Further Remarks on the New Manuscript of the Dirghāgama

Jens-Uwe Hartmann

Three years ago, Sadakata Akira published a short paper on two folios of a manuscript belonging to the recent finds from the area of "Greater Gandhāra", to use Richard Salomon's term, and reported to have been found in Northern Pakistan. Since the middle of the nineties of the last century, bundles of this manuscript had begun to reach the Western rare book market and, luckily, from the very beginning scholars were granted access to the originals and to reproductions in various forms. Already the first bundle gave rise to the supposition that it belonged to a manuscript of the Dirghāgama, the "Collection of Long (Discourses of the Buddha)", in a Sanskrit version, and in 2000 a brief survey of that first bundle was published.

Due to its size (about 50 × 10cm) and its state of preservation the manuscript stands out among the scrolls, leaves and thousands of fragments of Buddhist manuscripts in Indian languages which have reached Europe, Japan and the USA within the last five years from the Northwestern corner of the former Indian Buddhist world and have been made available for scholarly study. One of the later bundles in-

---

1 Sadakata 1999.
2 In autumn 1998 Matsuda Kazunobu and Klaus Wille recognized independently of each other that the manuscript apparently contained sūtras of the Dirghāgama, Matsuda when viewing the original folios in London, and Wille with the help of photographs.
3 Hartmann 2000.
cluded the last part of the manuscript with a final colophon preserving *Dirghāgama* as the title of the whole work. This conveniently confirmed the previous supposition and underlined the importance of the text. Since only a small part of the contents and structure of this Sanskrit version of the "Collection of Long Discourses" have so far been recovered from the Sanskrit fragments found in Central Asia, the principal results from a study of the newly arrived folios will be communicated in the following pages.

1. The final folio

Regrettably, the manuscript as it has reached the West is still by no means complete, and due to the present political developments (autumn 2001) and the vagaries of the art and book market it remains unpredictable whether all its surviving parts will ever be known or made accessible to interested scholars. So far, about 160 folios—complete or in fragments—have been ascertained; they belong mainly to the sections with the folio numbers 72-116, 264-330 and 385-454 and amount to roughly one third of the whole manuscript, since the final folio must bear the page number 454 (see below). This last folio is of particular importance for our understanding of the structure of the text, and therefore it will be introduced first. On the *recto* side it contains text of the final part of the *Brahmajālasūtra*, the Sanskrit parallel to the *Brahmajālasutta* of the *Dīghanikāya*. This points to a considerable difference in structure, since this sutta opens the Pāli collection, while it falls last in the present Sanskrit version, as becomes clear now from the new manuscript. The verso side of the folio begins with an *antaroddāna*, i.e., a verse-like list of key words from the preceding sūtra; then follows a longer *uddāna*, i.e., another verse-like list of key words which, unlike an antaroddāṇa, lists the text titles of the
preceding section. The folio concludes with two very brief colophons, one for the section and one for the entire manuscript.

The text area of the verso side is interrupted four times, once in the left third by the space left empty for the punch hole and three times by roundels consisting of four concentric circles, the interior of each being decorated with a different flower motif. While the other folios mostly contain eight lines, the text remaining for the verso side of this one comprises only five and a half lines. Regrettably, the upper layer of birch bark has peeled off in three places, which results in several gaps in the text.

1.1. Transliteration of folio 454 verso
2 kṣu[ṇā] · || ⊗ hetvathabrahmajālam* || uddānam* śuka jivaka ⊗ rājā ca vasiśṭhaḥ kāś[y]apena [ca] + [hm]. [jā] + + ⊗ kṛtvā ca
3 vīraḥ bha ⊗ vati samudditaḥ || τρδανθ piṅga ⊗ lā ... [dv].

