

THE GANDHARI PRAKRIT VERSION OF THE RHINOCEROS SŪTRA

J.C. WRIGHT*

The earliest South Asian manuscripts, dating from about the first century AD, have been preserved in eastern Afghanistan, thanks to a local practice of interring them in jars when well past their prime. The Early Buddhist Manuscripts Project of the British Library and University of Washington (Seattle) has undertaken the task of unrolling, reconstructing, and deciphering some of these congealed birch-bark scrolls in Kharoshti script and Gandhari Prakrit orthography. Following closely upon his preliminary description of the British Library collection in *Ancient Buddhist scrolls from Gandhāra* (Seattle and London, 1999), Richard Salomon has provided an edition together with excellent facsimile photographs, of one of the best preserved texts, a set of verses corresponding to *Khaggavisāṇasutta*, the ‘Rhinoceros Sūtra’ of Khuddakanikāya.¹

The survival of much of an Uddāna, which for once provides a catchword index of each and every verse, and the use of fibre-optic light to reveal a few obscured syllables, have made possible a painstaking reconstruction of this Gandhari ‘*Khargaviṣāṇa*’ text, relatively complete save for the disintegration of the third pāda of most verses (where textual variation is particularly prevalent). It differs strikingly from the Pali

1. Richard Salomon, *A Gāndhāri version of the Rhinoceros Sūtra: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5B. With a contribution by Andrew Glass.* (Gandhāran Buddhist Texts, 1), Seattle and London, 2000. Mr. Glass has contributed an important analysis of Kharoshti written forms. Studies of fragments corresponding to texts from Ekottarāgama, Dharmapada, Avadāna, and Abhidharma are currently being prepared by other participants in the project.

in many of its readings. The readings tend to agree with Sanskrit versions where available, and they seem to pose no very serious threat to the authenticity of the Pali tradition in this respect.

On the other hand, the very different arrangement of the verses in the Gandhari text may be evidence of an early stage in the process of compilation.² An impression of homogeneity, and an objection to the reconstruction of an Urtext, at least in the present state of knowledge, have made Salomon disinclined to pursue this aspect of the matter. He writes (p.41) of the 'repetitive character of the poem as a whole, which develops over and over in different terms the same basic themes of the benefits of solitude and the necessity of choosing one's companions carefully'. One can, however, identify three different types of verse, which are unlikely to have originated in one burst of poetic inspiration:

(1) About a third of the verses are constructed with gerunds, after the manner of the notably anomalous distich Pa[li] 11-12 (=Suttanipāta 45-46), Ga[ndhari] 25-26:

abhibhuyya ... careyya;

(rājā va ratṭham) pahāya ... eko care (khaggavisāṇakappo).

This is unique among the verses also in that the syntax explicitly relates the rhinoceros image to the verb *care* alone, and it has a respectably ancient pedigree as Dhammapada 328-329 ...*eko care (mātaṅg' araṇṇe va nāgo)*. The DhP version is more cogent, for there the image of a retiring king in one pāda clarifies the image of the ousted leader of a herd of elephants in the

2. 'Whereas P[ali] *Khaggavisāṇa*] is the outcome of a long tradition of standardization and canonization, G[andhari] *Khargaviṣāṇa*] is a single early testimony of what would be, at best, an early stage in the same processes' (Salomon, p.48). Like Salomon (p.47), one would no longer entertain the thought that the deliberately repetitive Sanskrit version might reflect an early stage of development.

other; it has no bearing on the rhinoceros image.

(2) About half of the verses are constructed with adjectival phrases (including participles, gerunds combined with adjectives, and adjectives plus *hutvā/bhavitvā*), where one may have to infer, from the analogy of the Dhp verses, that the rhinoceros image relates only to the verb *care* (and not, for example, to *saccavādī eko care* in Pa. 25, Ga. 10); or where one may gather, from the verse as a whole, that the rhinoceros is depicted as a ferocious and a peace-loving creature, equally comparable with the lion and the deer.

(3) Half a dozen verses, including two that provide the text with a framework (Pa. 1 and 41; Ga. 1 and 39), contrive to relate the image clearly to *care* alone by avoiding any syntactic relationship between it and the first three pādas. Despite Norman, *The group of discourses*, 1992, 6, an elephant verse Pa. 19, Ga. 32 will belong here (since it has the same construction as the lion verse Pa. 38, Ga. 22): 'as an elephant (wanders) leaving the herds ... one should wander in the forest; one should go one's way alone like the rhinoceros'.

