



# The Tridaṇḍi-sūtra and the two Lohitya-sūtras in the Gilgit Dīrghāgama manuscript\*

Choi, Jin kyoung

(Graduate Student, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München)

## 국문요약

1990년 후반 영국 런던의 한 고서적상에 장아함경 산스크리트 사본이 유입된 이후 지금에 이르기까지, 스코엔 컬렉션 연구 프로젝트의 구성원, 그 가운데에서도 뮌헨 대학의 옌스-우베 하르트만 교수(Prof. Dr. Jens-Uwe Hartmann)가 주축이 되어 그 연구 결실이 천천히 맺어져 오고 있음에도 불구하고, 국내는 물론 해외 연구자들에게도 그 성과가 널리 알려지지 않고

---

\*This article is the accumulated result of my presentations given at the IABS (International Associations of Buddhist Studies) conference in 2011 in Taiwan, as well as at the LMU (Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München)-UCB (University of California, Berkeley) Workshop, "Texts and beyond - New issues from Buddhist

있는 것이 사실이다. 본고는 필자가 독일 뮌헨 대학에서 박사논문 주제로 그 일부를 담당하고 있는 이 사본 프로젝트와 필자의 연구 내용을 소개하고자 하는데 목적을 둔다. 지난 근 20년 간 장아함경 산스크리트 사본 프로젝트가 거둔 성과와 현 시점의 연구 현황을 간략제시하고, 필자가 담당하고 있는 세 경전을 관련 문헌과 함께 소개하고자 한다.

주제어: 장아함경 산스크리트 사본, *Tridaṇḍi-sūtra*, *Lohitya-sūtra* I & II, 계온품(戒蘊品), 사문과경(沙門果經), 수행도

---

on May 16th-18th, 2012 in Munich, Germany. A brief introductory on the two *Lohitya-sūtras* was already given at the recent volume of the *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* (Vol. 60, No. 3, March 2012: 76-79), however, limited time and space did not allow me to elaborate more on the subject. Therefore, I truly appreciate this opportunity to introduce my dissertation subject in a longer version in this journal. This research was possible with the financial support of DAAD (Deutscher Akademischer Austausch Dienst). I express my sincere gratitude to my previous advisor Prof. Matsuda Kazunobu who initiated me into this important manuscript project, to my current advisor Prof. Hartmann his generous supports and encouragements in every aspect. Special thanks to Lewis Doney who not only proof read of my English, but also provided valuable comments. All mistakes and errors are on my own responsibility.

## I. General information on the Gilgit Dīrghāgama manuscript <sup>1)</sup>

During the latter half of the 1990s, parts of a Sanskrit manuscript arrived on the antique market in London.<sup>2)</sup> Thanks to the colophon in the final folio,<sup>3)</sup> it was soon confirmed as the manuscript of the

1) More specific informations on the Dīrghāgama manuscript has been presented by Hartmann (2000, 2002, 2004), Melzer (2010). Here I made an attempt to summarize the most basic informations as brief as possible.

2) According to Matsuda Kazunobu, it was Matsuda himself who first encountered this manuscript at an antique book store in London. In March, 1998, on his way back to Japan from the Schøyen Collection project meeting in Oslo, Matsuda stopped by Sam Fogg's antique book store in London, hoping he could come across other manuscripts from Afghanistan, for Sam Fogg was the one who had sold the fragments of the manuscript from Afghanistan to Mr. Schøyen. Mr. Fogg showed him a manuscript which he had recently imported from Afghanistan via Dubai. Judging from the material, the style of the script, the appearance of the manuscript, and also its contents, Matsuda could already presume that it was the manuscript of the *Dīrghāgama* of the (Mūla-)Sārvāstivādin, although this part of the manuscript did not include the colophone. Then he immediately informed other Schøyen project members about this news. He records this incident in his short essay in the *Newsletter* vol. 5 (2006) of the Research and Information Center for Asian Religious Culture of Bukkyo University. See also note 7 below.

3) The following is the edition of the last *uddāna* (list of contents) in the final folio. For more details see Melzer (2010) : 11–12 ; Hartmann (2002: 135–144; 2004: 124–125) (454v2–6) : *uddānam*\* ||

*śuka jīvaka rājā ca v(ā)siṣṭhaḥ kāśyapena ca °*  
*(bra)hm(a)jālena kṛtvā ca v(i)largo bhavati samuddiṭaḥ ||*  
*tṛdaṇḍī piṅgalā(treṇo) dve ca lauhityabhāṣite*  
*k(ai)varttī atha maṇḍīśas tac ca bhikṣuṣu bhāṣate °*  
*mahallī pṛ(ṣṭhapālas ca j)īvako bhavati saptamaḥ*  
*(vās)iṣṭhaḥ kāśyapaś caiva brahmajālam anopamāt || (||)*

*Dīrghāgama*, the ‘Collection of Long Discourses (of the Buddha),’ It is a large birch-bark manuscript, of which each folio measures about 48 x 9 cm, beautifully written in the so-called ‘Gilgit/Bamiyan-Type II’ script. According to Lore Sander’s paleographic research, this script suggests a date for the manuscript later than the 6th century.<sup>4)</sup> On the other hand, radiocarbon testing (<sup>14</sup>C) gave a date between 764 and 1000,<sup>5)</sup> which clearly supports the earlier suggestion based on paleographical grounds. It is now generally considered that the manuscript may have been written around the second half of the 8th century.