4 The text was read together with my friend Klaus Wille, Göttingen; Lance Cousins and Somadeva Vasudeva, Oxford, contributed some corrections of our readings and various very useful suggestions; Paul Harrison, Christchurch, corrected the English of this paper. I wish to thank all of them. Moreover, I am grateful to the present owner of the manuscript for putting excellent black and white photographs at my disposal and granting permission for their publication. — Parentheses or round brackets ( ) signify restoration in a gap, square brackets [ ] damaged akṣaras or uncertain readings, pointed brackets ⟨ ⟩ an addition without gap, three oblique dashes /// mark the point where the fragment breaks off; a cross + denotes a destroyed akṣara, two dots .. denote an illegible akṣara, one dot denotes an illegible part of an akṣara, the asterisk * denotes the virāma; ○ stands for the punch hole and ⊗ for the circular decorations.
[ca] lohityabhā .i + k. .e .i [a] .. ⊗ maṇḍśa
4 [s ta]c ca bhi ⊗ kṣuṣu bhāṣate · ○ mahallī pṛ ⊗ + + + [v].
ko bhavati sa ... ... ... [i]śṭha ⊗ h kāśyapa
5 ś caiva ⊗ brahmaṇālam a ○ nopamā || ⊗ ... ... ... śilaskandhāni-
[p]. [t]. s samāptaḥ || ⊗ || samā
6 pta ⊗ ś ca dirghā ○ + maḥ || ⊗ ||

1.2. Reconstruction

For the sake of a more lucid presentation, uncertain and problematic
readings are not signified by square brackets in the reconstruction. The
verses are provisionally numbered in order to facilitate reference in the
discussion of each key word.
ap(anta)roddānām ||
(1) śāsvato 'py ahetuś ca antakā amaras tathā |
samjñī caiva saṃjñī ca tathā uccheda nirvṛtaḥ (∥)
(2) unmajjanti ca saṃ(kliśṭāḥ) pratitya sparśo bhikṣuṇā ||
hetva<r>thabrahmaṇālam ||
∥ uddānām ||
(3) śuka jivaka rājā ca v〈ā〉siṣṭhaḥ kāśyapena ca ⟨⟩
(bra)hm(a)jā(lena) kṛtvā ca v〈a〉rgeo bhavati samudditaḥ ||
(4) tṛdaṇḍi pīṅgalā(treyo) dv(e) ca lohityabhā(ṣ)i(tau) ⟨⟩
k. .e .i(a)tha maṇḍśas tac ca bhikṣuṣu bhāṣate ||
(5) mahallī pṛ(ṣṭhapālaś ca) v. ko bhavati sa ... ... ⟨⟩
(vās)siṣṭhaḥ kāśyapaś caiva brahmaṇālam anopamā ||
... ... ... śilaskandhanip(ā)t(a)s samāptaḥ || || samāptaś ca dirgha-
(ga)maḥ || ||

1.3. Commentary

The uddānas display the metrical licence and the usual liberties
with regard to sandhi and word forms which are, at least partly, to
be explained by the transformation of texts originally composed in (a) Middle Indic language(s). Beyond such normal deviations from the usage of classical Sanskrit — which was never intended, to be sure — the verses are apparently defective in several places, as will become clear from a closer look at the section summarized in them.

The antaroddāṇa is included in the separate Tibetan translation of the sūtra edited by Friedrich Weller (Weller 1934), forming § 223 of his edition, and also in the second Tibetan translation which appears as a citation of the complete sūtra in Āvīḍathadeva’s Abhidharmakośaṭṭhipāyikā. This second version of the antaroddāṇa is shorter than the first and deviates in two places. Without a more detailed discussion of such phenomena, the Tibetan translations of each key word and the number of the respective section of the sūtra they refer to, as already pointed out by Weller in his translation (Weller 1935-36, p.38 [ = p.679]), will be given here.

śāśvato ‘py : rtag dan gcig pu (Weller 1934) : rtag dan phyogs gcig (Upāyikā). In the Sanskrit text, there is no basis for gcig pu “zum Teile (ewig)” (Weller), or phyogs gcig, but the pada is metrically deficient. Weller refers to §§ 26ff. and 57ff.

ahetuś ca : rgyu med daṅ (both translations); Weller refers to §§ 90 ff.

antarā : mtba’ ldan : mtba’ yod; Weller refers to §§ 108ff.

amarās tathā : de bzin lha mi spon : de bzin ’chi med daṅ; Weller refers to §§ 135ff. The separate Tibetan translation apparently renders the full expression amaravikṣepa which has to be abbreviated in the Sanskrit text for metrical reasons.

