

JENS-UWE HARTMANN

SANSKRIT FRAGMENTS FROM THE *ĀGAMAS* (I):  
THE AṄGULIMĀLASŪTRA

It is well known that the *Sūtrapīṭakas* of the various Buddhist schools, as far as they are preserved at all, do not always agree very closely with each other, although they share a common literary heritage. The only *Sūtrapīṭaka* preserved in its entirety belongs to the Pāli Tipiṭaka, the canon of the Theravāda school, and it therefore serves as the point of reference for comparative purposes. For many of the texts in the other surviving *sūtra* collections a counterpart is found in the Pāli *Suttapīṭaka*, which is similar enough to be easily recognized as such. Apart from such overall similarities and apart from the language in which each of the collections is either composed or preserved, many differences can be observed which concern not only the wording, but also the setting, the persons involved, the dogmatical contents, the structure, etc. of the *sūtras*. Thus, a *sūtra* usually contains enough individual characteristics to set it apart from all the other related versions.

Beyond differences within the texts, each collection also shows individual features which distinguish it from the other collections. Although the principle of the *Āgama/Nikāya* division appears to have prevailed in all collections against other, earlier forms of

structuring<sup>1</sup>, the contents of the respective *Āgamas/Nikāyas* by no means agree. Differences are found not only in their structure, i.e. in the division into subsections, in the number of *sūtras* and in their sequence, but also in assigning a *sūtra* to a specific *Āgama* or *Nikāya*. While a certain *sūtra* belongs to the "Collection of Long (Discourses)" of one school, it may be assigned to the "Collection (of Discourses) of Middle (Length)" by another, and vice versa. For instance, the version of the \**Bodharājakumārasūtra* preserved in the Sanskrit fragments published by Grigorij M. Bongard-Levin<sup>2</sup> most likely belongs to a manuscript of the *Dirghāgama* of the Central Asian *Sarvāstivādins*; its Pāli counterpart, however, the *Bodhirājakumārasutta*, is found in the *Majjhimanikāya* (no. 85)<sup>3</sup> and immediately precedes the *Aṅgulimālasūtra* (no. 86). The *Mahānidānasūtra*, on the other hand, is included in the long collection by the Theravādins (no. 15) and by the Dharmaguptakas (no. 13), but in the *Madhyamāgama* by the Sarvāstivādins<sup>4</sup>. Other *sūtras*, as for example the famous *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, are unanimously assigned by all schools to one and the same collection, in this case the *Dirghāgama/Dighanikāya*<sup>5</sup>.

In the case of the *Aṅgulimālasūtra* to be discussed here, the redactors of the various canonical collections were more divided: its *Theravāda* version is found in the *Majjhimanikāya*, and the (Mūla-)

<sup>1</sup> Cf. OSKAR VON HINÜBER, "Die neun *Aṅgas*. Ein früher Versuch zur Einteilung buddhistischer Texte", in *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* 38 (1994), pp. 121-135.

<sup>2</sup> G. M. BONGARD-LEVIN, "Three New Fragments of the *Bodharājakumārasūtra* from Eastern Turkestan", in *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 109 (1989), pp. 509-512.

<sup>3</sup> It is also absent from the *Dirghāgama* preserved in Chinese translation which probably belongs to the school of the *Dharmaguptakas*, and may also have been included in the lost *Madhyamāgama* of this school.

<sup>4</sup> No. 97 of the Chinese *Madhyamāgama* which represents a version of the *Sarvāstivādins*.

<sup>5</sup> No. 16 in the *Dighanikāya* and no. 2 in the Chinese *Dirghāgama*; for the Sanskrit text from Central Asia cf. MPS and G. M. BONGARD-LEVIN and M. I. VOROB'EVA-DESJATOVSKAJA, *Pamjatniki indijskoj pis'mennosti iz central'noj azii. Izdanie tekstov, issledovanie, perevod i kommentarij*, vypusk 2, Moskva, 1990 (Bibliotheca Buddhica, 34), p. 208 ff.

Sarvāstivāda version has been incorporated into the *Samyuktāgama*<sup>6</sup>. Another version is included in the Chinese translation of the *Ekottarikāgama*, which probably belongs to the Mahāsāṅghikas, although the question of its school affiliation is not yet finally settled<sup>7</sup>. Aside from these three, there exist three separate translations in the Chinese canon, which show various stages of development<sup>8</sup>. Two of them, T 118 and T 119, are similar to the *Ekottarikāgama* version, and in the third, T 120, the original story has served as the nucleus for a full-fledged Mahāyāna *sūtra* of the Tathāgatagarbha corpus, which has also been translated into Tibetan.

