

創価大学  
国際仏教学高等研究所  
年報

平成25年度  
(第17号)

Annual Report  
of  
The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
at Soka University

for the Academic Year 2013

Volume XVII

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所  
東京・2014・八王子

The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology  
Soka University  
Tokyo・2014

創価大学・国際仏教学高等研究所・年報  
平成25年度（第17号）

*Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*  
(ARIRIAB)  
*at Soka University for the Academic Year 2013*  
Vol. XVII (2014)

目 次／CONTENTS

#: paper written in Japanese.

● 研究報告 RESEARCH ARTICLES:

Harry FALK:		
The first-century Copper-plates of Helagupta from Gandhāra hailing Maitreya		3
Richard SALOMON and Joseph MARINO:		
Observations on the Deorkothar Inscriptions and Their Significance for the Evaluation of Buddhist Historical Traditions		27
ANĀLAYO:		
The <i>Brahmajāla</i> and the Early Buddhist Oral Tradition		41
Petra KIEFFER-PÜLZ:		
Quotatives Indicating Quotations in Pāli Commentarial Literature, II: Quotatives with <i>āha</i>		61
Seishi KARASHIMA:		
The Language of the <i>Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ</i> — The Oldest Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Text		77
Haiyan HU-VON HINÜBER:		
Quotations from earlier Buddhist Texts in the <i>Poṣadhavastu</i> of the Mūlasarvāstivāda School		89
Noriyuki KUDO:		
The <i>Karmavibhaṅgopadeśa</i> : A Transliteration of the Nepalese Manuscript A (6)		95
GUAN Di:		
Three Sanskrit Fragments Preserved in Arthur M. Sackler Museum of Peking University		109
Seishi KARASHIMA:		
New Research on the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts from Central Asia		119
Akira YUYAMA:		
Reviewing <i>Rgs</i> XIV 2 & 7: How One Can Rescue Oneself When Shipwrecked in the Ocean With Some Reference to Haribhadra's Commentary		129
Akira YUYAMA:		
A Brief Revisit to <i>Rgs</i> XXII.6 Quoted by Candrakīrti in his <i>Pras</i>		147
Jonathan A. SILK:		
Taking the <i>Vimalakīrtinirdeśa</i> Seriously		157
LI Xuezhū, Kazuo KANO and YE Shaoyong:		
A Sanskrit folio of the <i>Yuktiṣaṣṭikāvṛtti</i> newly found in Tibet		189
LI Xuezhū:		
Diplomatic Transcription of Newly Available Leaves from Asaṅga's <i>Abhidharmasamuccaya</i> — Folios 29, 33, 39, 43, 44 —		195
Michael RADICH:		
On the Sources, Style and Authorship of Chapters of the Synoptic <i>Suvarṇaprabhāsa-sūtra</i> T 644 Ascribed to Paramārtha (Part 1)		207
Peter SKILLING and SAERJI:		
How the Buddhas of the Fortunate Aeon First Aspired to Awakening: The <i>pūrva-praṇīdhānas</i> of Buddhas 1–250		245

James B. APPLE:		
Fragments and Phylogeny of the Tibetan Version of the <i>Mañjuśrīvihārasūtra</i> :		
A Case Study in the Genealogy of Tibetan Kanjurs		293
DHAMMADINNĀ:		
‘ <i>Mahāratnakūṭa</i> ’ Scriptures in Khotan: A quotation from the <i>Samantamukhparivarta</i>		
in the <i>Book of Zambasta</i>		337
DUAN Qing:		
Puñadatta’s Contract of Sale of an Estate		349
Tatsushi TAMAI:		
The Tocharian <i>Karmavācanā</i>		365
Tatsushi TAMAI:		
Tocharian Syllabary with Uigur Explanations: M34.4 of the Mannerheim Collection		
in Helsinki		395
Peter ZIEME:		
Collecting of the Buddhist Scriptures: Notes on Old Uigur “annals”		401
Isao KURITA:		
Gandhāran Art (Part 2) [57 figures]		423
Jonathan A. SILK:		
Keeping Up With the Joneses: From William Jones to John James Jones		427
Akira YUYAMA:		
Supplement to ‘A List of Writings with Brief Bibliographical Notes. Appendix: Curriculum Vitae		
— A Succinct Autobiographical Record’, <i>ARIRIAB</i> , XVI: 2012 (2013), pp. 343-390:		
<i>Addenda et Corrigenda as of 1 January 2014</i>		443
#辛嶋静志:		
大乘仏教とガンダーラ——般若経・阿弥陀・観音——		449
#[Seishi KARASHIMA: Mahāyāna Buddhism and Gandhāra — On the <i>Prajñāpāramitā</i> ,		
<i>Amitābha</i> and <i>Avalokitasvara</i> ]		
#工藤順之:		
(Mahā-)Karmavibhaṅga 所引經典類研究ノート(4): Nandikasūtra, Devatāsūtra 追補		487
#[Noriyuki KUDO: Philological Notes on the Quotations in the (Mahā-)Karmavibhaṅga (4):		
Supplementary Remarks on <i>Nandikasūtra</i> and <i>Devatāsūtra</i> ]		
#湯山 明:		
Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Marginal Anecdote (VI)		497
新刊論著紹介		
#[Akira YUYAMA: Miscellanea Philologica Buddhica: Marginal Anecdote (VI)		
Introducing Some Recent Publications]		
Brief Communication:		
Noriyuki KUDO: Newly Identified Folios in the <i>Gilgit Buddhist Manuscripts</i>		517
<b>● 国際仏教学高等研究所彙報 IRIAB BULLETIN:</b>		
活動報告	IRIAB Activities	519
所長・所員の著作	List of Publications of the IRIAB Fellows	522
受贈受入図書	Books Received	523
受贈受入雑誌	Journals Received	526
<b>● EDITORIALS:</b>		
執筆者紹介	Contributors to this Issue / Editorial Postscript	529
既刊案内	<i>Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India — Facsimile Edition</i> , Vol. I	
<b>● PLATES:</b>		
1 Harry FALK: “The first-century Copper-plates of Helagupta from Gandhāra hailing Maitreya”	PLATES	1–6
2 GUAN Di: “Three Sanskrit Fragments Preserved in Arthur M. Sackler Museum of Peking University”	PLATES	7–8
3 Seishi KARASHIMA: “New Research on the Buddhist Sanskrit Manuscripts from Central Asia”	PLATES	9–10
4 Akira YUYAMA: “Reviewing Rgs XIV 2 & 7: How One Can Rescue Oneself ...”	PLATES	11–12
5 Peter ZIEME: “Collecting of the Buddhist Scriptures: Notes on Old Uigur “annals””	PLATES	13–14
6 Tatsushi TAMAI: “Tocharian Syllabary with Uigur Explanations: M34.4 of the Mannerheim Collection	PLATE	15
7 Isao KURITA: “Gandhāran Art (Part 2)”	PLATES	16–32
8 DUAN Qing: “Puñadatta’s Contract of Sale of an Estate”	PLATES	33–34