śāṃjñī caivāpy asāṃjñī ca : ’du šes ’du šes med pa daṅ : ’du šes bcas daṅ ’du šes med || ’du šes yod min med min; Weller refers to §§

5 The uddāṇa is found in TP vol. 118, p. 169/2/1-2 = fol. 177a1-2.
6 For this term cf. Hartmann 1989, p. 49 ad V1.
159ff. Only the Upāyikā lists all the four possibilities.

tathā uccheda: chaḍa daṇḍaḥ: chaḍa; Weller refers to §§ 183ff.
nirvṛtaḥ: mya ūna ḍaḍ pa daṇḍaḥ: mya ūna ḍaḍ daṇḍaḥ; Weller refers to §§ 190ff.

unmajjanti ca sam(kliṣṭāḥ): dmyugs daṇḍaḥ kun nas rmoṇś pa daṇḍaḥ: g·yeṅs pa daṇḍaḥ || yaṇḍaḥ rmoṇś pa ūsaḥ bya daṇḍaḥ; Weller refers to §§ 207ff. A fragment of the Brahmajālasūtra from Central Asia suggests the form sāṃkleśyāḥ (cf. Hartmann 1992, Hs. 16 R4), but the a of sam in the present manuscript is clearly short, and therefore sam(kliṣṭāḥ) is reconstructed.

pratitya: brten daṇḍaḥ: brten naḥ byuṇḍaḥ daṇḍaḥ; Weller refers to §§ 212ff.

sparso: reg paḥ; Weller refers to §§ 214ff.

bhikṣuṇā: dge sloṇḍaṇḍaḥ: dge baṣ soḥ; Weller connects the word with § 220, adding a question mark, but this passage appears to be the only possible point of reference. In the Upāyikā, the antaroddāna ends with this key word.

hetva(r) thabrahmajālam: according to Tibetan rgyu daṇḍaḥ don caḥ dra ba ste, tha ma tshans pa'i dra ba'o (Weller § 223) one would expect a verse line like hetvarthadharmaḥ brahmajālaḥ ca paścimam. Weller refers to § 221.

The antaroddāna is followed by the uddāna verses listing a key word (in most cases probably the short title) for each sūtra in order to establish their sequence.

śuha: this denotes the parallel to the Subha-sutta of the Dighanikāya (DN no. 10).

jivaka: Jivaka Kumārabhrta appears as the interlocutor of the Buddha; without parallel in the Dighanikāya; the correspondence is found in the Majjhimanikāya (MN I 368-371). Cf. SHT VI 1525, line R3 which also seems to preserve the transition from this to the next
sūtra.

rājā ca: a reference to the sūtra corresponding to the Sāmaññaphalasutta (DN 2).

vasīṣṭhaḥ: probably to be corrected to vāsiṣṭhaḥ; it denotes the parallel to the Tevijjasutta (DN 13).

kaśyapena ca: this is the key word for the text corresponding to the Kassapasahanādasutta (DN 8).

(bra) hm(a) jā lena kṛtvā ca: the parallel to the Brahmajālasutta (DN 1), the first text of the Pāli and the last one of the Sanskrit version; the reconstruction follows corresponding lines in the uddānas of the Ekottarikāgama, cf. Tripathi 1995: 20-22 (§§ 16.0, 22.56, 35.0 and 36.0).7

uṛgo bhavati samudditah: "(with this) the section is summarized" (samuddita probably m.c. for samudita, cf. BHSD s.v.).

ṭṛdantaṃ piṅgalā(treyo) dv(e) ca lohityabhā(ṣ)i(tau): with this half verse another key word list begins. Apparently the Śilaskandha section of the DĀ began with the Trīdantīsūtra, and there is reason to assume that now all the sūtras in that section are summarized in the form of an uddāna. If this assumption is correct, several key words must have been omitted, as will be shown below.

The half verse is apparently quoted by Śamathadeva in his Abhidharmakośaśāṅkopāyikā in order to elucidate the placement of the first Lohityasūtra. In this commentary, which is preserved only in its Tibetan translation, he explains: phuṅ po las | dbyug (dbyu D) gu gsum daṅ gon bu gsum || (P | ) lu he (hi D) ta yi (ta'i P) rnam bṣad gñis | ( | deest P) žes bya ba'i lu he (hi D) ta'i mdo