Obviously, the tale of the notorious brigand Aṅgulimāla was exciting enough to serve as an example for illustrating the Buddha's impressive power of converting even the most untameable. Throughout Buddhist literature, the story is retold, quoted or alluded to<sup>9</sup>. Aṅgulimāla is mentioned as the embodiment of a person either full of hatred or of stupidity, or his taming exemplifies a conversion

<sup>6</sup> MN II 97-105 (no. 86); T 99, vol. 2, 280c (no. 1077), and T 100, vol. 2, 378b (no. 16).

<sup>7</sup> T 125, vol. 2, 719b; for the school ascription cf. EGAKU MAYEDA, "Japanese Studies on the Schools of the Chinese Āgamas", in *Schulzugehörigkeit*, pp. 102-103, JOHANNES BRONKHORST, "Dharma and Abhidharma", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies*, 48 (1985), p. 312 f., and LAMBERT SCHMITHAUSEN, "Beiträge zur Schulzugehörigkeit und Textgeschichte kanonischer und postkanonischer buddhistischer Materialien", in *Schulzugehörigkeit*, p. 321.

<sup>8</sup> For a description of this development in the existing versions of the *sūtra* cf. ANDRÉ BAREAU, "Étude du bouddhisme", in *Annuaire du Collège de France 1985-1986, Résumé des Cours et Travaux*, Paris, 647-658 ("2. La légende de l'Aṅgulimāla dans les anciens textes canoniques", p. 654 ff.).

<sup>9</sup> Peter Skilling, Bangkok, kindly draws my attention to a quotation in Vasubandhu's *Vyākhyāyukti*, cf. TT no. 5562, vol. 113, 277.4.8 = *sems tsam si*, 113a8: *sor phreñ ña ni kun nas sems can thams cad la || dbyug pa dag ni span par byas nas 'dug pa yin*, corresponding to MN II 99, 29-30 *Ṭhito ahaṃ, Aṅgulimāla, sabbadā sabbesu bhūtesu nidhāya daṇḍaṃ*. He further refers to another possible quotation in the *Vyākhyāyukti-sūtrakhaṇḍasāta*, cf. TT no. 5561, vol. 113, 240.1.1-3 = *sems tsam si*, 19b 1-3: *btsun pa bcom ldan 'das ni ma dul ba rnams dul bar mdzad pa | ma zi ba rnams zi bar mdzad pa | dbugs ma phyin ba rnams dbugs 'byin par mdzad pa | yoñs su mya ñan las ma 'das pa rnams yoñs su mya ñan las 'da' bar mdzad pa' o*, which corresponds to MN II 102, 20-21 *bhante, Bhagavā, adantānaṃ dametā asantānaṃ sametā aparinibbutānaṃ parinibbāpetā*. However, this citation may be a stock phrase, although it is found only once in the Pāli *Suttapiṭaka*.

by supernatural powers. In one of his famous *buddhastotras*, the Buddhist poet Mātṛceṭa marvels at the inner change of Aṅgulimāla with the following rhetorical question:

*indriyopaśamo nande mānastabdhe ca saṃnatiḥ |*

*kṣamitvaṃ cāṅgulimāle kaṃ na vismayam ānayet || .*

"Tranquillity of the senses in a Nanda, humility in a Mānastabdha, mercy in an Aṅgulimāla – whom would not these amaze?"<sup>10</sup>

The same persons are named, together with Urubilvākāśyapa, in the Avadānaśataka as examples of those whom the Buddha has saved from the ocean of *rāga* (Nanda), *dveṣa* (Aṅgulimāla), *māna* (Mānastabdha) and *moha* (Urubilvākāśyapa)<sup>11</sup>. Together with Nanda, Ajātaśatru and Udayana, Aṅgulimāla is adduced by Nāgārjuna in verse 14 of his *Suḥṛllekha* as an example of those who reformed their behaviour:

"One who has formerly been heedless, but later becomes heedful – like Nanda, Aṅgulimāla, Ajātaśatru and Udayana – will also be resplendent like the moon free from clouds."<sup>12</sup>

<sup>10</sup> Verse 125; quoted from *The Śatapañcāśatika of Mātṛceṭa*, ed. D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY, Cambridge 1951, 130 and 174. Aṅgulimāla is named in the commentary on verses 98, 105, 107, 122 and 123, cf. *ibid.*, pp. 108, 114, 115 and 128. – Cf. also verse 10 in a fragmentary *buddhastotra*, provisionally named "Praise of the Buddha's Conversions" by its editor, Dieter SCHLINGLOFF (cf. *Buddhistische Stotras aus ostturkistanischen Sanskrittexten*, Berlin 1955 [Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden, I], p. 104).

