

Two Sanskrit Manuscripts of the Mūlasarvāstivādin *Bhaiṣajyavastu* from Gilgit⁽¹⁾

Fumi YAO

Abstract

This paper is concerned with the newly identified Sanskrit manuscript of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. My intention is to make a comparison between the new manuscript and the Gilgit manuscript, which had been the only available Sanskrit material of the text, until the discovery and identification of the new manuscript. Close comparisons of these two manuscripts reveal that the newly identified manuscript preserves various readings that are less confused than those of the Gilgit manuscript. The former also provides a few less Sanskritized or standardized readings than the latter does. As for their relationships with Tibetan and Chinese translations, with some exceptions, the newly identified manuscript is generally closer to them than the Gilgit manuscript.

Introduction

Three versions of the *Vinayavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* had been available for decades. These included the Gilgit Manuscript,⁽²⁾ which was thought to be the only extant Sanskrit manuscript of the text, until another manuscript was recently found. The other two are Chinese translations of seven of the seventeen chapters by Yijing 義淨 completed in the early eighth century and a ninth-century Tibetan translation by a team that included Sarvajñādeva, Vidyākara-prabha, Dharmakara, and dPal gyi lhun po.⁽³⁾ Of these three versions, the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, the sixth chapter, is preserved in its entirety only in the Tibetan translation. About half of the folios in the chapter are missing from the Gilgit manuscript. The Chinese translation of the chapter lacks the last two of the twenty fascicles.⁽⁴⁾

Around the end of the last century, another Sanskrit manuscript was identified with the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*. Parts of it are now held in a private collection in Virginia, the United States, and others in the Schøyen Collection in Oslo, Norway. Although details on its discovery is unclear, this manuscript appears to have been found at the same location as the famous *Dīrghāgama* manuscript and several other manuscripts.⁽⁵⁾ The *Dīrghāgama* manuscript has been dated to the second half of the eighth century, or slightly later, and the date of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscript may be close to it.⁽⁶⁾ The identification and initial transliterations of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscript were made by Klaus Wille,⁽⁷⁾ and, based on his work, I have been studying these manuscript fragments since 2011. In spite of its fragmentary state, the newly identified manuscript has proven to be of great value. First, it is the sole Sanskrit material of some parts of the *vastu*, for which folios are missing or are seriously damaged in the Gilgit manuscript. Second, as a fourth witness it provides noteworthy information on the differences between the extant versions of this *vastu*. Comparisons of these versions can be conducted at different levels, namely, the levels of narrative structures; of stock passages; and of words, phrases, and sentences. At the levels of narrative structures and stock passages, the newly identified manuscript agrees with the Chinese version in some cases and with the Tibetan version in other cases, where these two versions disagree with each other. This fact suggests that many of the differences between these versions had already existed at the stage of textual transmission in Sanskrit.⁽⁸⁾ As for the Gilgit manuscript, however, its comparison with our manuscript at these levels produce few meaningful results, because the extant texts of these two manuscripts rarely overlap in places where there are differences between the extant versions.









What, then, does our manuscript tell us when it is compared at a finer level—that is, at the level of words, phrases, and sentences in Sanskrit—with the Gilgit manuscript? To what extent do these Sanskrit texts correspond to or differ from each other? How could the newly identified manuscript help us understand the text of the

Bhaiṣajyavastu? This paper is focused on these questions.

Format

Before examining the text of the two Sanskrit manuscripts, I would like to mention their physical characteristics. These manuscripts look very similar: both are written on birch bark with one string hole, with folio numbers written in the left margin of the recto. However, in terms of the size of its folios, the newly identified manuscript is somewhat smaller than the Gilgit manuscript;⁽⁹⁾ the former is written with eight lines per side, with the exception of the last few folios, which have nine lines, whereas the latter is written with ten lines. Both manuscripts are written with the Gilgit/Bamiyan type II script, or Proto-Śāradā.⁽¹⁰⁾ However, the script in the newly identified manuscript is, at many points, different from that in the Gilgit manuscript and the *Dīrghāgama* manuscript; the latter two scripts are, however, very similar. Both the newly identified manuscript and the Gilgit manuscript use the early and later types of *y* and *h*,⁽¹¹⁾ the earlier ones appear more frequently than the later ones in our manuscript, whereas the Gilgit manuscript shows the opposite tendency.

Table 1: *y* and *h* in the Gilgit manuscript and the newly identified manuscript of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*

	<i>y</i> (earlier)	<i>y</i> (later)	<i>h</i> (earlier)	<i>h</i> (later)
GBhv	 <i>ya</i>	 <i>ya</i>	 <i>ha</i>	 <i>ha</i>
NBhv	 <i>ya</i>	 <i>yo</i>	 <i>ha</i>	 <i>hā</i>

Scribal Errors and Emendations

Overall, the newly identified manuscript includes many minor mistakes, as does the Gilgit manuscript, and a few of the mistakes are common to both manuscripts. Most of these are simple scribal errors, such as the omission or addition of a word, *anusvāra*, *visarga*, *akṣara*, or part of an *akṣara*. As for significant errors that make the text more or less unintelligible—such as the omission of a sentence or a relatively long phrase, the confusion of one word with another, and the confusion of declension—the newly identified manuscript often provides sound readings that enable us to emend the text of the Gilgit manuscript; cases of the opposite are rather rare. This is interesting, especially given that the *Dīrghāgama* manuscript has been revealed to include a remarkable degree of confusion in terms of textual transmission.⁽¹²⁾

Example 1

To take an example, there is a problem in the following text of the Gilgit manuscript:

Gilgit manuscript, 235r4–5:

... tatra yasya pañcaśatāni dattāni tena tathāvavoditāni⁽¹³⁾ yathā ārūpyadhātau pratiṣṭhāpitāni yasyārdha-
trītyāni tena tathāvoditāni⁽¹⁴⁾ yathā (**r5**) pañcasv abhijñāsu pratiṣṭhāpitāni | kiṃ manyadhve bhikṣavo ...⁽¹⁵⁾

This part of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* narrates the story of the former lives of three of the Buddha's disciples, Śāriputra, Mahāmaudgalyāyana, and Brāhmaṇakapṇiṇa.⁽¹⁶⁾ However, in the Sanskrit text quoted above, only two characters appear to be mentioned.