## The Language of the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* — The Oldest Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Text \*

Seishi KARASHIMA

### Prologue

Probably, the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* (hereinafter Abhis.) originally formed a part of the *Vinaya* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. There is only one single palm-leaf manuscript, now preserved at the Tibet Museum in Lhasa, whose script is the same as that of the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, probably also belonging originally to the aforementioned *Vinaya*. Gustav Roth, who has studied both manuscripts and published an excellent edition of the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, named the script “the Proto-Bengali-cum-Proto-Maithili type” and assumed that both of them were written between the 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> centuries,<sup>1</sup> though the *Abhisamācārika-Dharma* Study Group of Taishō University has criticised his assumption concerning the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* manuscript and conjectured that it might be a much later copy, judging from its unskilful script — the manuscript contains many scribal errors which might have been caused by the scribe, who was inexperienced in copying the earlier script — and the good preservation of the manuscript.<sup>2</sup> The present author is rather inclined to agree with Roth, based on his experience of studying various manuscripts of the *Saddharmapūṇḍarīkasūtra*.

Abhis. is a very difficult text, due to its contents, language and its manuscript containing many scribal errors. The present author has worked on this complex text for twenty years and published *Die Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins* (hereinafter Abhis[K]) in collaboration with Oskar von Hinüber in 2012, consisting of a critical edition, German translation, grammar and glossary.

As stated above, there is only one surviving manuscript of this text, which contains quite a few scribal errors. This is probably due to the fact that the scribe, who lived later than the 11<sup>th</sup> century, could not understand its highly archaic and vernacular forms, many of which might date back to pre-Christian times. Therefore, it is often difficult to judge whether an elsewhere unattested word is a genuine, original reading or simply a scribal error.

Its contents are of greatly diverse descriptions and rules of everyday life of monks, how to behave on the days of *Poṣadha* (*Uposatha*), in the refectory, towards teachers,

---

\* I am very grateful to Kazuhiro Iguchi and Peter Lait for checking my English.

<sup>1</sup> BhiVin(Ma-L), pp. xxlff.

<sup>2</sup> Abhis(T), pp. 37f.

instructors; how to handle lodgings, beds, bedding, cushions, furniture; how to build and use a toilet; how to make and use toothpicks; how to prepare rice gruel; how to sit, wash one's hands and feet; how to beg for alms; how to cough, sneeze, yawn properly, deal with flatulence and so on.

Words and phrases, used in such descriptions of everyday life, are often unattested in other texts — this one contains about 1100 previously unattested words and phrases —, which makes it difficult to understand, even though the Chinese parallel text in the Chinese translation of the *Vinaya* of the Mahāsāṃghikas often helps. Even where words are attested elsewhere, it is still difficult to discover concrete meanings in the context of everyday life. For example, *pratipādikā* and *pratipādaka* (Pā. *paṭipādaka*), which have been understood as “footstool; the supporter of a bed”, can only mean a pad or plate put under a leg of a chair or bed to prevent damage to the floor.<sup>3</sup>

Abhis. preserves many Middle Indo-Aryan words and forms, which may date back to the time when Buddhist scriptures were still being orally transmitted in colloquial and everyday languages. The language of Abhis. is more vernacular and probably more archaic than those of other scriptures of the same school, such as the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* and the *Mahāvastu*.

### 1. The title: *Abhisamācārikā*, *Ābhisamācārikāḥ* or *Ābhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*?<sup>4</sup>

The manuscript of the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ* begins with “*abhisamācārikāṇām ādih*” and ends with “*ābhisamācārikāḥ samāptāḥ*”. The Chinese translation of the text begins with *Mingweiyifa* 明威儀法 (“Explanation of the Rules of Right Conduct”), with the variant *Weiyifa* 威儀法 (“The Rules of Right Conduct” = *Ābhisamācārikā dharmāḥ*), and ends with the title *Weiyi* 威儀 (“Right Conduct” = *Ābhisamācārikā*). This text, which is one of the thirteen parts of the Chinese translation of the *Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghikas* (T. 22, no. 1425, *Mohesengqilū* 摩訶僧祇律), is quoted as *Weiyi* 威儀 (“Right Conduct” = *Ābhisamācārikā*) in other parts of the *Vinaya* text: 459a29. 如威儀中廣說 (“As set forth in the *Weiyi* in detail”); 334c16ff. 諸比丘於修多羅中、毘尼中、威儀中言：“此是罪，非{是}罪。”；“是輕，是重”；“是可治，是不可治”；“是殘罪，是無殘罪。”，鬪諍相言 (“Monks quarrelled and disputed, based upon the [*Prātimokṣa*] *Sūtra*, the *Vinaya* [or] the *Weiyi* which states ‘This is an offence.’; ‘This is not an offence.’; ‘This is a light [offence].’; ‘This is a heavy [offence].’; ‘it is possible to atone for it.’; ‘it is not possible to atone for it.’; ‘This is an offence of a *Samghātiśeṣa*.’; ‘This is not an offence of a *Samghātiśeṣa*.’”).

Thus, except for the beginning of the Chinese translation of the text in question, where it is entitled 威儀法 (“The Rules of Right Conduct” = *Ābhisamācārikā dharmāḥ*), it is referred to in a shorter form as *Weiyi* 威儀 (“Right Conduct” = *Ābhisamācārikā*) in the Chinese translation of the *Vinaya of the Mahāsāṃghikas*.

In contrast, “*ābhisamācārikā dharmāḥ*” is used as a general term in the individual rules in the text. The sections from § 1 to § 30, i.e. Chapters I–III in it, end with the phrase “*na pratipadyati, abhisamācārikān dharmmān atikramati*” (“If one does not behave [in this

<sup>3</sup> See Abhis(K) I, 110–111(Übersetzung), note 4.