7 I owe these references to my friend Fumio Enomoto.
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Since it follows from other quotations that dbyug gu gsum serves as a translation of Tridāṇḍin, here it must denote the Tridāṇḍisūtra. Therefore the reference phun po las surely has to be taken as an abbreviation of tshul khrims kyi phun po las, (śila)skandhikāyām or the like. Neither for the Tridāṇḍisūtra nor for the Piṅgalatreyasūtra (the key word is reconstructed according to the name as it is preserved in the sūtra itself) is a parallel text attested in the Pāli canon, and only one of the two Lohityasūtras appears to have found its way into the DN (Lohiccasutta, no. 12).

k. e.i: according to the sequence of the sūtras in the manuscript, a key word for the text corresponding to the Kevaddhasutta (DN 11) is to be expected, e.g., kaivarti, and the preserved akṣara remains seem to point in the direction of the expected word, but the reconstruction of kaivarti is definitely excluded.

a(tha) maṇḍīsā: the introductory part of the sūtra suggests a correspondence with the Jāliyasutta (DN 7); in the Pāli version two wandering ascetics appear, namely Maṇḍīsa and Jāliya, but in the Sanskrit text only Maṇḍīsa.

tac ca bhikṣuṣu bhāṣate: "and (then the Buddha) speaks this (sūtra also) among the monks". This must be a reference to the second version of the Maṇḍīsasūtra, in which the Buddha reports his encounter with the wandering ascetic and his discourse with him to the monks. Due to this repetition, the sūtra is summarized in the manuscript by means of the usual abbreviations in roughly two lines (fol. 391v6-8).

mahalli: this denotes the parallel to the Mahālisutta (DN 6).

pr(ṭhapaḷaś ca): apparently, this key word refers to the text corre-

---

8 TP vol. 118, p. 265f. = vol. thu, fol. 119a8-b1; TD vol. ūu, fol. 74a1-2; Honjō Yoshifumi already saw lu he ta as corresponding to Lokecca, cf. Honjō 1985, p. 782.
sponding to the Poṭṭhapādasutta (DN 9), although it becomes obvious from the manuscript itself that three more sūtras, namely Śrōpatāṇḍya-, Kuṭatāṇḍya- and Ambāṣṭhasūtra, are arranged between Mahalli- and Prṣṭhapālasūtra. The uddāna is evidently defective here. Since the reading of the last preserved akṣara is unambiguous, the name must be reconstructed as pr(ṣṭhapāla) in accordance with the form attested in the text of the sūtra and in another uddāna. One could assume that here we are confronted with an unnamed Piṇḍoddāna, i.e., a summary of several uddānas which selects the first key word of each (cf. Panglung 1980), but there are two reasons against this: first, the fact that prṣṭhapāla appears as the second key word in the corresponding uddāna (cf. below) and, second, the fact that in the following line three consecutive sūtras are enumerated.

Part of the text omitted here can be reconstructed from other passages. On folio 410 of the manuscript, an uddāna is found in the lines r1-2 between the Kuṭatāṇḍya- and the Ambāṣṭhasūtra, which is repeated at the end of the section on folio 430r8. In both cases the text is only partly preserved, but the sequence becomes clear.

Folio [4]10r1-2:

avamṣṭhah prṣṭha ///
... [ta]ma āna[ndo] bhikṣuṣāstariḥ ||

Folio 430r8:

[a]ṃ[ḥ]aśṭha prṣṭhapālaś ca kāraṇavādi ca pudgalāh
śrutaṃ ma(ha)[l][l] [o nyan]a tama anando bhikṣu śāstā-ni ||

This attests to the sequence of Ambāṣṭha, Prṣṭhapāla, Kāraṇavādin, Pudgala (on four kinds of persons) and Śruta. The rest of the line
must refer to the following two sūtras, the first on another old brahmin and the second a repetition thereof. It seems odd that nearly half a verse is used for two texts, but no other explanation suggests itself at the moment. Obviously, at least pāda d (ānando bhikṣusāstāri?) refers to a kind of duplicate of the preceding sūtra at the end of which it is said (fol. 430r7): || ya[thā] jirṇo vṛddho mahallaka evam anyatamo brāhmaṇāḥ āyuṣmān ānando sāstā bhikṣūnām bhāṣate ||; it is not clear which text anyatama belongs to, since both of them have this word in their introduction.