While the Chinese translation is missing in this part, the Tibetan version provides a complete passage with three sentences, each of which explains one character's educational achievement:

Tibetan version:

de la lnga brgya gtad pa gang yin pa des ni ji ltar gzugs med pa'i khams la bkod pa de ltar gdams ngag

phog go || nyis brgya lnga bcu gtad pa gang yin pa des ni ji ltar gzugs kyi khams la bkod pa de ltar gdams
ngag phog go || nyis brgya lnga bcu phog pa cig shos kyis ni ji ltar mngon par (P pa) shes pa lnga la bkod
pa de ltar gdams ngag phog go || dge slong dag ji snyam du sems |⁽¹⁷⁾

Translation from the Tibetan version:

There, the one who was entrusted with five hundred [disciples] instructed [them] so that they were established in the formless realm. The one to whom two hundred fifty [disciples] were imparted instructed [them] so that they were established in the form realm. Another one instructed two hundred fifty [disciples] so that they were established in the five supernormal powers. What do you think, monks? ...

Based on the above Tibetan translation, we can be sure that parts of the second and third sentences were skipped in the Gilgit manuscript because of the similarities between these two sentences. This missing part is supplied in Nalinaksha Dutt's edition without any indications, such as brackets or footnotes.⁽¹⁸⁾ That the omission in the Gilgit manuscript happened between the end of line 4 and the beginning of line 5 suggests that the scribe jumped from one *yathā* to another when he moved from line 4 to line 5, or, in other words, the omission happened only in this manuscript and not in any preceding manuscript.

A fragment of our newly identified manuscript preserves part of this passage:

Newly identified manuscript, (200)r⁽¹⁹⁾:

8 + .rṭīyāni ṭṭīya[s].ā[r].. [t].ṭīyāni sa kāladharmaṇā saṃyu[k](ta)ḥ tatra yas.. paṃcaśatāni dattāni [t]e ...
///

9 + reṇārdhatṛt.[y]. + + [th]ā.o[d]i[tān]i ... [p].m[c]. ... i + + + + .. tā[ni] kiṃ man..dh.e [bh]ik.. ///

Since one line in this manuscript consists of approximately eighty-five *akṣaras*,⁽²⁰⁾ the lost right half of line 8 can accommodate either more or less than forty-six *akṣaras*. Judging from this number, it is most likely that the newly identified manuscript correctly preserved the second sentence as well as the first and third ones. With the help of the fragment and the repetitive nature of the passage, we can conjecture the lost text as follows, which is slightly closer to the Tibetan translation than Dutt's supplementation is.

Gilgit manuscript emended on the basis of the newly identified manuscript

(235r4) ... **tatra yasya paṃcaśatāni dattāni tena**
tathāvavoditāni yathā ārūpyadhātau pratiṣṭhāpitāni
yasyārdhatṛṭīyāni tena tathāvavoditāni yathā <rūpadhātau
pratiṣṭhāpitāni | itareṇārdhatṛṭīyāni **tathāvavoditāni**
yathā> **(r5) paṃcasv** abhiññāsu pratiṣṭhāpitāni | **kiṃ**
manyadhve bhikṣavo ...

(parts corresponding to the newly identified manuscript are printed in bold)

Newly identified manuscript (reconstructed)

r8 ... tatra yas(ya) paṃcaśatāni dattāni te ... ///

r9 + reṇārdhatṛ(ṭī)y. + (ta)thā(v)oditāni ... p(a)mc.
.. .i + + + + .. tāni kiṃ man(ya)dh(v)e [bh]ik(ṣa)
///

Example 2

The second example is a passage included in a story that constitutes the thirty-first chapter of the *Divyāvadāna*.⁽²¹⁾

Gilgit manuscript, 161r9:

... dṛṣṭvā bhikṣavaś cittam abhiprasādayiṣyanti | bhagavatā laukikam cittam utpāditam iti paśyanti bhagavām kāśyapasya samyaksambuddhasya śārīrasaṃghātam avikopitam draṣṭukāmas ...⁽²²⁾

Newly identified manuscript, [X3-3]v6–7:

6 /// + [t](p)ā[d]itaṃ dharmmatā khalu yasmim samaye .. + + + + + ///

7 /// + + [m] utpāditam iti : paśyanti bhagavān kāśyapasya samyaksa(m)bu[d]. ///

Tibetan version:

... mthong lags na | dge slong rnams sems mngon par dad par 'gyur lags so || bcom ldan 'das kyis 'jig rten pa'i thugs bskyed pa (P par) mdzad de | chos nyid kyis gang gi tshe sangs rgyas bcom ldan 'das rnams kyis 'jig rten pa'i thugs bskyed pa de'i tshe srog chags grog sbur rnams kyis kyang bcom ldan 'das kyi dgongs pa sems kyis shes par 'gyur bas klu rnams kyis bsams pa | bcom ldan 'das kyis ci zhig gi phyr 'jig rten pa'i thugs bskyed pa mdzad snyam na | bcom ldan 'das yang dag par rdzogs pa'i sangs rgyas 'od srung gi (S kyi) ring bsrel gyi tshogs ma zhig pa gzigs par bzhed par mthong nas ...⁽²³⁾

Translation from the Tibetan version:

[The monks said:] "... Having seen it, monks will make their minds faithful." The Blessed One entertained a worldly thought. It is customary that when Buddhas, Blessed Ones, entertain a worldly thought, living beings, including those as small as ants, understand the Blessed One's thought. *Nāgas* thought: "For the sake of what did the Blessed One entertain a worldly thought?" Having seen that the Blessed One wanted to see the unbroken skeleton of the Perfectly Enlightened One Kāśyapa, they

Chinese version:

... 若我得見，心倍清淨。于時世尊起世間心。常法如是。若佛起世間心時，一切含靈悉知佛意。龍作是念。世尊何故起世間心。即便觀見。世尊欲見迦攝波如來全身舍利。⁽²⁴⁾

Divyāvadāna Chapter 31:

... dṛṣṭvā bhikṣavaś cittam abhiprasādayiṣyanti | bhagavatā laukikam cittam **utpāditam** | **dharmatā khalu yasmin samaye** buddhā bhagavanto laukikam cittam utpādayanti tasmin samaye kuntapipīlikādayo 'pi prāṇino bhagavataś cetasā cittam ājānanti | nāgāḥ saṃlakṣayanti kiṃ kāraṇaṃ bhagavatā laukikam cittam **utpād<itam> iti** | **paśyanti**⁽²⁵⁾ **bhagavān kāśyapasya samyakṣambuddhasya** śarīrasaṃghātam avikopitaṃ draṣṭukāmaḥ |⁽²⁶⁾ (emended on the basis of the newly identified manuscript)

The Gilgit manuscript lacks a few sentences corresponding to the text underlined in the quotation above from the *Divyāvadāna*, and fragments of the newly identified manuscript preserve the sentences in question, as indicated with the bold font in the same quotation (I tentatively emended the text in order to make it easier to see the context of the fragmentary text of the newly identified manuscript). The Tibetan and Chinese translations also include these sentences. Presumably, the omission in the Gilgit manuscript was caused by confusing the two identical sentences: *bhagavatā laukikam cittam utpāditam*. This gap is located in the middle of line 9 in the manuscript, not at the beginning or end of the line, and thus this time it is not certain if the omission occurred when the Gilgit manuscript was written, or before.