<sup>4</sup> See Abhis(K) I, p. ix.

manner], one transgresses the rules of proper conduct.”), whereas those from § 31 to the end of the text, i.e. Chapters IV~VI, end with the variant phrase “*na pratipadyati, ābhisamācārikān dharmmān atikrāmati*”.

In a similar way, in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* of the same school (hereinafter BhiVin[Ma-L]), the sections in which the precepts are elucidated end with the plural forms “*pārājikā*”, “*saṃghātiśeṣā*” and “*nihsargikapācattikā*”. In BhiVin(Ma-L) § 68, the following expressions, ending in “*dharmāḥ*”, are used in the list of the precepts: *aṣṭau pārājikā dharmāḥ*, *ekūnaviṃśati saṃghātiśeṣā dharmāḥ*, *triṃśan nihsargikapācattikā dharmāḥ* (“Eight *Pārājika-Dharmas*, nineteen *Samghātiśeṣa-Dharmas*, thirty *Nihsargikapācattika-Dharmas*”). However, the sections themselves end each time without the designation “*dharmāḥ*”: e.g. § 137.3B6.7. *pārājikāḥ samāptāḥ*; § 172.5A7.7. *saṃghātiśeṣāḥ samāptāḥ*; § 182.6A4.3. *samāptā triṃśan naissargikāḥ*.

Since the words *abhisamācārika* / *ābhi*<sup>o</sup> (“concerning right conduct”) in this text are, as in Pāli, used certainly as adjectives, it is probable that the expressions “*abhisamācārikāṇām ādih*” and “*ābhisamācārikāḥ samāptāḥ*” are abbreviated forms of “*abhisamācārikāṇām dharmāṇām ādih*” and “*ābhisamācārikā dharmāḥ samāptāḥ*”.

Presumably, *Abhis.* was not an independent text originally, but formed a part of the *Vinaya* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins. This assumption is reinforced from the use of the word *antaroddāna* (“interim summary”) at the end of *Abhis.*

In conclusion, this text should be considered as a part of the *Vinaya* text, in which the *abhisamācārikā dharmāḥ* are explained. Therefore, as the title of the text, *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*<sup>5</sup> is preferred to *Abhisamācārikā, Ābhisamācārikāḥ*.

## 2. *Madhyuddeśapāṭhaka*

In the colophon of the manuscript of *Abhis.*, the following expression is found: *ārya-Mahāsāṃghikānām Lokottaravādinām madhyuddeśapāṭhakānām pāṭhena*. Similar phrases occur in other *Vinaya* texts of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins<sup>6</sup>, e.g. in BhiVin(Ma-L) § 1, BI 1. *āryaMahāsāṃghikānām Lokottaravādinām madhyuddeśikānām pāṭhena Bhikṣuṇīvinayasyādih*. The meaning of the expression *madhyuddeśika* has been discussed repeatedly. Roth translates the above-quoted sentence in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* as follows: “The beginning of the Disciplinary Code for nuns according to the recital of the Noble Mahāsāṃghikas, who profess the Supramundane, and recite [the *Prātimokṣa*] through the medium of an intermediate type of language.” (Roth 1985: 133). The expression *madhyuddeśika* in other texts was changed to *madhyuddeśa-pāṭhaka* (lit. “a reciter of the recitation of [the *Prātimokṣa*]”) in *Abhis.*, which makes its meaning clearer.

The *Prātimokṣasūtras* of the different schools in the following languages are either

<sup>5</sup> In this text, this is constantly used in the accusative form, namely *abhisamācārikān dharmmān (atikrāmati)*, while the nominative form *abhisamācārikā dharmāḥ* is found only once, i.e. at the end of BhiVin(Ma-L): § 293.10A3.7f. *āraṇyakaṃ jentākaṃ varca kaṭhinaṃ uddharitvā avāśeṣā tathaiva kāryāḥ abhisamācārikā dharmāḥ* (“Except for [the precepts concerning] *Āraṇyaka*, *Jentāka*, defecation and the *Kaṭhina* mat, the other rules for proper conduct should be observed in exactly the same way [as those for monks].”). It is clear that this is a generic term for the rules for proper conduct. Roth (BhiVin[Ma-L], p. 325, note 11) and the research group at Taishō University (*Abhis*[T], I, p. 30) consider this expression erroneously as the title of this text.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Abhis*(K) II, 470 (Übers), note 1.

extant or may have been in use:<sup>7</sup>

1. Theravādins : Pāli
2. Mahāsāṃghikas, Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins : Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit
3. Mūlasarvāstivādins : Sanskrit
4. Sarvāstivādins : (Gāndhārī) > Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit > Sanskrit
5. Dharmaguptakas : (Gāndhārī) > Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit > Sanskrit

Therefore, it is not impossible that, as Roth suspects, *madhyuddeśika* or *madhyuddeśa-pāṭhaka* means “a reciter of (the *Prātimokṣa*) in the “intermediate language””. This “intermediate language” means one, which is between Prakrit and Sanskrit, namely what is now designated as “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit”.

In the Chinese translations of the *Vinaya* texts of the Mahāsāṃghikas, no parallel to these self-designations of the school is found.

### 3. Language

The language of Abhis. is to be classified as “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit”, which is the same as that of the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* and the *Mahāvastu*. As von Hinüber has suggested, the term “Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit” should be restricted to the language of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin school.<sup>8</sup>

As mentioned above, the manuscript of Abhis. begins with “*abhisamācārikānām ādiḥ*” and ends with “*ābhisamācārikāḥ samāptāḥ*”. Interestingly enough is the fact that all the sections in the first half (§ 1~§ 30) of the manuscript end with the phrase *abhisamācārikān dharmmān atikramati* (“One transgresses the precepts of proper conduct”), while all those in the second half (§ 31~§ 62) end with *ābhisamācārikān dharmmān atikrāmati*. Not only the spellings of *abhisamācārikān* / *ābhisamācārikān* but also the verbal forms *atikramati* / *atikrāmati* alter. Also, the word for “accommodation, bed; bedding, cushions, furniture” occurs in two different variants in the text: *śayyāsana* occurs 55 times, of which 48 are between § 8:11 and § 14:7, while its variant *śeyyāsana* occurs 49 times remarkably *only* between § 14:10 and § 39:29. Perhaps, there are other such variations of forms in this text, but these two examples will suffice at this point. It seems that this manuscript of Abhis., which is the sole extant one, was written by only one scribe. If this assumption is correct, the above-mentioned variations of forms are probably due to a precedent manuscript underlying the present one or to an oral tradition.