Although the exact origination of the manuscript is unknown, according to the antique dealer the manuscript may have been discovered in Gilgit, the border area between Pakistan and Afghanistan. In addition, the material, its script and the entire format of this manuscript are very similar to those of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin’s *Vinayavastu* manuscript, which is also assumed to have originated from the Gilgit area. From these similarities, one can presume that the newly discovered *Dīrghāgama* also originates from Gilgit and belongs to one of the most influential Buddhist schools, the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādin.

Unfortunately, the manuscript is incomplete. The last folio number is 454, but only less than half of the whole manuscript is extant, and most of the folios are in a rather fragmentary state.

---

(*dīrghāga*)m(e) *śīlaskandhanipāt(a)s samāptaḥ* || || samāptaś ca *dīrghā(ga)maḥ* || ||

4) Sander (1968) pp. 122–123, 137; (2007) pp. 126–129.

5) cf. Allon et al. (2006) pp. 279–280, note 3.

Parts of the manuscript ended up in the hands of different collectors in the USA, Japan and Norway. According to the information provided by Hartmann, most of the folios belong to a private collection in Virginia, USA, 52 folios (fols. 330–384) to the Ikuo Hirayama Collection in Kamakura, Japan, and some fragments are held in the Schøyen Collection in Oslo, Norway.<sup>6)</sup>

Table 1. Distribution of the *Dīrghāgama* manuscript folios restored so far (provided by Hartmann)

Folio numbers	Place
1-70 (only fragments)	Schøyen Collection (Oslo, Norway) Private Collection, Virginia (USA)
ca. 70-125 (ca. 55 folios)	Private Collection, Virginia (USA)
ca. 260-329 (ca. 70 folios)	Private Collection, Virginia (USA)
330-384 (52 folios)	Hirayama Collection (Kamakura, Japan)
364-366 (3 folios)	Bukkyo University Collection (Kyoto, Japan)
385-454 (70 folios)	Private Collection, Virginia (USA)

After the renowned Japanese artist and a private collector, Hirayama has purchased the 52 folios, some more fragments from the same manuscript appeared, again with the same antique dealer in London. Table 1 shows that the Hirayama Collection holds 52 of 55-folio sequence 330-384. In other words, there were three folios missing in the Hirayama Collection. At the request of the antique book dealer, Matsuda had a chance to look at these fragments in London and discovered that they were none other than the three

6) Hartmann n.d. pp. 1-2.

folios missing from the Hirayama Collection. He transported these last fragments to Japan himself and now they are preserved at the Museum of the Bukkyo University in Kyoto.<sup>7)</sup> These are actually the only three folios I was able to examine in person so far, and they belong to the middle part of the *Tridaṇḍi-sūtra*.

The state of preservation of the folios is different from collection to collection. Only those in the Hirayama Collection and the Bukkyo University are fully restored by specialists and ready for scholarly disposal; whereas those in the private collection in Virginia remain in a poor condition. Most of the folios of my three texts belong to the Hirayama collection (fol. 360–363, 367–384) and the Bukkyo University (fol. 364–366), and only the last two folios of the *Lohitya* II text (fol. 385, 386) belong to the private collection in Virginia. Many folios in Virginia are still not separated from one another, or remain in a fragmentary state.<sup>8)</sup>

7) According to Matsuda, the second 5 bundles and many fragments of the DĀ manuscript arrived at the hands of another antique book dealer in London, David Aaron in March 2000. With the help of Sam Fogg, these manuscript parts were also purchased by the same American collector in Virginia. In August 2000, David Aaron imported, again, another 52 folios of the DĀ manuscript, which were brought to Japan and sold to Hirayama Ikuo through the mediation of Matsuda. Four years later (in August 2004), David Aaron contacted Matsuda about another fragments of the three folios of the same manuscript, and Matsuda immediately flew to London and brought them over to Kyoto. He eventually succeeded to persuade Bukkyo University to purchase the three folios of the manuscript. The fragments of the DĀ manuscript in the Schøyen Collection were included in the Afghanistan manuscript fragments that Mr. Schøyen purchased before 1998. See also note 3 above.

8) Hartmann n.d. pp. 1–2; Fortunately though, I can use these photos of the last two

The quality of the writing in this manuscript is generally poor. The editorial work is quite strenuous—not only because of the manuscript's corrupted or missing parts, but also because of the many sloppy mistakes of the scribes. Besides the random omissions or insertions of *anusvāra*, *visarga*, or *daṇḍas*, the manuscript also presents the same words several times containing many variations, which makes the process of edition painfully slow.<sup>9)</sup> The critical edition of this kind of corrupted manuscript, therefore, requires a lot of attention and care. It is much easier to edit the text when there is a recourse to clear parallel passages in Pāli or Chinese, even better in Sanskrit in the same Dīrghāgama texts.<sup>10)</sup> However, it takes much more time and effort, especially when there is no parallel texts in any languages, for example, like the beginning parts of the *Tridaṇḍin* and the *Lohitya* I.