<sup>11</sup> *Avadānaśataka. A Century of Edifying Tales Belonging to the Hīnayāna*, ed. J. S. SPEYER, St. Petersburg 1902-1909 (Bibliotheca Buddhica, 3), vol. I, 148, 9-10; for *Aṅgulimāla* and *Urubilvākāśyapa*, cf. also EDOUARD HUBER, *Aṣvaghōṣa, Sūtrālaṅkāra. Traduit en français sur la version chinoise de Kumārajīva*, Paris, 1908, pp. 204 and 460-461.

<sup>12</sup> *gañ 'zig siion chad bag med gyur pa lags || phyi nas bag dai ldan par gyur de yan || zla ba sprin bral lta hur rnam mdzes te || dga' bo sor phreñ mthoñ ldan bde byed bzin ||* (text and translation in L. JAMSPAL, N. S. CHOPHEL, P. DELLA SANTINA, *Nāgārjuna's Letter to King Gautamīputra*, Delhi, 1978, pp. 9 and 75). It is interesting to note that Nāgārjuna's verse is clearly modelled on a verse from the *Aṅgulimālasūtra*: cf. *yas tu pūrvaṃ pramādyeha paścād vai na pramādyate | sa imaṃ bhāṣate lokam abhramuktaiva ca candramāḥ ||* (Sanskrit text in *Udānavarga*, ed. Franz BERNHARD, Göttingen, 1965, verse 16.5; for the Pāli see MN II 104, 21-22, for the *Samyuktāgama* T 99, 281 b 11-12, and T 100, 379 a 15-16, and for the *Ekottarikāgama* T 125, 721b17-18). In his commentary on the *Suḥṛllekha*, Mahāmāti explains that Aṅgulimāla serves as an example of foolishness (*de ni hlun po 'zig ste*, TT 5690, vol. 129, 156.1.4-5 = *gtam yig ñe*, 334b 4-5).

In chapter 21 of his *Buddhacarita*, entitled *Las kyī rgyun* (translated by E. H. JOHNSTON as "Progress (*srotas*) of the Mission"), Aśvaghōṣa refers specifically to the Buddha's *ṛddhi* as the means of conversion:

"Among the Suhmas the Holy One by the might of His magic power converted Aṅgulimāla, a Brahman who was cruel like Saudāsa."<sup>13</sup>

Some, if not most, of the authors seem to allude not so much to Aṅgulimāla the brigand, but rather to Aṅgulimāla the collector of fingers from one thousand people, who is acting on a vicious instruction of his teacher<sup>14</sup>. This latter episode is still absent from the Theravāda and Sarvāstivāda versions of the *sūtra*; obviously, it was

---

<sup>13</sup> E. H. JOHNSTON, "The Buddha's Mission and last Journey: *Buddhacarita*, xv to xxviii", in *Acta Orientalia* 15 (1937), p. 100, verse 21.13 (repr. as Part III in E. H. JOHNSTON, *Aśvaghōṣa's Buddhacarita or Acts of the Buddha*, Delhi 1984). This part of the *Buddhacarita* is only preserved in Tibetan translation: 'tshe byed sor mo'i phreñ ba can || bran bzañs dañ mtshuñs gñis skyes ni || bcom ldan rdzu 'phrul phun tshogs kyis || phra mo rñams sit btul bar mdzad || (TT no. 5656, vol. 129, 158.4.7-8 = *skyes rabs ñe*, 91 a7-8).