The words, which are characteristic of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin school have been collected and studied by Roth (Roth 1966; Roth 1993: 232). To his list, the following words and phrases can be added: *ati-r-iva* (= *atīva*), *anyātaka*~ (“other”), *anyena* (“to elsewhere”), *apara*~ (“somebody, a certain”), *allīya*- (“come near, approach, come”), *ā-cikṣa*- (“show; say, tell”), *ā-ṇape*- (“order, command”), *itthaṃ* (“here”), *ekatam’ ante* (“in a corner”), *ekamante* (“aside”), *etarhiṃ* (“now”), *ettha* (“here”) *kisya* (“whose”), *taṃ velam* (“at this time”), *tumaṃ* (“you”), *dhova*- (“wash”), *bhaṭṭā*~ (“woman”), *viya* (“like, as”), *vistareṇa nidānaṃ kṛtvā* etc.

<sup>7</sup> See von Hinüber 1989: 354 (= 2009: 567).

<sup>8</sup> Cf. von Hinüber 1989: 341, 354 (= 2009: 554, 567); *ib.* 2001: § 43.

As stated above, there is only one surviving manuscript of Abhis. and this unfortunately contains many scribal errors and unclear words. It is often difficult to judge whether an otherwise unattested, difficult word is a genuine, original reading or simply a scribal error. However, it is evident that this text contains many genuine Middle Indo-Aryan forms, not found in dictionaries. This text contains about 1,100 (!) previously unattested words and phrases. Moreover, in this text, about 150 words are used in lexically-unattested meanings.<sup>9</sup>

Furthermore, many unusual usages of words are found in Abhis. For instance, the definite pronoun *etad~* is often used as an indefinite one (“one, some, a certain”) in the sentence construction “*etad~* + noun + verb”, which can only be rendered as “if somebody ...”; e.g. :

§ 4.5. *eso dāni koci saṃghaṃ bhaktena ... nimantreti, ...* (“Now, if somebody invites the community... to a meal”)

§ 41.22. *eso dāni bhikṣu yadā grāmāto nirggato bhavati, tato ...* (“Now, when a monk came back from a village, then ...”)

§ 43.3. *etaṃ dāni saṃghasya anugraho bhavati* (“Now, if there is a certain supply [of food] in the monastic community, ...”)

§ 50.4. *etaṃ dāni sarvvasaṃghasya antaraghare nimantranam bhavati, ...* (“Now, if the entire monastic community is invited [to a meal] in a house...”) etc.<sup>10</sup>

Around thirty onomatopoeic expressions, most of which are otherwise unattested, occur in Abhis. as well, e.g. *amaḍaṃ maḍamaḍaṃ* (“crack! crack!”), *cchitti* (“immediately, quickly”), *jhallaḥhallāṃ, jhallaḥhallāye, jhallaḥhallāye* (“splash! splash!”), *ṭaṭṭa ṭaṭṭa* (“crack! crack!”), *ḍharaḍhara, ḍharaḍharaḥ* (sound of flatulence), *pharapharāya (do.)*, etc.

Insulting or sarcastic expressions in conversations are very amusing, though their exact meanings are often difficult to understand, e.g. :

§ 26.1. “*he he he nāyaṃ kiñcid yāgu. Gaṅgā ayaṃ Sarayū Ajiravatī Mahī Mahāmahī tti. nicuḍavuntikāye imamhi taṇḍulā mārggitavyā.*” ... “*he he he nāyaṃ kiñci yavāgū, lehyaṃ ayaṃ, peyyā ayaṃ, kaṭṭārikācchejjā ayaṃ.*” (“ ‘Hey, hey, hey, this is not rice porridge! This is [so watery like] the Ganges, the Sarayū, Ajiravatī, Mahī, Mahāmahī [rivers]. One has to use a stalk of Nicuḍa [?] to find the rice grains in it.’ ... ‘Hey, hey, hey, this is not rice porridge! This is a meal at which you have to lick. This cannot be drunk. This must be cut with a knife.’”)

§ 31.16. “*hū ha he adyāpi taṃ tad ev’ ettha vasatha, ghuṇaviddhā tave, NandOpanandanā yūyaṃ nāgarājāno, ihāiva yūyaṃ jātā ihāiva marisyatha. jātā te śrgālā ye tumbhāṇaṃ māṃsāni khādiṣyanti.*” (“ ‘Hu, ha, hey! You still live here even now!’; ‘You [?] are [already] eaten by worms’ ‘You are the serpent kings, Nanda and Upanandana!’; ‘You are born here [and] you will die also just here!’; ‘The jackals are [already] born, which will eat your flesh.’”)

§ 31.17. “*hū ha he caṇḍa<ṃ> muktaṃ pañcavarṣikaṃ pravṛttaṃ sārtho prayāto*

<sup>9</sup> All such words and usages are treated in the third volume of Abhis(K).

<sup>10</sup> Cf. Abhis(K) § 4.5, n. 5, § 12.5, n. 1; *do.* III 163f., s.vv. *etad~* (2), *etad~ ... ka~ + ci.*



(Hs. *yathā pāṭito*)” (“ ‘Hu, ha, hey! [Here,] the devil is set free! It is [tumultuous] like when the Pañcavarṣika-Festival begins! The caravan [, with which you should have departed,] has set out [already]!’ ”)

§ 31.24. “*āyusmann, adyāpi yūyaṃ iha vasatha. he he śiṣṭā baṣṭā. yūyaṃ jātā, <jātā> te ye śrgālā ye yuṣmākaṃ māmsāni khāḍiṣyanti.*” (“ ‘You, oh venerable ones, live here still now! Hey, hey, [you] are left behind, oh you fools! You are born here, [and] the jackals are [already] born, which will eat your flesh.’ ”).