According to Hartmann's researches, out of 47 *sūtras* of the *Dīrghāgama* only about 36 *sūtras* are extant or almost completely extant; and so far only 16 *sūtras* have been edited.<sup>11)</sup> Most of the

---

folios also in relatively good condition, thanks to the technical help by Oliver von Criegern who skillfully restored the fragmented photos with Photoshop. It was only possible because of the photos with high resolution provided by Prof. Hartmann, which he made himself during his visit in Virginia. I would like to express here my gratitude for all.

- 9) More detailed information of the paleographical aspects on this manuscript can be found in Melzer (2010) pp. 61–80.
- 10) The beginning part of the *Lohitya* II, which describes the scene where one householder invites the Buddha for a meal, shows almost exactly the same formula as in the *Bodha-sūtra* of the same DĀ manuscript.
- 11) Hartmann presented on the current status of the DĀ manuscript project at a



these editions, however, have not been published yet, except the *Kāyabhāvanā-sūtra* published in China<sup>12)</sup> and a few doctoral dissertations published in microfilm format. The following is a list of the Sanskrit *Ārghāgama* texts marked with the editors' names on the texts either already completed or close to the completion.

Table 2. The *sūtras* in the *Ārghāgama* and the edited texts so far (provided by Hartmann)

I. Śaṣṭsūtrakaniṣāta		
1. Daśottara	?-? [6, 7, 11, 14]	
2. Arthavistara	?-?	
3. Saṅgīti	?-?	
4. Catuṣpariṣad	? [72 etc.]-88r8	
<b>5. Mahāvādāna</b>	<b>88r8-111v</b>	<b>Fukita Takamichi (Kyoto)</b>
<b>6. Mahāparinirvāṇa</b>	<b>111v-?</b>	<b>Klaus Wille (Göttingen)</b>
II. Yuganipāta		
7-13 missing		
14. Govinda	(266)-274v5	
15. Prāsādika	274v5-290v4	
16. [Prasādaniya]	290v5-299v2	
17. Pañcatraya	299v3-306r5	
18. Māyājāla	306r5-317v5	

conference, "Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: The State of the Field" at the Stanford University, June15-19, 2009. The outcome of this event on a state of the field survey of recent research on Buddhist manuscripts, along with Hartmann's paper, is expected to be published in the near future. Here I would like to give my deepest gratitude to Prof. Hartmann, again, who not only provided all the required materials, but also gave me permission to introduce them in this article before his own publication; Hartmann n.d. pp. 2-3.

12) Liu Zhen (2011) *Chanding yu Kuxiu* (禪定与苦修, *dhyanāni tapas ca*), Shanghai Guji Publishing House (上海古籍出版社).

19. Kāmaṭhika	317v5–329r4	
<b>20. Kāyabhāvanā</b>	<b>329r4–340r2</b>	<b>Liu Zhen (München)</b>
<b>21. Bodha</b>	<b>340r2–344v4</b>	<b>Blair Silverlock (Sydney)</b>
<b>22. Śaṃkaraka</b>	<b>344v4–348r8</b>	<b>Zhang Lixiang (München)</b>
<b>23. Āñānāṭa</b>	<b>348v1–354r4</b>	<b>Lore Sander and Siglinde Dietz (Berlin/Göttingen)</b>
24. Mahāsamāja	354r5–360v1	
<b>III. Śīlaskandhanipāta</b>		
25. Tridaṇḍin	360v2–367r3	
<b>26. Piṅgalātreya</b>	<b>367r4–369r5</b>	<b>Lita Peipina (Oslo)</b>
27. Lohitya	369r5–382r6	
28. Lohitya II	382r6–386v1	
<b>29. Kaivartin</b>	<b>386v1–390v1</b>	<b>Zhou Chunyang (Göttingen)</b>
30. Maṇḍīśa I	390v1–391v6	
31. Maṇḍīśa II	391v6–8	
32. Mahallin	391v8–395v6	
33. Śroṇatāṇḍya	395v6–401r1	
<b>34. Kūṭatāṇḍya</b>	<b>401r2–409v8</b>	<b>Oliver von Criegern (München)</b>
<b>35. Ambāṣṭha</b>	<b>410r2–416r3, 442–444</b>	<b>Gudrun Melzer (München)</b>
<b>36. Pṛṣṭhapāla</b>	<b>416r3–424r4</b>	<b>Gudrun Melzer (München)</b>
<b>37. Kāraṇavādin</b>	<b>424r4–424v3</b>	<b>Gudrun Melzer (München)</b>
<b>38. Pudgala</b>	<b>424v3–426v1</b>	<b>Gudrun Melzer (München)</b>
<b>39. Śruta</b>	<b>426v1–427v5</b>	<b>Gudrun Melzer (München)</b>
<b>40. Mahalla</b>	<b>427v6–430r7</b>	<b>Gudrun Melzer (München)</b>
<b>41. Anyatama</b>	<b>430r7</b>	<b>Gudrun Melzer (München)</b>
42. Śuka	430r8–433r2	
43. Jivaka	433r2–(435)r5	
44. Rājan	(435)r5–441, 446–447v2	
45. Vāsiṣṭha	447v2–451r1	
46. Kāśyapa	451r2–v8	
47. Brahmajāla	445, 452r1–454v2	

## II. The Structure of the Sanskrit *Dīrghāgama*, *Dīghanikāya* & Chinese *Dīrghāgama*

As shown in Table 2, the Gilgit *Dīrghāgama* consists of three sections, and the two *Lohityas* as well as the *Tridaṇḍin* all belong to the third section, *Śīlaskandhanipāta*, namely “Section on Ethics”.