<sup>14</sup> Cf. AKANUMA Chizen, *Indo bukk'yō koyameishi jiten* ("Dictionary of proper names of Indian Buddhism"), Nagoya, 1931, pp. 39-41, and G.P.MALALASEKERA, *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*, London, 1937, vol. 1, pp. 22 f.; see also chapter 36 in the *Sūtra* of the Wise and the Foolish where the story, similar to the Pāli Jātaka (no. 537), is connected with the *avadāna* of Sutasoma and Saudāsa, cf. DIETER SCHLINGLOFF, "Die Erzählung von Sutasoma und Saudāsa in der buddhistischen Kunst", in *Altorientalische Forschungen* 2 (1975), pp. 93-117, and *Studies in the Ajanta Paintings. Identifications and Interpretations*, Delhi, 1987, pp. 93-112; for a reference to a representation of the Aṅgulimāla story in Gandharan art see *Studies in the Ajanta Paintings*, p. 229. For the connection of Aṅgulimāla with Saudāsa/Kalmāṣapāda in the Uigur Daśakarmapathāvadānamālā cf. GERHARD EHLERS, "Notabilia zur alttürkischen Oberstufenzählung", in *Ural-Altäische Jahrbücher* 3 (1983), p. 86; the story of Aṅgulimāla himself is also told in the *Maitrisimit*, cf. Şinasi TEKIN, *Maitrisimit nom bitig. Die uigurische Übersetzung eines Werkes der buddhistischen Vaibhāṣika-Schule*, Teil 1, Berlin 1980 (Berliner Turfantexte, 9), p. 162. For remarks on the story see also W. STEDE, "Aṅgulimāla and Liberation", in *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 20 (1957), pp. 533-535. – The references given in this and the preceding notes are by no means exhaustive.

added later to explain his name<sup>15</sup>. While the verse portions are basically the same, the Theravāda version is much longer than the Sarvāstivāda one which lacks the episodes of how King Prasenajit, on his way to track down the wanted criminal, visits the Buddha and unexpectedly meets him newly ordained, or how Aṅgulimāla helps a woman having a difficult labour by a word of truth (*satyavacana*)<sup>16</sup>, or how various unpleasant incidents happen to him on his alms rounds<sup>17</sup>.

Of all the versions of the *sūtra*, only the Theravāda one is entirely preserved in its Indian original. When working on the Sanskrit manuscripts of the so-called German Turfan collection in the first decades of this century, Else and Heinrich Lüders succeeded in identifying one small fragment as belonging to a related version of the text. In 1965 it was edited by Ernst Waldschmidt as no. 160c in the first catalogue volume of the German collection, and in the accompanying notes Waldschmidt referred to the Pāli text and to the Chinese translation of the *Samyuktāgama*<sup>18</sup>. Although he did not express any opinion on the school affiliation of the Sanskrit

---

<sup>15</sup> For an attempt at explaining the background of the Aṅgulimāla story, cf. RICHARD GOMBRICH, *How Buddhism Began: the Conditioned Genesis of the Early Teachings*, Athlone, 1996, pp. 135-164 (chapter v: "Who was Aṅgulimāla?"). His ingenious restoration of Aṅgulimāla's second verse (MN II 100,1-4), however, is not borne out by the Chinese versions. Cf. now the review of Gombrich's book by MAITHRIMURTHI MUDAGAMUWA and A.V. ROSPATT in *Indo-Iranian Journal* 41 (1998), pp. 164-170, especially 169ff.

<sup>16</sup> This episode has caused the inclusion of the *sutta* among the *Paritta* texts; cf. RICHARD GOMBRICH, *Precept and Practice: Traditional Buddhism in the Rural Highlands of Ceylon*, Oxford, 1971, p. 224, and PETER SKILLING, "The Rakṣā Literature of the Śrāvakayāna", in *Journal of the Pāli Text Society* 16 (1992), pp. 121, 174 and 178.

<sup>17</sup> For the relation between these incidents and Aṅgulimāla's past *karma* see FUMIO ENOMOTO, "On the Annihilation of *karman* in Early Buddhism", in *Transactions of the International Conference of Orientalists in Japan* 34 (1989), pp. 53-55, and TILMANN VETTER, *The Ideas and Meditative Practices of Early Buddhism*, Leiden, 1988, p. 89 f.

<sup>18</sup> SHT I, pp. 90-91. – There is another small fragment, SHT VI 1561, which on one side appears to contain an encounter between the Buddha and Aṅgulimāla, but the few *akṣaras* which have been preserved do not permit one to relate it to any of the existing versions.

fragment, it is clear from his notes that it corresponds much better to the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda version of the Saṃyuktāgama than to the *Majjhimanikāya* of the Pāli. Consequently, Fumio Enomoto included this fragment in his study of the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama*<sup>19</sup>.