Example 3

The third example again concerns the omission of some words, but in this case, there are no repetitions or Sanskrit parallels that would help us. In a section of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* called *Anavataptagāthā*, there is a verse consisting of only two *pādas* of *śloka* in the Gilgit manuscript, but the Tibetan translation gives the verse with four *pādas*. The Chinese translation agrees with the latter. The verse is quoted below, verse 220, together with the preceding verse:

Gilgit manuscript, 206v7–8:

+++++++ +++++++

++ (da)[k](ṣ)inakaḥ pāṇir na yathā vāmakas tath[ā] <219>

+++ (v8) puruṣo vāpi duḥkhāṃ vindati vedanām* <220>⁽²⁷⁾

The newly identified manuscript, (159)r3⁽²⁸⁾:

i[d]. +++++ +++++ .. t[a]ḥ sataḥ

ayaṃ dakṣiṇakaḥ pāṇi ++++++

nā[r]. +++++ .. bh. + t pāradārikaḥ

narakeṣūpapannā [d](u)ḥ(kh)āṃ vi +++++ /// (+)

Tibetan version:

da dung du yang btsun pa dag | bdag ni rdzu 'phrul ldan gyur na'ang ||

lag pa g.yas 'di ji lta bar || g.yon pa de lta ma lags so ||

skyes pa'am bud med gang yang rung || byi bo byed pa gang yin pa ||

sems can dmyal bar skyes nas ni (S skyes gyur nas) || de ni sdug bsngal tshor ba myong ||⁽²⁹⁾

Translation from the Tibetan version:

Even though now, O Reverend Ones, I (Yaśas) am endowed with magic power,

This right hand is not like the left one. <219>

A man or woman who commits adultery

Tastes sensation of distress, after being reborn in hell. <220>

Chinese version:

今已得神通 由有餘殘報

我之左臂手 不如右手臂

若男若女人 侵妻及奪夫

常墮地獄中 恒受斯劇苦⁽³⁰⁾

Heinz Bechert, in his edition of the *Anavataptagāthā*, suggested that the first two *pādas* of verse 220 were missing, and reconstructed it as follows:

----- (narakeṣūpapannavān) |⁽³¹⁾

However, the verse in the newly identified manuscript suggests a different solution: in that manuscript, what precedes the word *duḥkhāṃ* is not the phrase *puruṣo vāpi*, as seen in the Gilgit manuscript, but *narakeṣūpapannā*. Although there is no physical gap between *puruṣo vāpi* and *duḥkhāṃ* in the Gilgit manuscript, the difference between the two manuscripts seems to indicate that the missing two *pādas* are the second and third *pādas*, not the first two, located between *puruṣo vāpi* (*pāda* a) and *duḥkhāṃ* (*pāda* d). The verse may possibly be reconstructed as follows:

nār(ī vā) puruṣo vāpi (yo) bh(ave)t pāradārikaḥ

narakeṣūpapannaḥ <sa> duḥkhāṃ vindati vedanām*

This reconstruction is, however, only a possibility.

As I mentioned briefly at the beginning of these comparisons, there is no example in which the newly identified manuscript shows any significant corruption, and the Gilgit manuscript preserves sound readings. The mistakes in

the newly identified manuscript for which the Gilgit manuscript gives correct readings are simple ones, such as omitted or superfluous words, *anusvāras*, *visargas*, and parts of ligatures, for example.

Example 4

However, an example in which the Gilgit manuscript might preserve a reading that precedes that of our manuscript should be mentioned here. With regard to verse 32 of the *Anavataptagāthā*, Bechert has pointed out a discrepancy between the Gilgit manuscript and the Tibetan translation.⁽³²⁾ The verse is as follows:

Gilgit manuscript, 202v4⁽³³⁾:

tenāhaṃ kuśalamū[]ena yatra yatropapannavān*
devabhūto manuṣyaś ca kṛtapuṇyo vya(rocayam*) <32>

Tibetan version:

dge ba'i rtsa ba de yis na (P ni) || gang dang gang du skyes par ni ||
bsod nams byas pas mdzes pa yi (S yin) || lha dang mi ni rnams su gyur ||⁽³⁴⁾

The difference lies in the presence and absence of the word *ahaṃ* in *pāda* a. The Tibetan translation indicates that the original Sanskrit did not include *ahaṃ*, unlike the Gilgit manuscript. As Bechert noted, both types of *pādas*, with and without *ahaṃ*, namely, *tenāhaṃ kuśalamūlena* and *tena kuśalamūlena*, are found in some verses in the *Anavataptagāthā*: the former in verses 23 and 64; the latter in verse 46.⁽³⁵⁾ Bechert remarked that although the replacement of *tenāhaṃ* with *tena* was fairly old, it was a redactional correction.⁽³⁶⁾ Our manuscript agrees with the Tibetan translation.⁽³⁷⁾

Newly identified manuscript, 152v7

tena kuśalamūle/(+ + + + + + + +
+ + + + + + + + + + + + +)

Example 5

There is an ambiguous case in which the difference between the two Sanskrit manuscripts could be the result of either an omission in one or an addition in the other:

Gilgit manuscript, 201v6:

... api tu y{a}śāṃ dhyānavimokṣasamādhi[sa](māpa)[tt]īnāṃ lābhī tathāga<ta>s tāsāṃ pratyekabuddhā
nāmāpi na jānanti | ...⁽³⁸⁾

Newly identified manuscript, (151)v2:

/// .. u [yā]śāṃ dhyānasamādhisamāpa /

Tibetan version:

'on kyang de bzhin gshegs pas brnyes pa'i bsam gtan dang | ting nge 'dzin dang snyoms par 'jug pa gang
dag yin pa de dag gi ming yang rang sangs rgyas rnams kyis mi shes so ||⁽³⁹⁾

Translation from the Tibetan version:

However, Self-Enlightened Ones do not know even the names of the *dhyāna*, *samādhi*, and *samāpatti* which the Tathāgata attains.