Salomon rightly urges the rendering 'Rhinoceros' for '*Khargaviṣāṇa*', in preference to 'Rhinoceros Horn', so that the wording of the refrain *eko care Khaggaviṣāṇakappo* may basically convey a recommendation to go one's way unconcerned after the manner of the grazing rhinoceros. He is willing to concede a fundamentally punning intent,³ although this would obscure both the image of the solitary grazing rhinoceros and (if it occurs at all outside the imagination of later compilers and commentators) that of the uniqueness of the Indian rhinoceros's horn.

The rhetorical figure based on the ambiguity of the verb *car-* 'to go one's way' and 'to graze' is clear; and, wrong though the Niddesa's explanation may be, there was no need to make

3. 'I prefer to solve, or perhaps avoid, the problem by declaring that ... the ambiguity is perhaps an intentional and creative one.' (p. 13).

nonsense of it, as the later commentators appear to have done, by correlating 'like it' in the phrase 'go his way like it' with 'horn' rather than with 'rhinoceros' (Nidd II E^c 129):

*yathā khaggassa nāma viṣāṇaṃ ekaṃ hoti adutiyam,
evam eva so paccekabuddho takkappo tassadiso tappaṭibhāgo
... eko adutiyo muttabandhano sammā loke carati.*

'As the rhinoceros has one single horn, so he, being individually enlightened, should go his way in life properly, like it, as one single individual rid-of-encumbrances'.

The syntax would readily confuse later commentators. It is an interesting attestation of the correlation of *tat-* in the posterior clause with the genitive *khaggassa* as the logical subject of the prior clause, for it is not obvious how the horn could share with the individual either the quality of lack of encumbrance or non-attachment. Nor does the Niddesa's explanation of *-kalpa* as 'like, having its qualities in a high degree'⁴ support the idea that the ascetic's 'loneness' is being compared with the horn's 'uniqueness'. The Niddesa can be attempting to combine the text's rational meaning with its explanation of the word *khaggavisāṇa* 'rhinoceros' as 'one-horned *khagga*', hence 'he should be minimally encumbered like the one-horned rhinoceros'. This agrees with the opening verses of both the Pali and the Gandhari, which proscribe, not the society of one companion, but that of a plurality of companions. Nevertheless, it is an error, for the verb *care* shows that the idea of solitary perambulation is paramount.

Niddesa's postulation of a neuter *viṣāṇa* is as implausible as its gloss 'one single horn'. Feminine *viṣāṇā*, possibly also *viṣāṇākā* (Whitney-Lanman, ad AV 6.44.3), was used to denote 'hartshorn' as a medicinal substance (AV 3.7.1), with explicit etymological reference to the fact that the antlers are

4. *yathā atilonam vuccati lonakappo...*

regularly shed (AV 6.121.1). The word seems to have been distinct from cattle horn (*svayaṃsrasta gośṛṅga* in *Kauś.*), and at that stage would seem to lack any obvious reference to the number of horns. The comparison (in the verse Pa. 5, Ga. 5) of the rhinoceros-like solitary ascetic with a free-roaming deer is somewhat inapt (given the deer's gregarious nature), but could have been prompted by an inevitable association of the animal's name with *viṣāṅā*, since the image of a fleet-footed deer is specifically invoked in connection with hartshorn in AV 3.7.1 (*hariṅśya raghuśyādo 'dhi sīrśāni bheṣajām, sá ... viṣāṅayā ... anīnaśat*). Variations on the theme, comparisons with a single lion and a single elephant in subsequent verses, share the same defect, but lack the etymological pretext.

Such evidence as there is (Mayrhofer, *EWA*, I, 443f.) suggests that there was an indigenous word for 'rhinoceros', of which NPers. *karg*, *kargadan* (Steingass), *karkadān* (*EWA*), Greek *kar[k]azōnos*,⁵ Ga. *khargaviṣ[ā]ṅa* and Skt. *khādga*, *khādgaviṣāṅa* are all adaptations. This tends to imply that *viṣāṅa* was introduced into the animal's name by analogy with antler mythology; and Gandhari (with its voiced sibilants) would be the likely source of the Persian and Greek. The name would be on a par with *mṛganābhi* (and Mh. Pkt. *migapuccha*: *BSOAS*, 62, 1999, 533f.), signifying either the musk-deer or musk itself.

