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

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 30 – 31
saṁbādho grhāvāsaḥ, rajāsāṁ āvāsaḥ; abhyavakāsaṁ ca pravrajyā;

Cf. MN I, no. 27, p. 179. 13– 14
Sambādho gharāvāso rajāpatho, abbhokāso pabbajjā,

2. 5

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

Cf. SBV II, p. 231. 31 – 232. 2

tad idaṁ na sukaraṁ grīṇe<hi> 'gāram adhyāvasa{m}<tā>

ekānta{śaṅkālikṛtām}<śaṅkalikhitām>\textsuperscript{87} yāvajjīvam kevalam paripūrṇam parisuddham paryavadātām brahmaçaryaṁ caritum

Cf. MN I, no. 27, p. 179. 14 – 16

na-y-idaṁ sukaraṁ ājihāvasată ekantaparipuṇṇaṁ ekantaparisuddhaṁ saṅkhalikhitam brahmacariyaṁ caritum,

2. 6

ya(n va)ham keśaśmaśrv avatārya kāśāyāni vastrāṇy ācchādya samyag eva śra\textsuperscript{369r1}(d)dh(a)yā āgārād anagārikāṁ pravrajeyam iti <l>

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 aham keśaśmaśrūṇy avatārya, kāśāyāni vastrāṇy ācchādya, samyag eva śraddhayā āgārād anagārikāṁ pravrajeyam;

Cf. MN I, no. 27, p. 179. 16 – 18

Yan - nūnāham kesamassum ohāretvā kāśāyāni vatthāni acchādetvā agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajeyyanti.

\textsuperscript{87} There has been ekāntaśaṅkālikṛtām in the manuscript of SBV II which has been changed by Gnoli to the right form ekāntaśaṅkalikhitam, see footnote 2, p. 231.

\textsuperscript{88} In MW “perfect in its kind, faultless”. P. V. Bapat analyses and describes all possible meanings of saṅkalikhitā (Bapat 1942).
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 jāti-parivartitaṁ prahāya, keśaśmaśrvy avatārya, kāśāyāṇi vastrāṇy ācchādyya, samyag eva śraddhāya agārād anagārikāṁ pravrajita;

Cf. MN I, no. 27, p. 179. 18 – 22
so apareṇa samayena appaṁ vā bhogakkhandhaṁ pahāya mahantaṁ vā bhogakkhandhaṁ pahāya, appaṁ vā nātiparivatṭaṁ pahāya mahantaṁ vā nātiparivatṭaṁ pahāya kesamassum ohāretvā kāśāyāṇi vatthāṇi acchādetvā agārasmā anagāriyaṁ pabbajati.

He lives possessed with a good disposition, occupied with observing restraint, perfect in conduct and personal associations, 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 śilavān viharati, prātimokṣasamvarasaṁvṛtah, ācāragocarasampanno ’nuṁatreśv avadyeṣu bhayadarśī samādāya śikṣate śikṣāpaḍeṣu;

89 Translation for ācāragocara from BHSD.
Cf. MN III, no. 107, p. 2. 7 – 9
… pātimokkhasaññañcaññañvuto viharāhi ācāragocarasampanno, aṇumattesu vajjesu bhayaḍassāvī samādāya sikkhassu sikkhāpadesūti.90

2. 9

(r3) [na] <sa> prāṇāṭipātam prahāya prāṇāṭipātā prativirato bhavati91 |

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

Cf. SBV II, p. 232. 9 – 10
sa prāṇāṭipātāṃ prahāya, prāṇāṭipātā prativirato bhavati;

Cf. MN III, no. 112, p. 33. 20 – 21
… pāṇāṭipātaṃ pahāya pāṇāṭipātā paṭivirato ahaśni…

3. 1

nihatadaṇḍo nihataśastra pūrvavad vi(sta)reṇa yathā tṛdaṇḍīsūtre <i> tatr{a}ko viśeṣah </i>