1. *Ṣaṭsūtrakaniṣāya*, “Six Sūtra Section” (6 texts)
2. *Yuganipāta*, “Section of Pairs” (18 texts)
3. *Śīlaskandhanipāta*, “Section on Ethics” (23 texts) : 26. *Tridaṇḍin*, 27–28. *Lohitya-sūtra* I & II

As with the Gilgit *Dīrghāgama*, the Pāli *Dīghanikāya* also consists of three sections; but here the same ‘Section on Ethics’, *sīlakkhandhavagga* in Pāli, is not the third but the first section and the *Lohitya* II’s Pāli parallel, the *Lohicca Sutta*, is the 12th *Sutta* of this *vagga*.

〈Pāli *Dīghanikāya* (DN)〉

- I. *sīlakkhandhavagga* (13 texts) : 12. *Lohicca Sutta*
- II. *mahāvagga* (10 texts)
- III. *pāṭīkavagga* (11 texts)

On the other hand, the Chinese translation of the *Dīrghāgama*, assumed to be part of the canon of the Dharmaguptaka school,

consists of four sections in total and has no specific titles for each section. *Lohitya* II's Chinese parallel *Louzhe-jing* 『露遮經』 is the last text of the third section, which signifies that not only are the order and contents of the sections of the three versions not identical, but neither are the order and content of each *sūtra* in each section.

〈Chinese Dīrghāgama(DĀ<sup>c</sup>) 『長阿含經』

1. 第一分 (4 texts)
2. 第二分 (15 texts)
3. 第三分 (10 texts): 29. 『露遮經』
4. 第四分 (12 texts)

Only the *Lohitya* II has Pāli and Chinese parallel texts; the equivalents of the *Tridaṇḍin* as well as the *Lohitya* I have not been traced in any Pāli and Chinese *Āgama* texts. In the *Samyuktanikāya*, there is one *sūtra* under the title “*Lohicca-sutta*,” yet it turns out to be, content-wise, an irrelevant text that merely shares the main interlocutor's name.<sup>13)</sup>

13) PTS, IV, p. 117-121.

### III. The *Śīlaskandhanipāta* and the ‘Discourse on the Path of Practice’

What, then, is this *Śīlaskandhanipāta* about? As its title clearly implies, this “Section on Ethics” is a collection of sūtras that contains or partly contains the passages describing the ethical rules of monastic monks. If you look closely at the contents of these passages, however, they seem to be about far more than that.

In this context, it is worth to note Yamagiwa Nobuyuki’s article published in 1997. As a part of his research on the origin of the *Vinaya*, he seeks to explain the relationship between *Vinaya* and *Nikāya/Āgama* texts. In this article, he thoroughly analyzes the “Section on Ethics” in the *Dīghanikāya* and the corresponding section in the Chinese *Dīrghāgama*. Utilizing Prof. Akanuma’s diagram on the *Dīghanikāya* and Chinese *Dīrghāgama*,<sup>14)</sup> he points out that the first section of the *Dīghanikāya* and the third section in the Chinese *Dīrghāgama* share the same type of content, namely, the “Buddha’s Discourse on the Path of Practice,” and that the discourse on *śīla*, or ethical rules, is included as one of the main parts of the section and represents the whole discourse as the title of the section in the Pāli *Dīghanikāya*. This also applies to the *Śīlaskandhanipāta* in the Gilgit *Dīrghāgama*.

Yamagiwa describes the elements of the “Discourse on the Path of

14) This implies the two diagrams I have presented in above, explaining the structure of DN and DĀ<sup>c</sup>. See above II.

Practice” as follows: It begins with a description of the Buddha’s manifestation in the world and his teaching of the Dharma. On hearing this teaching, a householder becomes a monk. The one who has become a monk trains himself by the restraint of the ethical rules. Once he becomes perfected in these rules, he becomes a guardian of the faculties of the senses. Then he eliminates the five hinderances, masters the four levels of concentration, achieves the six types of supernatural knowledge and finally attains liberation from *saṃsāra* or achieves cessation.<sup>15)</sup>

On the other hand, Gudrun Melzer also analyses the *Śīlaskandhanipāta* of the *Dīrghāgama* in her doctoral dissertation, which is the most extensive and thorough work done so far regarding the *Dīrghāgama* manuscript.<sup>16)</sup> Out of 23 *sūtras* in the *Śīlaskandha* section, she edited 7 *sūtras* (ca. 20 folios) along with her precise analysis on this section.<sup>17)</sup>

---

15) Yamagiwa (1997) p. 36.

16) Melzer (2010) pp. 11–24.

17) In describing the Discourse on the Path of Practice, however, she adopts the term “*Tathāgatha*–Predigt” (“*Tathāgatha*–sermon”), the term generally utilized by Oto Franke (1913) and Konrad Meisig (1987). I think this term rather inappropriate and problematic, especially because of its rather random usage of the word ‘*Tathāgatha*.’ Therefore I would prefer to use the term: “Discourse on the Path of Practice,” generally utilized by Yamagiwa and other Japanese scholars.