The Gilgit manuscript provides a compound consisting of four elements, namely, *dhyāna*, *vimokṣa*, *samādhi*, and *samāpatti*, whereas the newly identified manuscript and the Tibetan translation lack *vimokṣa*. Both types of

compounds are seen in various Buddhist texts, and, in the *Vinayavastu*, it is hard to tell which type should be regarded as typical. In the only example I found in the *Vinayavastu* other than this, the Gilgit manuscript does not include *vimokṣa*, and neither does the Tibetan translation.⁽⁴⁰⁾ However, as far as I have been able to find, the compound in question always includes *vimokṣa* in other parts of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, for which a Sanskrit text is not available, such as the *Vinayavibhaṅga*, the *Bhikṣuṇīvinayavibhaṅga*, and the *Kṣudrakavastu*.⁽⁴¹⁾ Although it is possible that the word *vimokṣa* was missed at some stage of textual transmission, resulting in the reading of the newly identified manuscript and the Tibetan translation, it is equally possible that someone supplied the word *vimokṣa*, which had not originally been there, based on, for instance, their knowledge of the well-known ten powers of the Tathāgata.⁽⁴²⁾ The Chinese version reads 如来所得之定 “the meditation which the Tathāgata has attained,” which is the simplest of the four extant materials.⁽⁴³⁾

Linguistic Features

In addition to the examples above, examples of linguistic features, too, are worthy of attention. Differences between the two Sanskrit manuscripts seem to suggest gradual Sanskritization or standardization, as we will see below.

Example 6

In the following example, our manuscript gives *m* as an inorganic *sandhi*-consonant or hiatus-bridger.⁽⁴⁴⁾

Gilgit manuscript, 180r10:

... alaṃ kumāra adya gamanena ...

Newly identified manuscript, (1)[20]v1:

... kumāra-m-alaṃ te 'dya⁽⁴⁵⁾ gamane[na] ...

Divyāvadāna, chapter 30:

alaṃ kumārādya gamanena⁽⁴⁶⁾

As seen above, the Gilgit manuscript uses a different word order that does not require the function of the consonant. It must be noted, however, that a *sandhi*-consonant is also found, if not frequently, in several parts of the Gilgit manuscript.⁽⁴⁷⁾ Thus, if the above reading of the Gilgit manuscript resulted from the elimination of the sandhi-consonant, such an attempt was not always made in the manuscript. The *Divyāvadāna* is closer to the Gilgit manuscript than our manuscript in this case.⁽⁴⁸⁾

Example 7

According to Richard Salomon, the *Anavataptagāthā* was presumably an independent text before it was interpolated into the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*: the text was written in a Middle Indo-Aryan language and later translated into Sanskrit. Based on close comparisons of the Gāndhārī version, the Gilgit manuscript, the Tibetan translation, and the Turfan Sanskrit manuscript, he convincingly argues that the translation often caused changes to the grammatical forms of words, words themselves, and even the structure of a verse, due to metrical requirements.⁽⁴⁹⁾ In the following verse, which is included in the *Anavataptagāthā* in the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, we have an example that shows that Sanskritization caused variants even between two Sanskrit manuscripts of the same text.

Gilgit manuscript, 206v3:

(ga)(v3)yaśīrṣaṃ vayaṃ gatvā gautamaṃ śāsa[n]. [t](a)t(a)[h] <|>

[ā]rabdhavīryair asmābhiḥ prāptaṃ nirvāṇaṃ uttamam* <209>⁽⁵⁰⁾

Newly identified manuscript, (158)v5⁽⁵¹⁾:

(+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + +) /// +

.. ta ārabdhavīryetiḥ prāptaṃ nirvāṇam uttamam*

Tibetan version:

bdag cag ga yā mgor son nas || gau ta ma'i bstan pa thos ||

de nas brtson 'grus brtsams pas ni || mya ngan 'das pa dam pa thob ||⁽⁵²⁾

The reading of our manuscript *ārabdhavīryetiḥ* is most probably a misspelling of *ārabdhavīryebhiḥ*, since the two *akṣaras*, *ti* and *bhi*, look quite similar to each other (in this and other scripts). As Heinz Bechert has observed, the Gilgit manuscript also preserves an example of the personal ending *-ebhiḥ* in another part of the *Anavataptagāthā*,⁽⁵³⁾ but here the manuscript gives *ārabdhavīryair*. The reading of the newly identified manuscript, *-ebhiḥ*, should be prior to that of the Gilgit manuscript, which is normal Sanskrit. It is possible that the irregularity of this declension as Sanskrit caused the scribal emendation of *ārabdhavīryebhiḥ* into *-vīryaiḥ*, and that this emendation led to a metrical problem that required further changes to the text, resulting in the differences between the entire *pāda* c of the two manuscripts.⁽⁵⁴⁾ The Tibetan version seems to be closer to the newly identified manuscript. We may say from this case that the Sanskritization of verses continued even after the *Anavataptagāthā* was interpolated into the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*.

Correspondence to the Tibetan and Chinese versions

The two translations in Chinese and Tibetan, themselves being quite different from each other, seem to be located closer to our manuscript than to the Gilgit manuscript in terms of textual transmission. As to most of the examples of variant readings, the Tibetan translation agrees with the newly identified manuscript, or is closer to it, where the two Sanskrit manuscripts disagree with each other, as we have seen in some examples in this paper. Where a comparison is possible, the Chinese translation also tends to agree with the newly identified manuscript.