It could be the verse Pa. 15 *evaṃ dutiyena saha ...*, with the sentiment 'two is a crowd', that inspired the Niddesa's etymology based on '*visāṅaṃ ekaṃ adutiyam*'. It occurs as Ga. 40, a final stanza that served to sum up the import of the

5. Read *kar[g]azōnos* for attested *karta*? On such evidence, Salomon's insistence on 'expected *khagga*' (p.77, etc.) in lieu of attested Ga. *kharga* needs to be modified. The PTS Dictionary cited the word as feminine *khaggaviṣāṅā* 'rhinoceros's horn': but there is no point in accepting the commentator's interpretation, while rejecting the imagined neuter *visāṅa* 'horn' on which they based it.

text as a whole (as Salomon observes, p.187). In the Pali, the verse has been appended instead to Pa. 14 (*pabhassarāni ... duve*), but there it would be intrusive, since Ga. 16-17 (Pa. 14 and 16) will have been placed together on the strength of their identical structure (*disvā, eko care*) and their inclusion of the basically synonymous words *prabhasvara* and *citra*.⁶ In that case, a naive arrangement of the material in Gandhari (two simple groupings: twice **dispā* in Ga. 16-17; and thrice **sahāya-* in 25-27) contrasts with a sophisticated arrangement in Pali, where a new juxtaposition of *disvā ... duve* with *dutiyena saha ... pekkhamāno* (Pa. 14-15) is used as a bridge linking the *sahāya* verses (11-13) with a new pair of *kāmaguṇesu* verses (16-17):

Pa. 11-13	<i>sahāya ... pahāya</i>	Ga. 25-27
Pa. 14	<i>disvā ... duve</i>	Ga.16
Pa. 15	<i>dutiyena saha ... pekkhamāno</i>	Ga.40
Pa. 16	<i>kāmaguṇesu disvā</i>	Ga.17
Pa. 17	<i>kāmaguṇesu disvā</i>	(not in Ga.)

The appearance of Pa. 15 after 14 (so separating 13 *sahāya-* from 15 *saha*, and 14 *pabhassarāni* from 16 *citrā*) is surprising, but it is at least consistent with the introduction of the new item 17 after 16. The reason for connecting 14 with 16 (synonyms *pabhassara* and *citra*, reinforcing *disvā*) would seem to have been forgotten, just as 15, the basis of Niddesa's explanation of *khaggavisāṇa*, has lost its status as part of the text's framework.

6. As catchword for Ga. 16 **dispa suvarṇaṣa ...*, the Uddāna used the significant term *prabhasvaraṇi*; but for Ga. 17 *kama hi citra ...*, it probably had *kama* (Salomon, p.193f), in keeping with its more normal practice of using the first word or phrase of the verse. Ga. 25-27, the three *sahāya-* verses, are also identified by their openings. Salomon considers **dispa* a plausible conjecture, in lieu of expected *-spa* or *-śpa*, on the strength of a possible trace of such a spelling in Ga. 17c, but he admits that the evidence, a remnant on the edge of a fragment, is far from compelling.

The original pair, Pa.14 and 16, Ga. 16-17, with their observation (*disvā*) of clashing bangles and vain pleasures, and with *eko care* as the lesson to be drawn from them, are akin to the old Nidarśanā figure, notably Bhaṭṭi's *avagamayann iva paśyataḥ* (where the calming of the raging sea is conveying a moral lesson to onlookers). Pa. 15, Ga. 40, on the other hand, is somewhat different. No doubt its first word *evam* has been utilized by the compilers, as Norman and Salomon suggest, to link this verse with what goes before, but that would not be its original function within the verse. From some quarrel that has been observed (*evam*), but is not described, one inference is drawn in the first three pādas (*evam... mam' assa* 'the same would happen to me'), and another in the fourth (*eko care*).

Besides, the participle *pekkhamāno* in Pa.15 is an interloper among the surrounding Pali gerunds. A tendency, common to both versions, to group certain gerundial constructions together may support the claim of the distich Pa. 11-12 to have had a seminal role in the evolution of the text. In Pa. 10-20, almost a dozen gerund-based verses cluster around the distich 11-12 and the *disvā* group Pa. 14-17. In the Gandhari, a group of five that includes the two **diṣpā* verses is soon followed by a group of four that includes the distich Pa. 11-12. There is another interloper in Pa. 10-20. Pa. 19 is one of the half dozen verses that avoid any syntactic link with the three pādas (*vihare ... care*: its gerund is incidental to the comparison *nāgo va*). The juxtaposition of Pa. 18-19 will reflect the fact that these verses correspond to Ga. 31-32, and were already paired at an earlier stage of compilation. Otherwise the three syntactic types are fairly randomly distributed in both texts.