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

Cf. SBV II, p. 232. 10 – 11
nyastadaṇḍaḥ, nyastaśastraḥ…92

3. 2

pūrvenivāsaṃ yo vetti svargā (r4) (pā)yaṃś ca paśyati |
atha jātikṣayaṃ prāpto <'>bhijñāvyavasito muniḥ </i>

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 Ganakamoggallānasutta is mentioned.
92 Here ends the agreement between Sanskrit of SBV and the Pimgalātreyā.
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 
Pubbenivāsaṁ yo vedi²⁴ saggāpāyaṁ ca passati, 
Atto jātikkhayaṁ patto, abhiññaṁ vosito muni.²⁵
Cittaṁ visuddhāṁ jānāti muttaṁ 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 一切食恚癡 
我說是三明 非言語所說²⁶

3. 3 
atha (r5) (piṃ)galātreyaḥ parivrājako bhagavato bhāṣitam abhinamdyānumodya 
bhagavato ’ntikāt prakrāntaḥ ||

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

²³ In Pāli version visuddham. 
²⁴ So Bm : Sk (her&in no.98) Si vedi (ed.). 
²⁵ f. no.98, S. N. p. 423 (ed.).
²⁶ This is not an exact parallel 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 Piṅgalātreyā 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 Piṅgalātreyā 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 traividyā in the Brahmanic sense is transformed into the Buddhist traividyā. However, owing the parallel text piece from the Cāṅkī sutta to the corresponding text fragment in the Piṅgalātreyā, any certainty about the ‘longer version’ as a part of the introduction to the Tathāgata-Predict decreases, as the analogue text passage in the Cāṅkī 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 Piṅgalātreyā’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 Piṅgalātreyā sūtra? Moreover, what about the Piṅgalātreyā 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 Saṅghabhедavastu 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 Pīngalātreyā 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 Saṅghabhедavastu by Yi-jing should be mentioned since the Saṅghabhедavastu 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 Yi-jing 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 Pīngalātreyā 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 Yi-jing’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 Yi-jing’s translation? Yi-jing 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 Yi-jing’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 problematic 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 problematic discussed in the chapter of text critics: There are some sūtras which do not begin with the traditional formulary evam mayā śrutam; although the Tridāndī sūtra, as showed by Kazunobu Matsuda, has the status of being more famous and is, indeed, placed as the first sūtra in the Śilaskandha 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 Śilaskandha 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 Pimgalātreyā, 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 Pimgalātreyā 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 Pimgalātreyā and the parallel text fragments of the sūtras in other Buddhist text collections. They are as well based on the difficulty of placing the Pimgalātreyā 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 Pimgalātreyā 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 \textit{rtog} instead of \textit{brtog} or \textit{gzhan} for \textit{bzan}. 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 stone 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 rnam s 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 / rnam 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 / gi mug gi chos la ston pa‘i / 247a:2 rnam par dag pa chol bar byed de/ ci tshe dang ldan pa ‘di la / chags pa gang gis zil gyis {gno na}<gnon> cing sens 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 sens 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 sens te /tshe dang ldan pa ‘di la chags pa gang gis zil gyis non cing / sens 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 par ‘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 sding gi chos dang / gsum pa gti mug gi chos la chel bar byed de / ci tshe dang ldan pa ‘di la gti mug gang gis zil gyi non cing sms la khyab na mi shes ba zhin khor nar shes so // zhes snyan ma 247b:3 mthong bzhin khor nar mthong ngo // zhes sms la 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 sms la khyab na mi shes <ba> bzhin khor nar shes so zhes sms la / ma mthong bzhin khor nar mthong ngo zhes sms la 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 sms te / tshe dang ldan pa ‘di gti mug gang gis zil gyis non cing sms la khab na mi shes bzhi khor nar shes so zhes sms la / ma mthong bzhin khor nar mthong ngo zhes sms la 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 ma 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 gti chags mdor sdis 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 rtags<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 snyam 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 mgon 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 khrims dang ldan ba la gnas pa yin / so sor thar pa’i sdom pas bsdam 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 /
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