However, there exist a few exceptions in which the translations agree with the Gilgit manuscript rather than with our manuscript. In addition to examples showing the simple omission of a word in the newly identified manuscript, there is one example of a change in a word where the Gilgit manuscript, the Tibetan version, and the Chinese version all agree, in contrast to the newly identified manuscript. Our manuscript in (148)r4 reads + *[dha]rmmavādī* (probably *adharmavādī*), whereas the Gilgit manuscript, the Tibetan translation, and the Chinese translation give *abhūtavādī*, *yang dag min pa smra ba*, and *ruo ren wei wangyu* 若人爲妄語, respectively.⁽⁵⁵⁾ This is the first word of a verse that has its parallel in the *Udānavarga*. I have not been able to find any parallel of this verse that supports the reading *adharmavādī*.⁽⁵⁶⁾

Concluding Remarks

Although we must be aware of the small sample size due to the shortage of available text in the newly identified *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscript, the following tendency of the newly identified manuscript is clear in its comparisons with the Gilgit manuscript at the level of words, phrases, and sentences: namely, its readings are less confused than the Gilgit manuscript. It also preserves a few less Sanskritized or standardized linguistic features than the Gilgit manuscript does. It is unlikely that there was any linear relationship between the newly identified manuscript and the Gilgit manuscript, where the former simply developed into the latter. However, one can safely state that readings of the former generally belong to an earlier phase of textual transmission than those of the latter.

Another notable tendency of our manuscript is its agreement with the Tibetan and Chinese versions in those instances in which it disagrees with the Gilgit manuscript. Although I have not treated it in detail here, because doing so would require another paper, the relationship between the *Divyāvadāna* and the extant *Bhaiṣajyavastu* materials is noteworthy. The *Divyāvadāna* also tends to agree with the newly identified *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscript, rather than with the Gilgit manuscript, where the two *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscripts differ from each other.

The newly identified manuscript thus reveals not only its own importance, but also that of other extant ma-

terials that convey the contents of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, namely, translations and excerpts, as witnesses of Sanskrit textual transmission. Although the Gilgit manuscript remains the sole substantial Sanskrit material of the *Vinayavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, our manuscript fragments remind us that the Gilgit manuscript is only one of a huge number of Sanskrit manuscripts of the *Vinaya* that once circulated in and around India.

Acknowledgments

I wish to express my gratitude to Professor Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Dr. Klaus Wille for access to scans of the manuscripts and Dr. Wille's unpublished reports. I also thank Professor Shayne Clarke for his helpful comments and Dr. Masanori Shōno for his kind replies to my questions. The responsibility for any remaining errors in this paper rests entirely on me. This research was supported by JSPS Postdoctoral Fellowships for Research Abroad and Waseda University Grant for Special Research Projects (Project number: 2017S-192).

Notes

- (1) This article is based on a paper read at the AAS-in-ASIA conference (Association for Asian Studies) held at Korea University, Seoul, on June 25, 2017: "The Newly Identified *Bhaiṣajyavastu* Manuscript and the Gilgit Manuscript."
- (2) Although a large number of manuscripts have been unearthed from Gilgit, in this paper, I use the term "the Gilgit manuscript" to indicate only the manuscript of the *Vinayavastu*.
- (3) Sanskrit: (edition) GM vol. 3, pt. i, (facsimile edition) Clarke 2014, Plates 46–134; Chinese: T no.1448 *Genben shuoyiqieyoubu pinaiye yaoshi* 根本說一切有部毘奈耶藥事, 24.1a1–97a24; Tibetan: D 1 'Dul ba gzhi, 'Dul ba Ka277b6–Ga50a7. For more details, see Yao 2015, 289n4.
- (4) For the concordance of extant materials of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*, see Yao 2013a, 587–596.
- (5) For details on manuscripts in these collections, see Hartmann and Wille 2014 and Melzer 2014, esp. 229–231. There are a few fragments of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscript stuck together with fragments of other manuscripts, which prove that these manuscripts had been preserved together for a long time until they were broken into smaller bundles and single fragments. Fragment G16.2A-1 is stuck together with a fragment identified with the *Aṇṇakāsūtra* of the *Ādīśākhāgama* by Dr. Wille (information from Dr. Masanori Shōno, personal communication); fragment MS 2627/1.3B-1 with a *Samyuktāgama* fragment (MS 2627/1.3A) identified with SĀc1 482–483 by Dr. Shōno; fragment MS 2627/1.6B-1 with another *Samyuktāgama* fragment identified with SN 56.44 and AKUp 6035 (≠SĀc1 435) by me. There are also fragments of the *Samyuktāgama* and *Vinayavibhaṅga* stuck together (F22.3 and G14.4, one side corresponding to SĀc1 907–908 or SĀc2 122–123 and the other Naissargikā Pāyattikā 18, both identified by Dr. Shōno). For the labeling of fragments, see Yao 2015, 290–291.
- (6) For the radiocarbon dating of the *Ādīśākhāgama* manuscript, see Allon et al. 2006, 279–280. For the difficulties in dating a manuscript based on its script, especially when it comes to Gilgit/Bāmiyān type II, see Sander 2014, 173: "It became a standard script, which was used with variations all over northern India, Kashmir, 'Greater Gandhāra,' Nepal, and Xinjiang between the 6th and the 11th centuries. ... It is nearly impossible to date such standard scripts with palaeographic means." Sander also points out the limits of radiocarbon analysis (*ibid.*, 173–174).
- (7) Wille 2011a, b, c.
- (8) Regarding the inclusion or abbreviation of stories and stock passages, for examples in which the newly identified manuscript agrees with the Chinese version and not the Tibetan version, examples in which it agrees with the Tibetan version and not the Chinese version, and examples in which it disagrees with both the Tibetan and Chinese versions, see Yao 2013b. For more comparisons at the levels of narrative structures and stock passages, see Yao forthcoming.
- (9) Although I have not been able to measure the manuscript fragments themselves, judging from the reported size of the *Ādīśākhāgama* manuscript, about 10×50 cm (Hartmann 2002, 133. Cf., also, Melzer 2014, 231), the short edge of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* manuscript seems to be about 7.7 cm (this estimate is based on some scans that include both the *Ādīśākhāgama* and *Bhaiṣajyavastu* fragments, e.g., E25 and E26). Since there is no complete extant folio for this manuscript, the length of the long edge is unknown. However, the amount of text per line estimated from stock phrases suggests that the length is between 47 cm and 53 cm, that is, similar to the *Ādīśākhāgama* manuscript. Thus, the newly identified manuscript is smaller than the Gilgit *Vinayavastu* manuscript, which has been reported by several scholars to be between 12 cm and 12.7 cm on its short edge and 59.69 cm and 67 cm on its long edge (cf. Clarke 2014, Introduction, 3n19).
- (10) Cf. Melzer 2014, 229 and 262–268.
- (11) Cf. Melzer 2014, 238 and 246–247.
- (12) See Hartmann 2014, 155–156; Melzer 2014, 227–228.
- (13) Read *tathāvavāditāni*? Cf. BHSD s.v. *avavādati*, *avavādayati*, *avoditāh*.
- (14) See the preceding note.
- (15) The transliteration is mine, based on the photograph in Clarke 2014. The same applies to other transliterations of the Gilgit manuscript in this paper, with the exception of the quotations from Wille 1990 indicated in footnotes.
- (16) GBhv 235v9–235r7, GM i 266.10–267.21; D Ga40b6–41b3; Chinese translation missing.
- (17) D Ga41a6–7; P NGc38b7–39a1; S Kha43b4–6.