During a survey of the Sanskrit manuscripts from Northern Turkestan in the Hoernle collection in London, two more fragments of the same text could be identified<sup>20</sup>, which will be introduced in the following. They form part of a single leaf, starting at the right side of the punch hole, and can be joined without a gap. The leaf contains six lines and the text is written in the standard form of the later Northern Turkestan Brāhmī. In the first line of the recto side the last sentence of the preceding *sūtra* is preserved, and in the second line the *Aṅgulimālasūtra* begins. The end of the preceding text entails a certain problem, since according to the Chinese *Saṃyuktāgama* this *sūtra* closes with the standard formula that the monks rejoiced in the words of the Blessed One. The corresponding Sanskrit phrase would be something like *te bhikṣavo bhagavato bhāṣitam abhyanandan*, cf. SWTF s.v. *abhinand*. However, the present fragment starts with *///sya bhāṣitam*, which could hardly refer to the Buddha as the speaker of the foregoing. Since the genitive ending alone offers little basis for further speculation, at present it must suffice to draw attention to the problem.

---

<sup>19</sup> FUMIO ENOMOTO, *A Comprehensive Study of the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama. Indic Texts Corresponding to the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama as Found in the Sarvāstivāda-Mūlasarvāstivāda Literature. Part I: \*Saṃgītanipāta*, Kyoto, 1994, p. 22.

<sup>20</sup> JENS-UWE HARTMANN and KLAUS WILLE, "Die nordturkistanischen Sanskrit-Handschriften der Sammlung Hoernle (Funde buddhistischer Sanskrit-Handschriften, II)", in *Sanskrit-Texte aus dem buddhistischen Kanon: Neuentdeckungen u. Neueditionen*, 2, Göttingen, 1992 (SWTF, Beiheft, 4), p. 38 (ad Photo 172; right part of the fragment) and 41 (ad Photo 179; left part); both fragments carry no number and are therefore referred to by means of a microfilm of the collection produced in 1950. The originals could be compared during a visit to the India Office Library in April 1990. They are not placed under glass, but kept loose in envelopes, and on the microfilm, the lower edge is folded back in two places which conceals a few *aṅṣaras* in lines r 6 and v 1.

Recto<sup>21</sup>

- 1 /// + [sya] bhāṣita[m abhi]na .[yā]numodya utthāyāsa[n] .[r] .///  
 2 /// .. deṣu caryāṃ caraṃ yena dhavajākāvanaṣaṇḍa taṃ mārgaṃ  
 .[r] .///  
 3 /// O utpathājīvā manuṣyā bhagavaṃtaṃ mārgaṃ pra .. ///  
 4 /// O tra coraḥ pratyasthāt\* mā te sa vihetḥayi + ///  
 5 /// + + [tar] apī gopālakāḥ paśupālakāḥ pūrvava + ///  
 6 /// + + ca punar asiñ ca + [kh]e .. kaṃ .. + + + + + ///

## Verso

- 1 /// + taṃ dṛṣṭvā ca punar asyetad abhavat\* + + + + + ///  
 2 /// + śaknuvāṃ prākṛtayā gatyā gacchamtaṃ anvāgamtuṃ + + ///  
 3 /// O rvajanena dhāvaṃ bhagavaṃtaṃ na śaknoti prā[k]r + ///  
 4 /// O vaṃtaṃ idam avocat\* tiṣ[ṭh]a tiṣṭha śramaṇa + ///  
 5 /// .gulimālaś coras tasyāṃ velāyāṃ gāthāṃ babhāṣe · || [g] .///  
 6 /// rtha[m] sthitas [tvaṃ k] . .. m a[sthi]to ham\* bhagavāṃṇ aha [ | ] + ///

## Recto

- 1: restore to *abhina(nd)yānumodya utthāyāsan(āt p)r(akrāntah)* or *(p)r(akrāntāḥ)*, one of the possible formulas at the end of a *sūtra* or of a passage within a *sūtra*. For the different ending in the Chinese SĀ (the monks rejoicing in the word of the Buddha: T 99, 280 c 16), cf. above.  
 2: restore to *(magadheṣu or māgadḥakeṣu janapa)deṣu caryāṃ caran yena dhavajākāvanaṣaṇḍa<ṃ> taṃ mārgaṃ (p)r(atipannaḥ)*, cf. T 99, 280c 19 and T 100, 378b 17. The restoration of the location is based on T 100 (*mojietuo*); T 99 has *yangquduolo*. For the Sanskrit forms of the name see, e.g., SHT VI 1415 v2 *bhagavāṃ [maga]dheṣu viharati* and 1381 folio 175 r3, v1 *māgadḥako gopālakāḥ*. According to the Pāli the Buddha stays in Sāvattḥī.