Salomon observes a 'pattern of interrelationship and influence' (p.17f.) between the Gandhari text, the Dharmapada

and Sn. *Aṭṭhakavagga*. The reading in Ga. 20b (**jālaṃ ... śaunto*), as against Pa. 28b (*jālaṃ va bhettvā salil' ambucārī*), has indeed probably been altered, possibly on the model of *sakunto jālamutto va* in DhP 174c, as Salomon implies, p.149. The occurrence in Sn 971f. of phrases corresponding to the two variant readings of one verse, Ga. 28ab *okṣitacakhu yaśacari gramo guttiṃdriyo ...* and Pa. 29ab *okkhittacakkhū na ca pādalo guttiṃdriyo ...*, implies that the Gandhari has inaccurately adapted Sn's *gutto yatacārī gāme*, in preference to the expression *pādalo*. When it is a question of the arrangement of verses, however, the contiguity of two similar phrases in DhP 331bc and Ga. 34f. contrasts with their arbitrary dispersal in Pa. 8 and 40. The fact that Sn 774ab shares phrases with both Pa. 31 and 23, which are contiguous in Ga. 12-13, could similarly be an indication that the more original sequence is preserved in the Gandhari and in *Aṭṭhakavagga*.

Of a couple of items of vocabulary that Ga. alone shares with DhP, one is the Uddāna keyword *ohariṇa* for Ga. 19 (Salomon, pp. 37, 194). Judging by the catchwords in *-aṇa* that have been reconstructed for Ga. 2 and 9, this *ohariṇa* would stand for the **ohāraṇa* that is appropriate to the reading of Pa. 30, and not to that of Ga. 19. Salomon has shown that the copyist has in effect substituted *ohāriṇaṃ*, the initial word of the second pāda of DhP 346. This procedure may have been encouraged by the Ga. readings: its first pāda begins with an apparently irrelevant *ośaḍaita*, but its second has *ośiṇa*.

The significant feature here is the dispersed occurrence in Pa. 10ab and 30ab of two versions of the one hemistich of Ga. 19ab and the Sanskritized *Mahāvastu*:

Pa. 10 *oropayitvā gihivyañjanāni*
saṃsīṇapatto yathā kovidāro,
chetvāna vīro ghibandhanāni
eko care khaggavisāṇakappo.

- Pa. 30 *ohārayitvā gihivyañjanāni*
saṃchinnapatto yathā pārīchatto,
kāsāyavattho abhinikkhamitvā
eko care khaggavisāṇakappo.
- Ga. 19 *ośaḍaita gihivimjanāni*
ośiṇapatro yaśa kovirado,
ka[ṣa].
- Skt. 4 *otārayitvā ḡhivyañjanāni*
saṃśīrṇapatro yathā pārīpātro,
kāśāyavastro abhiniṣkramitvā
eko care khadgaviṣāṇakalpo.

In Ga. *ośiṇapatro*, according to Salomon (p. 147f.), 'the scribe originally wrote *a*, or perhaps rather *sa*', but it is hard to agree, especially with the contention that the downward extension of the letter (a regular feature of pāda-initial syllables) is a secondary addition. From the facsimiles, one might rather infer that someone had heavily overwritten an original *ośiṇapatro* so as to read *aśiṇapatro* 'not devoid of leaves'. This (with **aśīṇa-* or *aśīrṇa-*) would be an emendation of Pa. 30, following the Niddesa's forced explanation of its reading *saṃchannapatto* as 'leaf-covered'. The scribe's original graph *ośiṇa-*, which no doubt prompted the alliterative *ośaḍaita*, would intend **avaśīṇa-* or *avaśīrṇa* in agreement with Pa. 10, where the Niddesa reads *saṃchīnna-*, understood as 'fallen'. The Pa. 10 variant readings *saṃhinapatto* (C^b: altered to *saṃsīna-*) and *saṃbhinnapatto* (B^a) have clearly a similar aim.