- (18) *tatra yasya pañcaśatāni dattāni tena tathāvacoditāni yathā ārūpyadhātau pratiṣṭhāpitāni | yasyārdhatrīyāni tena tathāvacoditāni yathā [rūpadhātau pratiṣṭhāpitāni | yasyāpy ardhatrīyāni tena tathāvacoditāni yathā] pañcasv abhijñāsu pratiṣṭhāpitāni | kiṃ manyadhve bhikṣavo ...* GM i 267.9–13. I added square brackets around the part supplied by Dutt.
- (19) For the folio numbering of the newly identified manuscript, see Yao 2015, 291 and 295–301.
- (20) Yao 2015, 291–292.
- (21) Many of the stories in the *Divyāvadāna* are likely to have been extracted from the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*. Cf. Hiraoka 1998. The passage quoted here is also found, with some variants, in the sixth chapter (Divy 77.12–17), because the second half of Chapter 31 (Divy 465.10–469.18) is erroneously duplicated as the second half of Chapter 6 (Divy 76.10–80.9). See Iwamoto 1978, 135–137 [1967, 135–137]; Hiraoka 2007, i 168n14; Rotman 2008–17, i 419n432, ii 390n476.
- (22) Cf. GM i 75.4–7. Cf., also, a similar passage in GBhv 199v7; Wille 1990, 71.
- (23) D Kha160b2–4; P Ge149a1–4; S Kha213b1–5.
- (24) T no.1448, 24.53a23–27.
- (25) “*utpāditam*” in the edition by Cowell and Neil (Divy 466.14). The manuscripts read *utpādayanti* (*ibid.*, n1).
- (26) Divy 466.9–15. Cf. Hiraoka 2007, ii 269 (Japanese translation) and Rotman 2008–17, ii 176 (English translation).
- (27) Transliteration is quoted from Wille 1990, 97.
- (28) I numbered this folio [X4-2] in Yao 2015 since the continuity of three folios that included it ([X4-1], [X4-2], and [X4-3]) and the extant folios preceding it was unclear at that time. These folios should be numbered 158, 159, and 160.
- (29) D Kha295a4–5; P Ge273b5–6; S Kha3981–2. Cf. Hofinger 1954 [1982], 87 and 234 (Tibetan text based on the sNar thang and Peking xylographs and French translation).
- (30) T no.1448, 24.83b24–27.
- (31) Bechert 1961, 151. Cf., also, Wille 1990, 97n192.
- (32) Bechert 1961, 95n8.
- (33) Wille 1990, 81.
- (34) D Kha287a2–3; P Ge265b2–3; S Kha262a5. Cf. Hofinger 1954 [1982], 52 and 200.
- (35) Verse 23: GBhv 202r9–10; Wille 1990, 80. Verse 46: GBhv 203r1; Wille *ibid.*, 82. Verse 64: GBhv 203r8; Wille *ibid.*, 83. Unlike in verse 32, the Tibetan translation agrees with the Gilgit manuscript in these three cases: *dge ba'i rtsa ba des na bdag* in verses 23 and 64 (D Kha286b3; 288a7); and *dge ba'i rtsa ba de yis ni* in verse 46 (287b4). There are other examples, the counterparts of which are unavailable in both the Sanskrit manuscripts: Kha304a2, 305a7, 307a2, each reading *dge ba'i rtsa ba de yis ni*; Kha307b5, 312a1, 313a5, *dge ba'i rtsa ba des na bdag*.
- (36) There is an example that may make things more complicated: *tena kuśalamuleṇa* in verse 17 of the Gāndhārī *Anavataptagāthā* (Salomon 2008, 175 and 209), the counterpart of which in the Gilgit manuscript is *aham etena puṇyena*. Salomon regards the reading in the Gilgit manuscript as the result of a rearrangement for a metrical reason (*ibid.*, 172). I am presently unable to discuss any relationships between this phenomenon and our current example.
- (37) Unfortunately, the verses in question other than this one, verse 32, cannot be confirmed in the available fragments of the newly identified manuscript.
- (38) Transliteration is quoted from Wille 1990, 75.
- (39) D Kha285a7; P Ge263b6; S Kha382b2–3.
- (40) PLv § 4.14; D Ga151a2–3.
- (41) D 3 'Dul ba Ca97b7, 100b3, 105a4–5, 201a7–b1, 208a1, 281b7, Cha96b4, 5, 107b4–5, Ja152b6–7, 153b3, 167a5–6, 276b5, Nya39a6; 5 'Dul ba Ta62b2, 207b6–7; 6 'Dul ba Tha156b4, Da24b7, 25a1.
- (42) Cf. AKBh 411.18; Mvy 126.
- (43) The *Kaṭhināvadāna*, a later work that is said to have been composed on the basis of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*, lists only *dhyāna* and *samāpatti* in the similar context (Degener 1990, 29).
- (44) BHSg 4.59–60.
- (45) *Avagraha* is not written in the manuscript.
- (46) Divy 451.25.
- (47) For example, *m* as a hiatus-bridger: 381r7 (Sbhv i 104.23–24) *agnyarthī-m-agnigaveṣī*; 411r5 (Sbhv ii 22–23 *tiṣṭhati*; *sālokena*) *tiṣṭhati-m-ālokena* (Chung and Fukita 2011, 220 and 231). There are also examples of *r* (Bechert 1961, 24 and 192; Yamagiwa 2001, 24) and *n* (Chung and Fukita 2011, 265 and 288) as the same. The newly identified manuscript preserves a possible example of *d*, [X1-4]r3 /// + + + + + .ittādhavahitaśrottrā ... (probably *manasīkṛtvaikāgracittā-d-avahitaśrottrāḥ*. The corresponding part is missing in the Gilgit manuscript).
- (48) Although it is unclear whether the Tibetan version's original Sanskrit corresponded to the newly identified manuscript or the Gilgit manuscript in this case, at least it should be noted that the Tibetan version agrees with the Gilgit manuscript in lacking the pronoun *te*: *gzhon nu deng 'gro ba shol la ...* (D Kha213b7; P Ge201a7; S Kha290a6).
- (49) Salomon 2008, esp. 51–54 and 58–60.
- (50) Transliteration is quoted from Wille 1990, 96.
- (51) This folio was numbered [X4-1] in Yao 2015 (see note 28).
- (52) D Kha294b4. Cf. Hofinger 1954 [1982], 85 and 233.