Table 3. The contents of the Discourse on the Path of Practice

Yamagiwa's Analysis on DN & DĀ <sup>c</sup>		Melzer's Analysis on DĀ		
i	The Buddha's Manifestation and Teaching of the Dharma	1.1.	1. Ethics ( <i>śīla</i> )	
		1.2.		
ii	A Householder becomes a Monk	1.3.		
		1.4.		
iii	Restraints of the Rules ( <i>śīlakandha</i> )	1.5.		
iv	Guarding the Faculties of the Senses	2.1	2. Concentration Practice ( <i>samādhi, dhyāna</i> )	
v	Elimination of Five Hinderances			
vi	Four Levels of Concentration	2.2.		
		2.3.		
		2.4.		
		2.5.		
		2.6.		
vii	Six Types of Supernatural Knowledge	2.7.		
		3.1.		3. Six Types of Supernatural Knowledge ( <i>abhijñā</i> s)
		3.2.		
		3.3.		
		3.4.		
3.5.				

Table 3 compares Melzer's analysis with Yamagiwa's. I did not list the specific content Melzer categorizes,<sup>18)</sup> but it is easy to see that her analysis is more detailed and further categorized with the notion of Three Classes of Practice system, i.e. *śīla*, *samādhi/dhyāna* and *abhijñā*. And in that process she encompasses all previous elements as the *śīla* class, whereas Yamagiwa specifically points out only the

18) This categorization is based on the works of Meisig (1987) and Ramers (1996). See Melzer (2010) pp. 15-18.

third element as *Śilakkandha*. The more detailed and thorough comparison between Sanskrit, Pāli and Chinese versions would be possible once the full Sanskrit version is available.

Returning to our topic, I shall now show how the content of the Discourse on the Path of Practice is included in the *Tridaṇḍin* and the two *Lohitya-sūtras* along with some other *sūtras* in the *Śīlaskandhanipāta*—since it displays some important patterns of this section.<sup>19)</sup> As the first *sūtra* in the section, the *Tridaṇḍin* contains an almost complete version of the Discourse on the Path of Practice, including the *Śīlaskandha* elements. One interesting point to note here is that there are two versions of the first element on the Path of Practice, depending on whether or not one is describing the Buddha's purity with regard to the Three Natures, i.e. Lust, Delusion and Hatred (*lobha-*, *moha-*, *dveṣa-dharma*) is described.<sup>20)</sup> Whereas the *Tridaṇḍin* skips this part, the following text, the *Piṅgalātreyā*, introduces it for the first time, but abbreviates the rest of the elements by referring to the description in the *Tridaṇḍin*.<sup>21)</sup> The *Lohitya* I is the only *sūtra* in the *Śīlaskandhanipāta* that includes a complete version of the Discourse on the Path of Practice. In contrast, the *Lohitya* II abbreviates the whole content into a single sentence as follows: 'Lohitya, the teacher arises in this world, [and

19) Since most of the texts other than my own three texts are not fully available yet, the information I suggest here mostly depends on Melzer's analysis ; Melzer (2010) pp. 19–24.

20) *Lohitya* I (367v5–371v1), *Piṅgalātreyā* (367v5–368v7), SBV II 230,16–231,29.

21) DĀ 26 : *nihatadaṇḍo nihataśāstra pūrvavad vistareṇa yathā tridaṇḍī-sut্রে*.



so on] *śīlaskandha*, *dhyāna* and *abhiññā* with detailed examples.<sup>22)</sup> Interestingly, the *Prṣṭhapāla-sūtra* refers to the *Tridaṇḍi-sūtra* for the abbreviated parts<sup>23)</sup> and in the case of the *Rāja-sūtra*, it clearly refers to the *Lohitya-sūtra*, which doubtless indicates the *Lohitya* I.<sup>24)</sup> Based on these patterns, it would not be completely wrong to say that the *Tridaṇḍin* and the *Lohitya* I are the key texts in the *Śīlaskandhanipāta*, which contains the complete or almost complete version of the Path of the Practice formula.

It might be quite a common practice to place the whole formula of the Path of Practice in the beginning of the section, as a model text. For example, in the Pāli *Sīlakkhandhavagga*, it is the second text, *Sāmaññaphala-sutta*, which contains the whole formula without abbreviation. Likewise, in the Chinese *Dīrghāgama*, it is the first *sūtra* of the section, *Amozhou-jing* 『阿摩昼經』 which is equivalent to the Pāli *Ambaṭṭha-sutta* and Sanskrit *Ambāṣṭha-sūtra*.<sup>25)</sup>

22) DĀ 27 : *iha lohitya śāstā loka utpadyate vistareṇa sadṛṣṭāntaka*⟨h⟩ *śīlaskandh*⟨o⟩ *dhyānāny abhiññās ca sadṛṣṭāntikā*⟨h⟩.

23) DĀ 36 : *iha prṣṭhapāla śāstā loka utpadyate vistareṇa yathā tridaṇḍisūtre* *tathaiva*.