<sup>21</sup> Round brackets ( ) signify restoration in a gap, square brackets [ ] damaged *aḥṣaras*, pointed brackets < > the omission of (part of) an *aḥṣara*; a cross + denotes a destroyed *aḥṣara*, two dots .. denote an illegible *aḥṣara*, one dot an illegible part of an *aḥṣara*; O stands for the punch hole, /// for the breaking off of the fragment, and \* denotes the *virāma*.



For *dhavajākāvanaṣaṇḍa* compare the similar *jalūkāvanaṣaṇḍa* in MPS 26.3. In T 99 the name is transcribed (*tuoposhelijia*), but in T 100 translated (*taohe shulin*, "Peach River Coppice").

- 3: restore probably to (*adrākṣuḥ*) . . . *pra(tipannam)* "People making their living in out-of-the-way places saw the Lord wandering along the way", cf. T 99, 280c 20-21 and MN II 98, 7-9 *Addasāsuṃ kho gopālakā pasupālakā kassakā padhāvino Bhagavantaṃ yena coro Aṅgulimālo ten' addhānamaggaṃ paṭipannaṃ*.
- 4: restore to (*ya*)*tra*, "where the brigand dwelled"? The exact reference of this sentence remains unclear, but apparently it belongs to the words of the cowherds etc. At the end of the line, restore to *viheṭṭhayi(syati)*, "May he not harm you!" There is no verbal correspondence in either the Chinese SĀ (cf. T 99, 280 c 22) or in the Pāli text.
- 5: read and restore to (*pu*)*nar*? Or should one, on the contrary, read *t[r]r*? Cf. T 99, 280 c 23 and MN II 98,23-24 *Tatiyaṃ pi kho gopālakā pasupālakā kassakā padhāvino Bhagavantaṃ etad avocum*. Moreover, *paśupālakāḥ* is to be corrected to *ṣpālakāḥ*. Restore to *pūrvava(d yāvata)*; apparently the formula which precedes *utpathājīvā manussyāḥ* in r3 is repeated, cf. T 99, 280 c 19-20.
- 6: *asi* shows that Aṅgulimāla has been introduced, cf. T 99, 280 c 24 and MN II 99,5-6 *Atha kho coro Aṅgulimālo asicammaṃ gahetvā dhanukalāpaṃ sannayhitvā*. The line is probably to be restored to (*adrākṣīd aṅgulimālaś coro bhagavantaṃ mārgaṃ pratipannaṃ dṛṣṭvā*) *ca punar asiñ ca khe(ṭa)kaṃ* and a form of *grah*, "the brigand Aṅgulimāla saw the Lord wandering along the way and, having seen [him], took sword and shield"; cf. also T 99 ("with his hand he seized sword and shield").

#### Verso

- 1: the Buddha notices that Aṅgulimāla is following him. At the beginning, the line is probably to be restored to (*adrākṣīd bhagavān aṅgulimālaṃ coraṃ anvāgacchaṃ*)*taṃ* or (... *dhāvaṃ*)*taṃ* (for the latter, cf. v3), "The Lord saw the brigand