The language of Abhis. has preserved more archaic features than those of the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* and the *Mahāvastu* of the same school. Thus, quite often, one finds in it, for example, the absolutives in *-iyāna* (e.g. *aṅṭhiyāna*, *kariyāna*, *gacchiyāna*, *thaviyāna*; 36 examples of 24 different verbal roots)<sup>11</sup> as well as those in *-iyānaṃ* (e.g. *kariyānaṃ*, *utkṣipiyānaṃ*, *gacchiyānaṃ*, *dhoviyānaṃ* etc.; *in toto* 125 examples of 63 different verbal roots)<sup>12</sup>, while the absolutives in *-iyānaṃ* (5 instances of *uddiśiyānaṃ*, *vītināmiyānaṃ* and *nirmmādiyānaṃ*)<sup>13</sup> and those in *-iyāna* (2 instances of *vītināmiyāna*)<sup>14</sup> occur much less frequently. The absolutives in *-iyāna* and *-iyānaṃ* are found also in the older layer of the Jain Canon in *Ardha-Māgadhī*, while in *Pāli*, *-iyānaṃ* is used and in *Buddhist Sanskrit*, *-iyāna* is utilised.<sup>15</sup> In contrast to Abhis., these absolute forms do not occur anywhere in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*. In another text of the same school, namely the *Mahāvastu*, the absolutives in *-iyāna* of 20 different verbal roots occur 33 times, while the old absolute *-iyāna* occurs *only* once (Mvu I 227.16. *upagrahiyāna*) and the other older forms in *-iyānaṃ* and *-iyānaṃ* do not occur at all.<sup>16</sup> In this connection, it should be pointed out that these Middle Indo-Aryan absolute forms are neither found in the *Prātimokṣasūtra* text of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins (PrMoSū[Ma-L]) nor in the fragmentary manuscript of the same school or the Mahāsāṃghikas (PrMoSū[Ma(-L)]). The numbers of Middle Indo-Aryan absolute forms which occur in the literature of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins are as follows:

	<i>-iyāna</i> (= Pkt)	<i>-iyānaṃ</i> (= Pkt)	<i>-iyānaṃ</i> (= Pā)	<i>-iyāna</i> (= Pā)
Abhis.	36	125	5	2
<i>Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya</i>	0	0	0	0
<i>Mahāvastu</i>	1	0	0	33
PrMoSū(Ma-L)	0	0	0	0

As one can see, the frequent occurrences of these forms in Abhis. are thus quite conspicuous.

Also, forms like *thave-*, *sthave-* (“put, set, lay”; < Skt. *sthāpayati*; cf. Pkt. *ṭhavei*, *ṭhavai*) never occur in either the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* or the *Mahāvastu* nor in other Buddhist texts, but in Abhis., they do five times (see Abhis. III 282, 543). This reveals the antiquity of its language.

Probably, the same also applies to the following examples.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Abhis(K) III, 48~49.

<sup>12</sup> Cf. Abhis(K) III, 49~50.

<sup>13</sup> Cf. Abhis(K) III, 49~50.

<sup>14</sup> Cf. Abhis(K) III, 48.

<sup>15</sup> Cf. Pischel § 592; Geiger § 214, Oberlies 2001: 265, 267f.; BHSG §§ 35.45f.; Roth 1980: 87~88 = 1986: 298~299.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. Roth 1980: 87f. = 1986: 298f.

The Middle Indo-Aryan forms *yeva* (= Pā, Pkt) and *yveva* (= Pkt)<sup>17</sup> and their corresponding Sanskrit one *eva* occur in Abhis.<sup>18</sup>, the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, the *Mahāvastu* and in PrMoSū(Ma-L) in the following frequencies:

	<i>yeva</i> (= Pā)	<i>yveva</i> (= Pkt)	<i>eva</i> (= Skt)	total
Abhis.	74	23	54	151
<i>Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya</i>	17	0	182	199
<i>Mahāvastu</i>	42	0	946	988
PrMoSū(Ma-L)	0	0	41	41

The two Middle Indo-Aryan forms *yeva* and *yveva* occur a great deal in Abhis., while the Sanskrit form *eva* does less frequently than *yeva*. The form *yeva* appears more often in Abhis. than in either the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* or the *Mahāvastu*<sup>19</sup>, while *yveva* is not found in these latter two texts at all. In contrast, *eva* appears far more frequently in these two texts than in Abhis. If we consider that the lengths of the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* and the *Mahāvastu* are 1.5 and 6 times, respectively, longer than that of Abhis., the frequent occurrences of *yeva* and *yveva* in Abhis. are all the more prominent and reveal the antiquity of its language. In the *Prātimokṣasūtra* texts of the same school, namely PrMoSū(Ma-L) and PrMoSū(Ma[-L]), neither *yeva* nor *yveva* occurs, but instead only the Sanskrit form *eva* is used, which may reveal that they have been greatly Sanskritised.

The Middle Indo-Aryan form *viya* (= Pā, Pkt) and its equivalent Sanskrit one *iva* occur in Abhis., the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, the *Mahāvastu* and the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins in the following frequencies:

	<i>viya</i> (= Pā, Pkt)	<i>iva</i> (= Skt)	total
Abhis.	14	1	15
<i>Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya</i>	6	27	33
<i>Mahāvastu</i>	30	123	153
PrMoSū(Ma-L)	1	4	5

While in Abhis. *viya* is mainly used, the Sanskrit form *iva* occurs only once. Exactly the opposite can be seen where *iva* is used frequently in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, the *Mahāvastu* and the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, while the Middle Indo-Aryan form *viya* rarely occurs.

The Middle Indo-Aryan form *kissa* (“whose; why”) occurs twice in Abhis., while the corresponding hybrid form *kisya* appears only once.<sup>20</sup> In the *Mahāvastu*, only the latter form is found, appearing 27 times, while neither of the two forms occurs in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* or the *Prātimokṣasūtra*.

The Middle Indo-Aryan past participle form *dinna~* (“given”; cf. Pkt. *diṇṇa*)<sup>21</sup> of

<sup>17</sup> According to Norman, both forms are constructed by combining *ye* (emphatic particle) and *eva*; cf. Norman 1967: 162f. = CPI 48f.; cf. also Steiner 1997: 199ff., Esposito 2004: 44.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. Abhis(K) III, 454-456.

<sup>19</sup> According to Dr. Katarzyna Marciniak (personal communication, February 2014), the form *yeva* occurs 197 times in the old palm-leaf manuscript of the *Mahāvastu* from the 12<sup>th</sup> century.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Abhis(K) III, 292.