- (53) Bechert 1961, 24. The newly identified manuscript provides another example in verse 680, *śatebhiḥ* (179r7). See, also, BHSG 8.110. The examples from “MSV i 34.11–15 and 35.11–16” in this entry of BHSG should be excluded because they are based on Dutt’s silent emendation of *-kāraṇābhiḥ* into *-cāraṇebhiḥ*. The examples from “MSV i 276.20; 277.1” are correct.
- (54) Not only *pāda* c but also *pāda* b must have changed in the same process, judging from the position of *tataḥ*.
- (55) GBhv 199r8 (Wille 1990, 69); D Kha281a4; T 24.76b19.
- (56) UvSu 8.1; UvTib 8.1; T no.210 (法句經), 4.570a7–8; T no.212 (出曜經), 4.663c29–664a1; T no.213 (法集要頌經), 4.781b3–4; DhP 306; PDhp 114; GDhp 269 (not included in Lenz 2003); Sn 661.

Abbreviations

- AKBh *Abhidharmakośabhāṣya* ed. by Pradhan (1967)
- AKUp *Abhidharmakośaṭīkopāyikā* (Honjō 1984 and 2014 for numbering)
- BHSD *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. II Dictionary by Edgerton ([1953] 1998)
- BHSG *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*, vol. I Grammar by Edgerton ([1953] 1998)
- D Derge xylograph of *bKa’ ’gyur*
- Dhp *Dhammapada* ed. by von Hinüber and Norman (1995)
- Divy *Divyāvadāna* ed. by Cowell and Neil ([1886] 1987)
- GBhv *The Baiṣajyavastu* in the Gilgit manuscript. Facsimile edition: Clarke 2014, 46–134
- GDhp *Gāndhārī Dharmapada* ed. by Brough (1962)
- GM *Gilgit manuscript of the Vinayavastu* ed. by Dutt (1942–50)
- Mvy *Mahāvīyutpatti* ed. by Sakaki ([1916] 1998)
- MW *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary* by Monier-Williams (1899)
- NBhv *The newly identified Baiṣajyavastu manuscript fragments held in the Private Collection, Virginia, and the Schøyen Collection*
- P Peking xylograph of *bKa’ ’gyur*
- PDhp *Patna Dharmapada* ed. by Cone (1989)
- PLv *Pāṇḍulohitakavastu* ed. by Yamagiwa (2001)
- S sTog Palace manuscript of *bKa’ ’gyur*
- SĀc1 *Samyuktāgama* in Chinese (T no.99 *Za ahan jing* 雜阿含經)
- SĀc2 *Samyuktāgama* in Chinese (T no.100 *Bieyi za ahan jing* 別譯雜阿含經)
- Sbhv *Sanḥabhedavastu* ed. by Gnoli (1977–78)
- SN *Samyuttanikāya* ed. by Feer ([1884–98] 1975–2006)
- Sn *Suttanipāta* ed. by Andersen and Smith ([1913] 1984)
- T *Taishō shinshū daizōkyō* 大正新脩大藏經. 100 vols. Tokyo: Taishō Issaikyō Kankōkai 大正一切經刊行會, 1924–34; digital database at <http://21dzk.l.u-tokyo.ac.jp/SAT/>
- Uv *Udānavarga* ed. by Bernhard (1965–68)
- UvSu *Udānavarga* in the Subasi manuscript ed. by Nakatani (1988)
- UvTib *Udānavarga* in the Tibetan translation ed. by Champa Thupten Zongtse (1990)

References

- Allon, Mark, Richard Salomon, Geraldine Jacobsen, and Ugo Zoppi. 2006. “Radiocarbon Dating of Kharoṣṭhī Fragments from the Schøyen and Senior Manuscript Collections.” In *Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection: Buddhist Manuscripts III*, 279–291. Oslo: Hermes Publishing.
- Andersen, Dines, and Helmer Smith [1913] 1984. *Sutta-Nipāta*. London, Boston, Melbourne and Henley: Pali Text Society.
- Bechert, Heinz. 1961. *Bruchstücke buddhistischer Verssammlungen aus zentralasiatischen Sanskrithandschriften 1: Die Anavataptagāthā und die Sthaviragāthā*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 6. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag.
- Bernhard, Franz. 1965–68. *Udānavarga*. 2 vols. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 10. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Brough, John. 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. London Oriental Series 7. London: Oxford University Press.
- Champa Thupten Zongtse. 1990. *Udānavarga III*. Sanskrittexte aus den Turfanfunden 10, 3. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- Chung, Jin-il, and Takamichi Fukita. 2011. *A Survey of the Sanskrit Fragments Corresponding to the Chinese Madhyamāgama*. Tokyo: The Sankibo Press.
- Clarke, Shayne. 2014. *Gilgit Manuscripts in the National Archives of India: Facsimile Edition. Volume I. Vinaya Texts*. New Delhi: National Archives of India; Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhism, Soka University.
- Cone, Margaret. 1989. “Patna Dharmapada.” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 13:101–217.
- Cowell, Edward Byles, and Robert Alexander Neil. [1886] 1987. *The Divyāvadāna, a Collection of Early Buddhist Legends*. Delhi: Indological Book House.
- Degener, Almuth. 1990. *Das Kaṭhināvadāna*. Indica et Tibetica 16. Bonn: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Dutt, Nalinaksha. 1942–50. *Gilgit Manuscripts*, vol. 3 in 4 parts. Srinagar: Research Department. Reprint, Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1984.
- Edgerton, Franklin. [1953] 1998. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. 2 vols. Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