- 1: Aṅgulimāla coming after him and, having seen [him], he considered". The beginning of his reflections on making use of his supernatural faculties is preserved in SHT I 160 c r1; there one has to restore to *(yan)[v a]haṃ tad[rū](pān ṛddhyabhisamskārān abhisamskuryāṃ yathā ...)* "I should now accomplish such a performance of supernatural power that ...", cf. SWTF s.v. *ṛddhy-abhisamskāra*. The Chinese version is shorter (cf. T 99, 280 c 25), and the Pāli text shows no verbal correspondence (MN II 99, 7-8).
- 2: apparently Aṅgulimāla talks to himself: "I should be able to follow the [ascetic] who is walking at a normal pace". In the Pāli, a sentence with partially similar wording appears in a later place *atha ca panāhaṃ imaṃ samaṇaṃ pakatiyā gacchantaṃ sabbathāmena gacchanta na sakkomi sampāpunītuṃ iti*, MN II 99,15-16. The reading in SHT I 160 c r2 has to be corrected to *(gac)[ch]antam*, cf. the facsimile in SHT II, plate 31.
- 3: *///rvajanena* obviously corresponds to MN II 99,9 *sabbathāmena*, but remains unintelligible in this form. Read *(sa)rvajavena*, "with all speed", cf. *kuai* in T 99, 280 c 26? For the whole line cf. MN II 99,8-10 (as quoted for v2, but now in the 3rd person). The line overlaps with SHT I 160 c r3.
- 4: restore to *(athāṅgulimālaś coro bhaga)vaṃtam ...*, "Then the brigand Aṅgulimāla said to the Lord: 'Stay! Stay, ascetic!'", see T 99, 280c26 and MN II 99,16-17 *Ṭhito Bhagavantaṃ etad avoca: Tiṭṭha, samaṇa; tiṭṭha, samaṇāti'*, see also SHT I 160 c r4. Cf., moreover, the corresponding version of the story in the *Sūtra of the Wise and the Foolish*, TT no. 1008, vol. 40, 106.2.3-4 = *mdo hu*, 260r3-4 *saṅs rgyas kyis de ltar 'oṅs pa gzigz nas | zábs kyis dal gyis gśegs kyaṅ sor phreṅ can mthu stobs gtugs te | brgyugs kyaṅ ma slebs nas | rgyaṅ ma nas dge sloṅ khyod cuṅ zad cig sdod cig ces bos so || bcom ldan 'das kyis kyaṅ rgyaṅ ma nas | ṅa ni rtag tu sdod na | khyod ṅid mi sdod do źes bka' stsal pa. daṅ etc.*
- 5: restore with SHT I 160 c r5 to *(athāṅ)gulimālaś*, cf. T 99, 280 c 28 and MN II 99,23 -24 *Atha kho coro Aṅgulimālo Bhagavantaṃ gāthāya ajjhabhāsi*. Furthermore, MN II 99, 25

*Gacchaṃ vadesi* suggests the restoration to a form of *gam* at the end of the line.

- 6: restore to *k(atha)m*, cf. MN II 99, 27-28 *Pucchāmi taṃ, samaṇa, etam atthaṃ: Kathaṃ t̥hito tvaṃ, ahaṃ aṭṭhito 'mhi?* It would be tempting to use SHT 1 160 c r6 *[[[ṣ]e tvaṃ śramaṇaitam a]]* for a restoration (*tvaṃ śramaṇaitam a*)*rthaṃ*, but this is impossible for metrical reasons. The metre is probably Indravajra, which would become defective by such a restoration. Is it possible that another *katham* has been omitted and that one should therefore restore to (– – ∪ – *tvaṃ śramaṇaitam a*)*rthaṃ* <*kathaṃ*> *sthitas tvaṃ k(atha)m asthito 'ham*, "Tell me, ascetic, about this matter: How is it that you are standing still, how is it that I am not standing still"?

Finally, the first *akṣara* in SHT 160 cr6 is rather to be read as *[[[m]e*, and such a reading suggests *brūhi me* or the like as a possible restoration. This is indirectly confirmed by T 99, 281 a2, where a verb is used meaning "to speak" and not "to ask" (as in the Pāli).

#### Abbreviations

MN = *Majjhima-Nikāya*, ed. V. TRECKNER, ROBERT CHALMERS, 3 vols., London 1888-1899 (The Pāli Text Society).

MPS = *Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*, Teil I-III, ed. ERNST WALDSCHMIDT, Berlin 1950-1951 (Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, 1949,1, 1950, 2-3).

*Schulzugehörigkeit* = *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III,1-2)*, ed. HEINZ BECHERT, vols. 1-2, Göttingen, 1985-1987 (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, 149, 154).

SHT = *Sanskrithandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, Teil 1 -7, ed. ERNST WALDSCHMIDT, LORE SANDER, KLAUS WILLE, Wiesbaden 1965-1995 (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, X, 1-7).

SWTF = *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, begonnen von ERNST WALDSCHMIDT, hrsg.

von HEINZ BECHERT, bearbeitet von GEORG von SIMSON,  
MICHAEL SCHMIDT, JENS-UWE HARTMANN, SIGLINDE DIETZ,  
Bd. I, Göttingen, 1973-1994.

T = *Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō* or *Taishō Issaikyō*, 100 vols., Tokyo,  
1924 ff.

TT = *The Tibetan Tripitaka*, Peking Edition (repr.), ed. Daisetz T.  
SUZUKI, 168 vols., Tokyo, Kyoto, 1955-1961.