<sup>21</sup> Except in Abhis., *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, Mvu, PrMoSū(Ma-L) and PrMoSū(Ma[-L]), this Middle Indo-Aryan form appears only rarely in Buddhist Sanskrit texts, as Edgerton has noted (BHSG § 34.16). In addition to the occurrences in the above-mentioned texts and in those referred to in BHSG § 34.16, the following examples can

√ *dā* occurs in Abhis. 14 times<sup>22</sup>, while its corresponding Sanskrit form *datta*~ not once. In contrast to Abhis., both forms appear in the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* (*dinna*~ 21 times; *datta*~ 12 times) and in the *Mahāvastu* (*dinna*~ 125 times; *datta*~ 18 times). In the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, as in Abhis. only *dinna*~ is used.<sup>23</sup>

	<i>dinna</i> ~ (= Pā)	<i>datta</i> ~ (= Skt)	total
Abhis.	14	0	14
<i>Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya</i>	21	12	33
<i>Mahāvastu</i>	125	18	143
PrMoSū(Ma-L)	10	0	10

The Middle Indo-Aryan form *khāyitaka*~ (“bitten”; cf. Pā *khāyita* + suffix *ka*) occurs twice in Abhis., while once its variant *khāditaka*<sup>24</sup>. In the old palm-leaf manuscript of the *Mahāvastu* from the 12<sup>th</sup> century, the older form *khāyitaka*~ occurs twice<sup>25</sup>, while it was replaced by *khāditaka* in later paper manuscripts (Mvu II 78.11, 14).

Śākyamuni himself did not speak in Sanskrit, probably he preached in Old Māgadhī, the dialect of Magadha. Old Buddhist scriptures were at that time orally transmitted in the spoken languages of the ordinary people, so-called Middle Indo-Aryan languages, namely Pāli and Prakrit. While the Theravādins have more or less preserved the scriptures in Pāli, the other schools converted them gradually into a literary language, namely Sanskrit — this process is called "Sanskritisation".

As we have seen above, amongst the scriptures of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, Abhis. preserves Middle Indo-Aryan forms the most, with the *Mahāvastu* coming second and the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* the third, while the *Prātimokṣasūtra* is the most "Sanskritised".<sup>26</sup> The language of Abhis. is, therefore, more vernacular and probably more archaic than those of the other scriptures of the same school. In conclusion, we may say that Abhis. is the oldest Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit text which we have.

---

be added: PDhp 356~358. *dinnam* hoti mahapphalam (cf. *Udānavarga* 16.16~18. *dattam* bhavati mahāphalam); *Merv-Avadāna*, folio 5 verso. *grhasya dinnam*, 15 recto 2. *acchādo dinnam*, 63 recto 4. *yaṃ dinnam taṃ pi chardditam siyā*. Cf. also Karashima 2001: 209f.; von Simson 1997: 584, 592~3, 595.

<sup>22</sup> Cf. Abhis(K) III, 203.

<sup>23</sup> In the *Prātimokṣasūtra*, this form occurs in the following compositions: *adinna*, *durdinna*, *dinnadinnāni*.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Abhis(K) III, 218.

<sup>25</sup> I thank Dr. Marciniak for this information (personal communication, February 2014).

<sup>26</sup> The present author assumes that the reason why the levels of Sanskritisation of these texts of the same school differ was because the *Prātimokṣasūtra* was constantly recited every fortnight, namely on the *Posadha* (*Uposatha*) day, from the earliest times of Buddhism onwards. The text was thus always in use, therefore it was gradually "sanskritised" to follow the trend of the time when Sanskrit came to be used more generally in Buddhist communities, probably from the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> century C.E. onwards. The *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, mainly consisting of nuns' eight grave duties and a commentary on their *Prātimokṣasūtra*, was presumably "sanskritised", following the Sanskritisation of the latter for the same reason as stated above. In contrast to these texts, the *Mahāvastu*, which is a collection of stories of the former lives of the Buddha and his disciples as well as the events in his life, may not have been recited nor read by many monks, therefore its Sanskritisation is rather limited. Although Abhis. contains detailed descriptions and miscellaneous rules of everyday life of monks, it is rather doubtful whether these were applicable and practised in locales, which differed from where it was composed. This text also may not have been recited nor read by many monks, which is presumably why it retains very archaic and vernacular forms.

#### 4. A linguistic similarity between the literature of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins and the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā*

In the literature of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins, namely Abhis., the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* and the *Mahāvastu*, the verb  $\sqrt{\text{jalp}}$  occurs frequently in the meaning “(somebody) says, speaks”. In Abhis., this verb occurs 37 times<sup>27</sup>; e.g. :

§ 19.42.19A3. *vaidyo jalpati* “*bhadantā pūtimūtram pibanāya dethê*”*tti* (“A doctor says: ‘Give [him], oh venerable ones, stinky urine to drink!’”)

§ 50.9.43B5. *atha dāni so jalpati* “*āyusman, bhujja tvaṃ. bhuktaṃ mayê*”*ti*, ... (“Now, if he says: ‘Eat, oh venerable one! I have eaten!’, ...”)

In the *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya*, it occurs 38 times; for example :

§ 120.3B1.6. *yo dāni ahaṃ jalpāmi* “*āciḡṣatu āryā kim ājñāpayasi*” (“Now I say: ‘The noble one should say what she orders.’”)

§ 236.8A9.2. *yā puna bhikṣuṇī puruṣeṇa sārḡhaṃ anto hastapāśasya santiṣṡheya vā saṃlapeya vā upakarṇaṃ vā jalpeya pācattikaṃ* (“And if a nun stands very close to a man, talks to him, or speaks in his ear, she commits a *pācattika*.”)

In the *Mahāvastu*, this verb occurs 56 times; e.g. :

Mvu I 311.6. *te āhansu* “*jalpa yā te vijñapti*” (“They [i.e. the Brahmins] said [to Mālinī]: ‘Tell [us] your desire!’”)

Mvu I 348.18f. *tehi dāni yasya yaṃ mataṃ so taṃ jalpati* (“Now, they [both] told each other what they had thought.”)