24) DĀ 44 : ⟨*iha*⟩ *mahārāja śāstā (loka utpadyate tathāga)to 'rhan sammyaksambuddho vidyācaraṇa-sampannaḥ sugato lokavid anuttaraḥ puruṣadamyasārathi*⟨h⟩ *śāstā devamanuṣyānām buddho bhagavāṃ* ⟨l⟩ *sa dharmam deśayati ādau kalyāṇam madhye ka*(*lyāṇam paryavasāne kalyāṇam svarthaṃ suvyañjanam*) *kevalam paripūrṇam pariśuddham paryavadātam brahmacaryam prakāśayati* ⟨l⟩ *taṃ khalu dharmam śr noti grhapatir vā grhapatiputro vā* ⟨l⟩ *sa taṃ dharmam śrutvā tṛṣu sthāneṣu śāstu*⟨r⟩ *viśuddhiṃ s(a)m(a)nveṣate | vistareṇa yathā lohityasūtr*⟨e⟩ *dhyāne dhyāne abhiññāyā*⟨ṃ⟩ *yāvan nāparam asmād bhavaṃ prajānāmīti* ⟨l⟩.

25) Yamagiwa (1997) pp. 40–42 ; regarding the Path of Practice passages in the *Lohitya* II's equivalents texts in Pāli and Chinese see Choi (2012) p. 78.

#### IV. More parallel texts of the three *sūtras* and works on the “*Śrāmaṇyaphala-sūtra*”

As I have mentioned above, it is only the *Lohitya* II that has Pāli and Chinese parallels, which suggests a slight correction in previous works by Prof. Hartmann and Melzer.<sup>26)</sup> There are some Sanskrit parallel fragments from Central Asia, but here the title is *Lokecca-sūtra* I and II. According to Klaus Wille, there will be more fragments of the *Lokeccas* included in the next volume of the Turfan manuscript project. Even though most of them are only fragments, sometimes they can be extremely helpful for reconstruction. For example, SHT 806 is a relatively well-preserved fragment, which is parallel to the beginning of the *Lohitya* I that does not have any other parallels at all. Recently, I noticed that two more, so far unidentified, fragments in the Turfan Collection (SHT 807, SHT 808) are also parallel texts to either the *Tridaṇḍin* or *Lohitya* I, since these parts belong to *Śilaskandha* passages only found in these two *sūtras*. It is noteworthy that the one previous fragment is SHT 806, which I just mentioned. Also, thanks to Hartmann’s hint during one of our Manuscript reading sessions, I was able to find some more Central Asian fragments in Tocharian, earlier identified by Couvreur as the *Śrāmaṇyaphala-sūtra*, which list the exact wording found only in the *Lohitya* I.<sup>27)</sup>

26) Melzer p. 8; Hartmann (2004): 125–128.

27) Hartmann (1992) pp. 14–16; Couvreur (1967) pp. 151–165.

One interesting fact about the Sanskrit *Śrāmaṇyaphala-sūtra*, which has been extensively studied so far along with its Pāli and Chinese parallel texts, is that its title was only given based on the content of the text, and its Sanskrit version is the part inserted in the *Saṅghabhedavastu*.<sup>28)</sup> More importantly, there is no *sūtra* under such a title in the *Dirghāgama* manuscript; the one which corresponds to the Pāli *Sāmaññaphalasutta* in the *Dīghanikāya* is the *Rāja-sūtra*, which refers to the *Lohitya* I regarding the Path of Practice passages, as noted above. Regarding this issue, it is also worth to note Honjo's article in 1985, in which he introduces the nine *Dirghāgama* texts quoted in Śamathadeva's *Abhidharmakośa Upaikā*. Among them, 4 texts belonging to the "*Śīlaskandhikā*" are the *Brahmajāla-sūtra*, the *Tridaṇḍi-sūtra*, the *Kaivarta-sūtra* and the *Lohitya-sūtra*, which clearly implies the *Lohitya* I. Quoting the phrase describing the state of an ascetic who achieved the four levels of concentration, Honjo concludes that this phrase should be considered as not only belonging to the Sanskrit *Śrāmaṇyaphala-sūtra*, but also to the *Lohitya-sūtra* in the *Śīlaskandha* section.

Several European and Japanese scholars have worked on the "*Śrāmaṇyaphala-sūtra*," partly comparing their versions with one another. Among them three works are worth to be noted regarding my own edition. The first is Yamagiwa and Hiraoka's cooperative

28) According to Hartmann, among the *Dirghāgama* texts from Central Asia, the *Śrāmaṇyaphala-sūtra* belongs to the texts, of which titles cannot be confirmed and he also points out that most of the passages found in the Pāli *Sāmaññaphalasutta* are traced in the Central Asian *Tridaṇḍin* Hartmann (1992) 16-17.