The sequence of sūtras between Mahallin and Ambāṣṭha can also be confirmed from another uddāna, but so far only from one preserved in a Central Asian Sanskrit text. The fragmentary folio c of manuscript SHT V 1290 of the German Turfan finds contains the end of the Kūṭatāṇḍya- and the beginning of the Ambāṣṭha sutra. In line R8 (p. 210) of fragment c, parts of the uddāna are preserved: [pha].. śoṇatāṇṭhyaś ca kūṭatāṇṭhyena paścimāḥ 1°///. At the beginning of the line traces of two akṣaras are preserved, the first of which was read as [pha] by the editors of the volume. However, the graphically very similar [ha] is equally possible, and with a high degree of probability the following syllable contains an l. Therefore it is very tempting to reconstruct the also metrically fitting title Mahallī which would result in the following half śloka: (ma)hal(li) śoṇatāṇṭhyaś ca kūṭatāṇṭhyena paścimāḥ.

v. ko bhavati sa . . . .: the textual remains recall pāda 3d v<a>rgo bhavati samudditaḥ, “(with this) the section is summarized”, but

9 It is difficult to decide if this sign is to be understood as a number or as a punctuation mark; if it is to be taken as a numerical symbol, it may possibly indicate a numbering of the uddānas within the Śilaskandha section.

10 Cf. the facsimile in SHT V, plate 85.
reading the first two akṣaras as vargo is impossible. Apart from that, one would expect such a line as the last pāda of an uddāna verse, but hardly as pāda b which it appears to be in the present case. In the face of the obvious break in the sequence of texts indicated by the following key words — at least four sūtras remain unmentioned — one suspects that part of the text is omitted in the verse. It seems difficult to find another explanation for the interruption of the sequence, and the reconstruction of the line is at present better left open.

(vās)īṣṭhaḥ: evidently the enumeration jumps to the text corresponding to the Tevijjasutta (DN 13), reconstructed here with reference to the name as preserved in verse 3b.

kāśyapaś caiva: again this key word denotes the text corresponding to the Kassapasihanādasutta (DN 8). A comparison of verses 3 and 5 demonstrates clearly that different wordings are (or, perhaps better, can be) used for those uddānas summarizing a section and those summarizing a larger part or a whole work.

brahmajālam anopamā: the first word refers of course to the Brahmajālasūtra with its parallel in DN 1. The second word is most likely to be taken as an attribute — in the sense of anupamam, “matchless” with lengthening for metrical reasons, cf. BHSD s.v. anopama — since Śamathadeva who quotes the Brahmajālasūtra as the last text in the Śilaskandha section,11 confirms that no other sūtra can possibly follow.

........... śilaskandhanip(a)t(a)s samāptah: possibly to be reconstructed as "dirghāgame śilaskandhanip(a)t(a)s samāptah "the Śilaskandha section (in the Dirghāgama) is completed". This colophon concludes the last section of the Dirghāgama. Previously, its Sanskrit name

was known in the form of Śīlaskandhikā only from a quotation in the Abhidharmakośabhāṣya which is explained in the Vyākhyā as śīlaskaṇḍhikā nāma nipātaḥ, “the section named Śīlaskandhikā”;\footnote{Abhidh-k-bh(P) 255,13 with Abhidh-k-vy 420,18.} the corresponding Pāli term is Silakkhandhavagga.

**samāptaś ca dirgha(ga)mah:** “the Collection of Long (Discourses) is also completed”. The terms for section, nipāta in Sanskrit and vagga in Pāli, and also the terms for the collection as a whole are different: in the Sanskrit version āgama is chosen, while the Pāli prefers nikāya (although āgama in this context is by no means unknown to the Pāli tradition).

## 2. Loss of text in the manuscript\footnote{This paper was first read on March 29, 2001, at the 28th Deutscher Orientalistentag, and I wish to thank the participants for the stimulating discussion of this point.}