In Pāli, its equivalent form *jappati* with the same meaning occurs occasionally<sup>28</sup>; e.g. :

Vin IV 271.1f. *yā pana bhikkhunī ... purisena saddhiṃ eken’ ekā santiṡṡheyya vā sallapeyya vā nikarṇikaṃ vā jappeyya, ... pācittiyaṃ* (“And if a nun stands alone with a man, talks to him, or speaks in his ear, she commits a *pācittiya*.”)<sup>29</sup>

Mil 31.8. *sādhu bhante, atthaṃ jappehi* (“Please tell [me] the meaning, oh venerable one!”)

In the epic Sanskrit, there are several examples of the usage of this verb with the same meaning.<sup>30</sup> It is remarkable that the verb  $\sqrt{\text{jalp}}$  in the meaning “(somebody) says, speaks” occurs very rarely in other Buddhist Sanskrit texts. In the entire corpus of the Sanskrit literature of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, this particular usage of the verb is not found even once. In *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, it occurs only once in a fragment of an unidentified, but likely to be classified Abhidharma text.<sup>31</sup> The frequent occurrence of  $\sqrt{\text{jalp}}$  of this particular usage in the literature of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins is therefore striking and thus, one may assume that this usage is one of the characteristic features of their language.

In the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā*, we find two occurrences of probably the same usage of the verb  $\sqrt{\text{jalp}}$ :

<sup>27</sup> Cf. Abhis(K) III, 254, s.v.  $\sqrt{\text{jalp}}$ .

<sup>28</sup> Cf. DP II 205f., s.v. *jappati*<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Waldschmidt 1926: 179f.

<sup>30</sup> Cf. PW, III 66~67, s.v. *jalp*.

<sup>31</sup> SWTF II 290; SHT III, p. 208, no. 946 = S 434R3. [*priyava*]canāni jalpati.

AS 15.14ff. = AS(R) 30.15ff. = AS(W) 122.5ff. *āha*: “*utpādo dharmo ’nutpādo dharmo ity, āyusman Śāriputra, na pratibhāti jalpītum.*” *āha*: “*anutpādo ’pi te, āyusman Subhūte, na<sup>32</sup> pratibhāti jalpītum?*” *āha*: “*anutpāda evāyusman Śāriputra, jalpah. ...*” (“[Subhūti] said: ‘In my opinion, oh venerable Śāriputra, one cannot say that the *dharmo* “production” is the *dharmo* “non-production”.’ [Śāriputra] said: ‘Don’t you think that, oh venerable Subhūti, one can talk of “non-production”?’ [Subhūti] replied: “Non-production” is, oh venerable Śāriputra, [merely] a speech. ...’”)

AS 42.2ff. = AS(R) 83.19ff. = AS(W) 252.5f. *yadāpi sa dharmabhāṅako na jalpītukāmo bhaviṣyati, tadāpi tasya te devaputrās tenāiva dharmagauraveṇa pratibhānam upasaṃhartavyaṃ maṃsyante, yathā tasya kulaputrasya vā kuladuhitur vā bhāṣitum eva chando bhaviṣyati* (“Even when the Dharma preacher is not willing to talk, the deities will still think that, because of their respect for the Dharma, they must induce in him eloquence [self-confidence, inspiration], so that the man or woman of good family could obtain the will to preach.”)

This particular usage of the verb  $\sqrt{\text{jalp}}$  found in the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā* seems to support the often assumed idea that this early Mahāyāna text was composed by the Mahāsāṃghika(-Lokottaravādin)s.<sup>33</sup> However, we need to compare the vocabulary of each Mahāyāna sutra with that of the literature of the Mahāsāṃghika(-Lokottaravādin)s thoroughly, to verify the relationship between certain Mahāyāna sutras and these schools.

### Bibliography, Abbreviations and Signs

Abhis = the *Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ*

Abhis(K) = *Die Abhisamācārikā Dharmāḥ: Verhaltensregeln für buddhistische Mönche der Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins*, herausgegeben, mit der chinesischen Parallelversion verglichen, übersetzt und kommentiert von Seishi Karashima, unter Mitwirkung von Oskar von Hinüber, Tokyo 2012: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University, (Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XIII), 3 vols.

Abhis(T) = Chapters I-IV, in: *Daishubu Setsushusebu Ritsu Biku Igihō: Bonbun Shahon Eīnban Tebiki* 『大衆部説出世部律・比丘威儀法』梵文写本影印版手引 [A Guide to the Facsimile Edition of the *Abhisamācārika-Dharma* of the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin], ed. Biku Igihō Kenkyūkai 比丘威儀法研究会 (Abhisamācārika-Dharma Study Group), Tokyo 1998: Taishō Daigaku Sōgō Bukkyō Kenkyūjo 大正大学総合仏教研究所 (The Institute for Comparative Studies of Buddhism, Taishō University).

AS = *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā with Haribhadra's Commentary called Āloka*, ed. P.L. Vaidya, Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute of Post-Graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning, 1960 (Buddhist Sanskrit Texts, no. 4).

AS(R) = *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā*, ed. Rajendralala Mitra, Calcutta 1887~1888: Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal (Bibliotheca Indica 110).

AS(W) = the text of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* quoted in: *Abhisamayālaṃkāra'ālokā*

<sup>32</sup> *na* : In AS, this word is missing (a misprint).

<sup>33</sup> For the composition of the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā-Prajñāpāramitā*, cf. Karashima 2013.