- Feer, Léon. [1884–98] 1975–2006. *The Saṃyutta-Nikāya of the Sutta-Piṭaka*. 5 vols. Reprint, Oxford, London: Pali Text Society.
- Gnoli, Raniero. 1977–78. *The Gilgit Manuscript of the Saṅghabhedavastu: Being the 17th and Last Section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin*. 2 vols. Serie Orientale Roma 49(1–2). Roma: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente.
- Harrison, Paul, and Jens-Uwe Hartmann ed. 2014. *From Birch Bark to Digital Data: Recent Advances in Buddhist Manuscript Research. Papers Presented at the Conference Indic Buddhist Manuscripts: The State of the Field, Stanford, June 15–19 2009*. Vienna: Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe. 2002. “Further Remarks on the New Manuscript of the *Dīrghāgama*.” *Journal of the International College for Advanced Buddhist Studies* 5:133–150.
- . 2014. “The *Dīrgha-āgama* of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins: What was the Purpose of this Collection?” In Dhammadinnā ed. *Research on the Dīrgha-āgama*, 135–166. Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation.
- Hartmann, Jens-Uwe, and Klaus Wille. 2014. “The Manuscript of the *Dīrghāgama* and the Private Collection in Virginia.” In Harrison and Hartmann ed. 2014, 137–155.
- Hinüber, Oskar von, and K.R. Norman. 1995. *Dhammapada*. Oxford: Pali Text Society.
- Hiraoka, Satoshi 平岡 聡. 1998. “The Relation between the *Divyāvadāna* and the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*.” *Journal of Indian Philosophy* 26:419–434.
- . 2007. *Budda ga nazotoku sanze no monogatari: ‘Diviya-avadāna’ zen’yaku*, ブッダが謎解く三世の物語『ディヴィヤ・アヴァダーナ』全訳 [The stories of the past, present, and future revealed by the Buddha: A complete translation of the *Divyāvadāna*], 2 vols. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版.
- Hofinger, Marcel. 1954 [1982]. *Le congrès du Lac Anavatapta (Vies de saints bouddhiques): Extrait du Vinaya des Mūlasarvāstivādin Bhaiṣajyavastu 1, Légendes des anciens (Sthavirāvadāna)*. Louvain: Publications Universitaires.
- Honjō, Yoshifumi 本庄 良文. 1984. *A Table of Āgama-Citations in the Abhidharmakośa and the Abhidharmakośopāyikā*, part 1 俱舍論所依阿含全表. Kyoto: private edition.
- . 2014. *Kusharonchū Upāikā no kenkyū: Yakuchūhen* 俱舍論註ウパーイカーの研究 訳註篇 [A study of the *Abhidharmakośa-īkopāyikā*: An annotated translation]. 2 vols. Tokyo: Daizō shuppan 大蔵出版.
- Iwamoto, Yutaka 岩本 裕. 1978. *Bukkyō setsuwa kenkyū josetsu* 仏教説話研究序説 [An introduction to the study of Buddhist narrative literature]. Bukkyō setsuwa kenkyū 仏教説話研究 [Study of Buddhist narrative literature] 1. Tokyo: Kaimei shoin 開明書院 (a revised edition of the book published from Hōzōkan 法蔵館 with the same title in 1967).
- Lenz, Timothy. 2003. *A New Version of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada and a Collection of Previous-Birth Stories: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 16 + 25*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Melzer, Gudrun. 2014. “A Palaeographic Study of a Buddhist Manuscript from the Gilgit Region: A Glimpse into a Scribes’ Workshop.” In *Manuscript Cultures: Mapping the Field*. Studies in Manuscript Cultures 1, 227–272. Berlin, Munich, and Boston: Walter de Gruyter GmbH.
- Monier-Williams, Monier. 1899. *A Sanskrit-English Dictionary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nakatani, Hideaki 中谷 英明. 1988. *Subashi shahon no kenkyū* スバシ写本の研究 [A study of the Subasi manuscript]. Kyoto: Jinbun shoin 人文書院.
- Pradhan, P. 1967. *Abhidharm-koshabhāṣya of Vasubandhu*. Patna: K. P. Jayaswal Research Institute.
- Rotman, Andy. 2008–17. *Divine Stories: Divyāvadāna*. 2 vols. Boston: Wisdom Publications.
- Sakaki, Ryōzaburō 榊 亮三郎. [1916] 1998. *Bonzōkanwa shiyaku taikō hon’yaku myōgi taishū* 梵藏漢和四譯對校 翻譯名義大集 [A quadrilingual Sanskrit-Tibetan-Chinese-Japanese edition of the *Mahāvīyutpatti*]. Kyoto: Rinsen shoten 臨川書店.
- Salomon, Richard. 2008. *Two Gāndhārī Manuscripts of the Songs of Lake Anavatapta (Anavataptagāthā): British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 1 and Senior Scroll 14*. Seattle and London: University of Washington Press.
- Sander, Lore. 2014. “Dating and Localizing Updating Manuscripts.” In Harrison and Hartmann ed. 2014, 171–186.
- Wille, Klaus. 1990. *Die handschriftliche Überlieferung des Vinayavastu der Mūlasarvāstivādin*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- . 2011a. “Private Collection, Virginia, USA: Transliteration by K. Wille” (unpublished).
- . 2011b. “Further Identified Manuscripts in the Private Collection, Virginia” (later published in Hartmann and Wille 2014, 145–155).
- . 2011c. “The Schøyen collection (Oslo) —Ser. No. 2627” (unpublished).
- Yamagiwa, Nobuyuki. 2001. *Das Pāṇḍulohitakavastu: Über die verschiedenen Verfahrensweisen der Bestrafung in der buddhistischen Gemeinde*. Indica et Tibetica 41. Marburg: Indica et Tibetica Verlag.
- Yao, Fumi 八尾 史. 2013a. *Konponsetsuissaiuburitsu yakujū* 根本説一切有部律藥事 [The *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya* (annotated Japanese translation)]. Tokyo: Rengō shuppan 連合出版.
- . 2013b. “A Brief Note on the Newly Found Sanskrit Fragments of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya.” *Journal of Indian and Buddhist Studies* 61(3): 72–77.
- . 2015. “A Preliminary Report on the Newly Found Sanskrit Manuscript Fragments of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu* of the Mūlasarvāstivāda *Vinaya*,” *Indian Logic* 8:289–303.
- . Forthcoming. “Problems of the Newly Identified Sanskrit Manuscript of the *Bhaiṣajyavastu*.” *Puṣpikā: Tracing Ancient India Through Texts and Traditions: Contributions to Current Research in Indology*.