translation work on the “*Śrāmaṇyaphala-sūtra*” inserted in the *Saiṅghabhedavastu*, Yamagiwa and Hiraoka mainly used the Gnoli’s edition, translated into Japanese, painstakingly reconstructing many problematic or missing phrases with recourse to the Pāli and the Tibetan versions. An earlier German contribution can be found in Konrad Meisig’s work of 1987, in which the “*Tathāgata-sermon*,” or the Discourse on the Path of Practice is examined within the scope of the “*Śrāmaṇyaphala-sūtra*.” He edited the Pāli text of this sūtra critically, translated the Chinese versions into German and printed the parallels from Gnoli’s edition of the *Saiṅghabhedavastu* for comparison. The most recent and most thorough examination comes from Peter Ramers’s dissertation in 1996. In contrast to Meisig’s work which only list parallel texts without comments, Ramers also worked on the Sanskrit version of the *Saiṅghabhedavastu*, which he checked with the copies of the original photos of the manuscript in comparison to Gnoli’s problematic edition.<sup>29)</sup> Furthermore, in preparing a German translation with detailed commentaries, Ramers constantly took into account the Tibetan and even Mongolian translation of the *Saiṅghabhedavastu* and brought together numerous parallels. His work, however, deals only with the *Śīlaskandha* part of the Discourse on the Path of Practice, which describes the moral conduct of monks.

---

29) It has been pointed out that there are numerous problems with Gnoli’s edition of the *Saiṅghabh*, fortunately though, there is good news that the edition and English translation of this text will be prepared by Dr. Fumi Yao at the Tokyo University.

## V. Themes of the three sūtras

The *Tridaṇḍi-sūtra*, as the first sūtra in the *Śīlaskandha* section, opens with a scene where a wondering mendicant (*parivrājaka*) Tridaṇḍin visits the Buddha in Rājagṛha and asks him about the three knowledges (*traiṇidya*). The Buddha answers to the question with his discourse on the Path of Practice. The theme of the three knowledges are repeated in the very next text, the *Piṅgalātreya-sūtra*, where the Buddha's answer is mostly abbreviated except the beginning part.<sup>30)</sup>

The main themes of two *Lohityas* differ greatly from each other, even from the very beginning of the narrative. The first *Lohitya* begins with Brahmin Lohitya paying a visit to the Buddha, who is staying at Jetavana in Śrāvastī during the rainy season. Lohitya asks the Buddha about *jñeya dharma*, 'things to be known,' a pedagogical device that he can apply in teaching his disciples. In answer to this question, the Buddha gives, again, a long discourse on the Path of Practice. In contrast, *Lohitya* II relates the episode also found in its Pāli and Chinese versions. Lohitya is a rich and well-respected Brahmin in Sālavatī, but one with an evil point of view. He thinks it is pointless for an ascetic or a Brahmin to teach others after he obtains some good Dharma. On hearing that the Buddha is in the vicinity, Lohitya invites him for a meal at his home. Being aware of Lohitya's problem, Buddha gives a discourse

---

30) See note 21 above.

on the three types of bad teachers, presents an example of a good teacher and convinces Lohitya that his viewpoint is wrong. In the details of the story, the Sanskrit version is much closer to the Pāli version than to the Chinese translation, except in the Discourse on the Path of Practice.

Based on a close reading of my texts, I have found that the Discourse on the Path of Practice in these texts is not always completely harmonized with the context in which it is spoken. For example, in the *Tridaṇḍin*, the Discourse is given as an answer to the question: “what is *trai-vidyā?*” but in *Lohitya* I the question is rather: “what is *jñeya dharma?*” Furthermore, as Melzer suggests in her dissertation, sometimes the key word *abhijñā* in the formula on the Path of Practice contradicts with the term *prajñā* in the main narrative.<sup>31)</sup> The *Lohitya* II obviously interrupts the story line to give the highly abbreviated formula of the Path of Practice—the text would flow more naturally if this formula was omitted. This clearly supports Meisig’s theory that the Path of Practice is a later addition.<sup>32)</sup>

---

31) Melzer (2010) pp. 12–15.

32) Meisig (1987) p. 35ff.; 53 ff.; Ramers (1996) pp. 6–7.

## VI. Importance of the three texts and further tasks

This dissertation project is important not only because it introduces a critical edition of newly discovered *Ārghāgama* texts, but also because these two *Lohitya-sūtras*, along with the *Trindaṇḍī-sūtra*, serve as important sources for the study of the *Vinaya* and the study of the Buddhist practice system. The texts that I am studying provide another full Sanskrit version of the Buddhist Path of Practice,<sup>33)</sup> which is vital to any truly comparative study of the Path of Practice in the future. Such a study, encompassing all the extant versions, is still a *desideratum* in the field. In order to conduct this more extensive research, however, an edition of these three texts has to be prepared, and more *sūtras* in the *Ārghāgama* manuscript will need to be edited and analyzed and more research and publication on Turfan manuscripts (including the Turfan Dictionary) will have to be completed.

---

33) All the manuscript still does have many problems and errors, but thanks to the parallel texts I have introduced above, most of the corrupted parts of my texts can be filled in and corrected. At the same time, several missing parts in the *Saṅghabh*, which is also based on the single manuscript with many problems, can be completed.

## Abbreviations

DĀ: *The Dīrghāgama*

DĀ<sup>c</sup>: Chinese translation of the *Dīrghāgama* (T1)

DN: *The Dīgha Nikāya*, ed. T. W. Rhys Davids, J. Estlin Carpenter, 3 vols., London 1890–1911 (Pali Text Society)

*Saṅghabh*: *The Saṅghabhedavastu*, ed. Raniero Gnoli, *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu, Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*, (Serie Orientale Roma 49/1–2) Roma 1977–78.