In my earlier paper I observed that text seemed to be missing in the manuscript, without being able to explain that omission. The apparently missing text was a whole sūtra, the Prasādaniyasūtra (Pāli Pāsādikasutta), which could not be found in the place indicated by the uddāna and by the parallel in the Central Asian manuscripts.\footnote{Hartmann 2000, p. 364.} Since then, considerable textual gaps have been noticed in the last part of the manuscript, and therefore it is now reasonable to assume that most or all of these losses occurred in the transmission process of the text. Some of the missing passages may be recovered in rather unexpected places, once the manuscript is better studied and more folios have become available. Lance Cousins kindly drew my attention to the fact that three leaves of the Ambāṣṭhasūtra (which basically covers the
folios 410-416) are inserted in a later section and probably numbered as folios 442-444. This can only be explained if one assumes that the leaves were first copied, then mixed up, wrongly rearranged and only then finally numbered. The last folios of the manuscript display the following situation: on folio 451r2 the Kāśyapasūtra begins, which should cover a number of leaves; the next folio 452, however, contains text from the Brahmajālasūtra, but not from its beginning; it sets in with the section corresponding to § 151 in Weller. The next folio 453r connects directly with 452v; it has not yet been separated from the final folio 454, and therefore no photographs of folios 543v and 454r are available to us. The remaining text of the Brahmajālasūtra (§§ 206-223 in Weller’s edition) fits quite well into this gap, and we assume that the final part of the sūtra is completely preserved. In the first line of the verso side of folio 454 the antaroddāna begins (§ 223 in Weller). The various gaps in the uddānas have already been referred to above.

It appears that the manuscript was copied in a way which aimed at reproducing its exemplar folio for folio. This is indicated by the sometimes fairly copious spacing between the aksaras in the last line of a page or by the filling up of the last line with strokes. Both serve as a means for reproducing justified margins in order to conform to the format of the exemplar. Such phenomena will have to be studied very carefully throughout this manuscript, but also in comparison with other similar manuscripts. At the moment there is reason to suspect that some folios had already been lost in one of our manuscript’s exemplars, and without attempting to recover them from other manuscripts in the process of copying, the folio numbers were simply applied

---

15 Cousins refers to the same phenomenon reported by Andrew Skilton in a recent paper, cf. Skilton 2000, p. 11.
16 For similar observations on Khotanese manuscripts in Central Asia cf. Sander 1988, pp. 547f.
to the remaining leaves. This does not yet explain the fragmentary text of the *uddānas*, but here, too, it will be necessary to take all the evidence from the available folios into consideration before we can reach a better understanding of the textual developments within this particular manuscript.

3. *List of the sūtras in the Śilaskandha section*

The *uddānas* and the available folios of the manuscript provide enough information for an attempt at reconstructing the sequence of sūtras within the Śilaskandha section with a fairly high degree of certainty. In the following list, the first and/or the last folio of each sūtra is mentioned, if preserved and determinable, and a reference to the Pāli parallel in the DN is added. The remark that no corresponding text is traced in the DN only means that no sutta appears in the DN with the same or a similar title and with corresponding interlocutor(s). The exact relation between the so far unknown Sanskrit texts and the suttas of the Pāli Nikāyas will have to be clarified in the course of an edition and close study of each sūtra. According to the present state of knowledge the Śilaskandha section contains altogether 23 texts as opposed to 13 suttas in the Silakkhandhavagga of the DN — all the 13 texts of the Pāli find a correspondence in the Sanskrit — and 9 in that Collection of Long Discourses which is only preserved in Chinese translation and generally ascribed to the school of the Dharmaguptakas.\(^{17}\)

1. Tridāndin fol. ?-367r3 without correspondence in the DN
2. Piṅgalātreya 367r4-? without correspondence in the DN
3. Lohitya I ?-? Lohicca, DN 12

\(^{17}\) However, cf. Boucher 2000, pp. 67f.
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4. Lohitya II   
5. Kaivartin   
6. Maṇḍiśa I   
7. Maṇḍiśa II   
8. Mahallin   
9. Śrōṇatāṇḍya   
10. Kūṭatāṇḍya   
11. Ambāṣṭha   
12. Prṣṭhapāla   
13. Kāraṇavādinⁱ⁸   
14. Pudgala   
15. Śrūta   
16. Mahalla⁹   
17. Anyatama   
18. Śuka   
19. Jivaka   
20. Rāja   
21. Vāsiśṭha   
22. Kāśyapa   
23. Brahmajāla   

(three folios [442-444] of the Ambāṣṭha and one [445] of the 
Brahmajāla are inserted here)

24. Brahmajāla   

---

¹⁸ The following key words are omitted in the uddāna, but cf. the 
commentary on the key word pr(ṣṭhapālaḥ) above.

¹⁹ The reading of this and the following key word are not fully sure, 
cf. the remark on the key word pr(ṣṭhapālaḥ ca) above.

²⁰ The transition from this text to the next is preserved, but the folio 
is damaged at the left margin, and therefore the folio number is not pre-
served.
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