- Prajñāpāramitāvyākhyā: The Work of Haribhadra*, together with the text commented on, ed. U. Wogihara, Tokyo 1932: The Toyo Bunko; repr.: Tokyo 1973: Sankibō Busshorin.
- BhīVin(Ma-L) = *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya, including Bhikṣuṇī-Prakīrṇaka and a Summary of the Bhikṣu-Prakīrṇaka of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin*, ed. Gustav Roth, Patna 1970: Jayaswal Research Institute (*Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 12*).
- BHS(D, G) = Franklin Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, 2 vols., New Haven 1953: Yale University Press; repr. Delhi, 1970: Motilal Banarsidass.
- DP = *A Dictionary of Pāli*, by Margaret Cone, Oxford 2001~: The Pali Text Society.
- Esposito, Anna Aurelia  
2004 *Cārudatta. Ein indisches Schauspiel. Kritische Edition und Übersetzung mit einer Studie des Prakrits der 'Trivandrum-Dramen'*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz (Drama und Theater in Südasien 4).
- Geiger = *A Pāli Grammar* by Wilhelm Geiger, translated into English by Batakrishna Ghosh, revised and edited by K. R. Norman, Oxford 1994: The Pali Text Society.
- von Hinüber, Oskar  
1989 “Origin and Varieties of Buddhist Sanskrit”, in: *Dialectes dans les Littératures Indo-Aryennes*, éd. par Colette Caillat, Paris 1989: Collège de France, Institut de Civilisation Indienne, pp. 341~367.  
2001 *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*, 2., erweiterte Auflage, Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (SbÖAW Bd. 467 = Veröffentlichung der Kommission für Sprachen und Kulturen Südasiens, Heft 20).  
2009 Oskar von Hinüber: *Kleine Schriften*, hrsg. von Harry Falk und Walter Slaje, 2 vols, Wiesbaden 2009: Harrassowitz (Glasenapp-Stiftung 47).
- Karashima, Seishi  
2001 “Some Features of the Language of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*”, in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 44 (2001): 207~230.  
2013 “Was the *Aṣṭasāhasrikā Prajñāpāramitā* Compiled in Gandhāra in Gāndhārī?”, in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University* 16(2013): 171~188.
- Merv-Avadāna = “The Avadāna Anthology from Merv, Turkmenistan” by Seishi Karashima and M.I. Vorobyova-Desyatovskaya (forthcoming)
- Mvu = *Le Mahāvastu*, ed. Émile Senart, 3 vols., Paris 1882~1897: Imprimerie nationale; repr.: Tokyo 1977: Meicho-Fukyū-Kai.
- Norman, Kenneth Roy  
1967 “Notes on the Aśokan Rock Edicts”, in: *Indo-Iranian Journal* 10(1967): 160~170 (= Norman CP I 47~58).
- Norman CP = *Collected Papers*, K.R. Norman, Oxford 1990~; I (1990), II (1991), III (1992), IV (1993), V (1994), VI (1996), VII (2001), VIII (2007): The Pali Text Society.
- Oberlies, Thomas  
2001 *Pāli: A Grammar of the Language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka: With a Concordance to Pischel's Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, Berlin: W. de Gruyter (*Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 3*).
- Pā = Pāli
- PDhp = Margaret Cone, “Patna Dharmapada: Part I: Text”, in: *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 13(1989): 101~217.
- Pischel = Richard Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*, Straßburg 1900: Karl J. Trübner (Grundriß der Indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde I, 8).
- Pkt = Prakrit
- PrMoSū(Ma-L) = *Prātimokṣasūtram of the Lokottaravādimahāsāṃghika School*, ed. Nathmal Tatia, Patna 1976 (*Tibetan Sanskrit Works Series 16*).

PrMoSū(Ma[-L]) = Fragments of a Manuscript of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottara)vādins, in: Seishi Karashima “Fragments of a Manuscript of the Prātimokṣasūtra of the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottara)vādins (1)”, in: *Annual Report of The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism at Soka University*, vol. XI (2008): 71~90 + 25 plates; “Manuscript Fragments of the *Prātimokṣasūtra* of the Mahāsāṃghika-(Lokottaravādins) (2)”, *ibid.* vol. XVI (2013): 47~90 + plates 14~51.

PW = Otto Böhtlingk, Rudolph Roth, *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch*, 7 vols., St. Petersburg 1855~1875.

Roth, Gustav

1966 “Bhikṣuṇīvinaya and Bhikṣu-prakīrṇaka and Notes on the Language”, in: *Journal of the Bihar Research Society* 52: 29~51.

1980 “Particular Features of the Language of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins and their Importance for Early Buddhist Tradition”, in: *Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung / The Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition (Symp. II)*, ed. Heinz Bechert, Göttingen 1980 (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse; Folge 3 117), pp. 78~135 = Roth 1986: 289~346.

1985 “The Readings *Madhy’-uddeśika*, *Madhyoddeśika*, and *Madhyadeśika* in the Scriptures of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins including Notes on *daśa-baddhena* and *pañca-baddhena gaṇena*”, in: *Zur Schulzugehörigkeit von Werken der Hīnayāna-Literatur*, Erster Teil (Symposien zur Buddhismusforschung, III, 1), hrsg. von H. Bechert, Göttingen 1985 (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Phil.-Hist.Klasse Göttingen 149), pp. 127~137.

1986 *Indian Studies*, Selected Papers, ed. H. Bechert and P. Kieffer-Pülz, Delhi 1986 (Bibliotheca Indo-Buddhica 32).

1993 “Nachtrag zur Edition des *Bhikṣuṇī-Vinaya* der Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin”, in: *Studien zur Indologie und Buddhismuskunde: Festgabe des Seminars für Indologie und Buddhismuskunde für Professor Dr. Heinz Bechert*, hrsg. von R. Grünendahl u.a., Bonn 1993 (Indica et Tibetica 22), pp. 229~238.

SHT = *Sanskrihandschriften aus den Turfanfunden*, ed. Ernst Waldschmidt *et al.*, Wiesbaden / Stuttgart: F. Steiner, 1965~ (Verzeichnis der orientalischen Handschriften in Deutschland, Bd. 10), I~.

von Simson, Georg

1997 “Eine Prātimokṣasūtra-Handschrift in hybrider Sprache”, in: *Bauddhavidyāsudhākaraḥ: Studies in Honour of Heinz Bechert on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, ed. Petra Kieffer-Pülz and Jens-Uwe Hartmann, Swisttal-Odendorf 1997: Indica et Tibetica Verlag (Indica et Tibetica 30), pp. 583~604.

Steiner, Roland

1997 *Untersuchungen zu Harṣadevas Nāgānanda und zum indischen Schauspiel*, Swisttal-Odendorf: Indica et Tibetica Verlag (Indica et Tibetica 31).

SWTF = *Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden*, ed. H. Bechert, K. Röhrborn, J.-U. Hartmann, Göttingen 1973ff.

Waldschmidt, Ernst

1926 *Bruchstücke des Bhikṣuṇī-Pratimokṣa der Sarvāstivādins, mit einer Darstellung der Überlieferung des Bhikṣuṇī-Pratimokṣa in den verschiedenen Schulen*, Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft (Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte 3); reprint in: *id.*, *Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte* Heft III and IV, Wiesbaden 1979 (*Monographien zur indischen Archäologie, Kunst und Philologie*, ed. H. Härtel. Bd. 2), pp. 1~191.