SHT: *Sanskriithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Hrsg. Ernst Waldschmidt u. a., Wiesbaden, 1965 ff.

T: Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō

## Symbols Used in the Edition

- ( ) reconstructed text in a gap
- < > reconstructed text without a gap
- … correction of error
- { } superfluous akṣara(s) / word(s)
- || daṇḍa
- \* virāma

## Bibliography

- Allon, Mark / Salomon, Richard / Jacobsen, Geraldine / Zoppi, Ugo  
2006 “Radiocarbon Dating of Kharoṣṭhī Fragments from the Schøyen  
and Senior Manuscript Collections,” in: Jens Braarvig, Paul



- Harrison, Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Kazunobu Matsuda, Lore Sander (eds.), *Manuscripts of the Schøyen Collection, Buddhist Manuscripts 3*, Oslo, 279-291.
- Bonbunbutten-Kenkyukai, (represented by Yamagiwa Nobuyuki, Hiraoka Satoshi)
- 1994 An Annotated Japanese Translation of the *Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra* (1), *Journal of the Faculty of Letters, Bukkyo University* Vol. 2: 1-32.
- 1995 An Annotated Japanese Translation of the *Śrāmaṇyaphalasūtra* (2), *Journal of the Faculty of Letters, Bukkyo University* Vol. 3: 17-57.
- Choi, Jin kyoung
- 2012 “The two *Lohitya-sūtras* in the *Dirghāgama* Manuscript”, *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* Vol. 60, No. 3, March 2012 : 76-79.
- Couvreur, W.
- 1967 “Sanskrit-Tochaarse en Sanskrit-Koetsjische Trefwoordenlijsten van de *Dirghāgama* (*Dīghanikāya*)”, *Orientalia Gandensia* 4 : 151-165.
- Franke, R. Otto
- 1993 *Dīghanikāya, Das Buch der langen Texte des buddhistischen Kanons. In Auswahl übersetzt*, Göttingen, Leipzig
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe
- 1989 “Fragmente aus dem *Dirghāgama* der *Sarvāstivādins*,” *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon*:

- Neuentdeckungen u. Neueditionen*, 1, Göttingen 1989 (Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden, Beiheft 2 : 37–67.
- 1992 *Untersuchungen zum Dīrghāgama der Sarvāstivādins*, Göttingen (unpublished Habilitationdissertation).
- 2000 “Bemerkungen zu einer neuen Handschrift des Dīrghāgama” in *Vividharatnakaraṇḍaka: Festgabe für Adelheid Mette*, ed. Christine Chojnacki, Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Volker M. Tschannerl, Swisttal-Odendorf 2000 (*Indica et Tibetica*, 37) : 359–367.
- 2002 “Further Remarks on the New Manuscript of the Dīrghāgama.” *Journal of the International College of Advanced Buddhist Studies*, 5: 133–5.
- 2004 “Contents and Structure of the Dīrghāgama of the (Mūla-) Sarvāstivādins.” *Annual Report of the International Research Institute of Advanced Buddhology*, 7 : 119–37.
- n.d. “The *Dīrghāgama* manuscript.” unpublished paper given at “Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: The State of the Field” at the Stanford University.
- Honjō, Yoshifumi
- 1984 *A Table of Āgama-Citations in the Abhidharmakośa and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā*, Part I, Kyoto.
- 1985 “Upāyikā shoden no Jōagon” (“The *Dīrghāgama* Transmitted by Śamathadeva”), *Indogaku Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū* vol. 33 : 783–779.
- Matsuda, Kazunobu
- 2006 “Bonbun Jōagon no *Tridaṇḍi-sūtra* ni tsuite” in *Indogaku-*

*Bukkyōgaku Kenkyū*, vol. 54, no. 2 : 129–136.

Meisig, Konrad

1987 *Das Śramaṇyaphala–Sūtra, Synoptische Übersetzung und Glossar der chinesischen Fassungen verglichen mit dem Sanskrit und Pāli*, Wiesbaden.

Melzer, Gudrun

2010 *Ein Abschnitt aus dem Dīrghāgama*, PhD Dissertation, Ludwig Maximilians University, Munich.

Ramers, Peter

1996 *Die “Drei Kapitel über Sittlichkeit” im Śrāmaṇyaphala–Sūtra. Die Fassungen des Dīghanikāya und Saṃghabhedavastu, verglichen mit dem Tibetischen und Mongolischen. Einführung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*, Inauguraldissertation Rheinische Friedrich–Wilhelms–Universität zu Bonn.

Sander, Lore

1968 *Paläographisches zu den Sanskrithandschriften der Berliner Turfansammlung* (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Supplement 8). Wiesbaden.

2007 “Confusion of Terms and Terms of Confusion in Indian Palaeography,” in: Karin Preisendanz (ed.), *Expanding and Merging Horizons. Contributions to South Asian and Cross–Cultural Studies in Commemoration of Wilhelm Halbfass*, Vienna: 121–139.

Yamagiwa, Nobuyuki

1996 “Pāri Chōbu ‘Kaiunbon’ to Ritsuzō”, *Journal of the Faculty of Letters, Bukkyo University*, vol. LXXX : 35–51.