The Ga. text seems certain to be more original in having only one verse. The construction of Pa. 10 *saṃchinna-* ... *chetvāna* and Pa. 30 *saṃchanna-* ... *pārīchatto kāsāyavattho* presupposes the correctness of the Niddesa readings; but the Pa. 10 version *oropayitvā gihivyañjanāni* ... *chetvāna vīro ghibandhanāni* is repetitious and (like its use of *saṃchinna-*)

unlikely to be original. There is no similar objection to Pa. 30 *saṃchannapatto yatha pārichatto*, providing one does not like Niddesa, try to explain it with **pattasaṃchādita* 'leaf covered'. Here Norman (in *The Group of discourses*, II, PTS, 1992) opted for *saṃchanna-* as *<*saṃśanna* 'fallen' (E° *saṃchinna-*). The coincidence with AV *parṇasādā* 'leaf-fall' is indeed notable: the form *paṇṇasaṭa* in Pali prose shows a necessary defensive retroflexion (via **-sada*). Construed also as equivalent to *channapatto* 'with its leaves hidden from view' (referring to a *pārichatta* 'shady tree' out of season), it would constitute a clever play on the word *chad-* in combination with *vyañjanāni* 'manifestations'.

The poet has succeeded in contriving a pun on **śannapatra* and *channa/vyakta*. This would lead to difficulty, when *śad-* developed into *saḍ-* (and *saṭ-*), and makes it likely that Pa. 10 is basically a drastic emendation using *saṃchinna*. It is doubtful whether Niddesa and Ga. 19 were right to identify the shady tree of Pa. 30 (*pārichatta*) with the *kovidāra* of Pa. 10. This specification was presumably added in order to support the reading *saṃchinna-* 'shorn', for the leaves of *Bauhinia* species have practical uses (G. Watt, *The commercial products of India*, London, 1908, 122), and these could lead to denudation.

In Pa. 10, Norman opted for *saṃsīna-* as *<saṃśīrna* 'fallen'. The form *-sīna* occurs, however, only in C^b (emending *saṃhīna*), in the Niddesa (Thai ed. *sina* for S° *sinna*), and in Ga. in the alliteration *osaḍ- / ośī-*. Its reading *osaḍaita* may be derived from the attested word *apaśātaya-* 'despatch' AV, Pali *sāṭe-* 'dispel' (again an instance of defensive retroflexion). Since the gloss *saṃśīrṇa* 'fallen' in Skt. 4 shares the semantic artificiality of Niddesa's *saṃchinna* 'fallen', it seems probable that it is a back-formation from Prakrit *sīṇa* 'fallen' (whose existence is possibly confirmed by these Pa. and Ga. readings: cf. *CDIAL*, 12494, and *EWA*, II, 607). Association

of *osaḍaya-* with *osīna* in Ga. would seem to be a sign of the collision of *śat-* 'cut off' with suppletive *śad-* / *śī-* 'fall' that is registered in Pāṇini.

A total of 40 verses seems to have been a common aim of the compilers. Salomon has shown (p.197f.), as best possible in the fragmentary state of the manuscript, that the Gandhari text indeed had 40. It could justify this with a 40-unit Uddāna which, on the evidence of **ohāraṇa* as catchword for Ga. 19, reflects an older stratum than the text to which is appended. The Pali Apadāna, deemed to be a later compilation, has 42 by conflating the Gandhari reading of an initial title-verse with that of Sn.⁷ That Sn has 41 could be precisely due to its duplication of the *saṃchanna* verse, upsetting the neat total that has otherwise been achieved by including four verses that are not found in the Gandhari.

The Gandhari, on the other hand, reaches 40 owing to its duplications of Pa. 22 (Ga. 33 and 38) and 26 (Ga. 6 and 18), both of which seem rather clearly to be induced by accidents of graphic corruption; and by virtue of a more creative triplication of the title-verse (Ga. 1, 14 and 23). As Pa. 1, the verse combines a non-violence' hemistich with a celibacy hemistich, so that there is an effective antithesis between kindness to all (*sabbesu bhūtesu*) and attachment to none (*kuto sahāyam*). In Ga. 1, the non-violence is repetitiously combined with benevolence (**metreṇa cittaṇa hitāṇukampī*) In Ga.14 and 23, religious instruction is enjoined along with the isolation, but that is neither logical nor really in the spirit of the text. Since 23c seems to have had **na icheya putraṃ* like Skt. 11, possibly 14c has rather **ñātīm na icheya* in 14c like Skt. 12. Salomon however, is unwilling (p. 41) to draw any such conclusions about duplication from the evidence, or

7. Salomon (p.116f.) calls it 'title line', since the Gandhari copyist wrote it separately, as his reaction to the lack of an individual title.

(p. 46) even to admit graphic corruption as a factor.

The Sanskrit text converts the 'non-violence' title-verse into a complete framework, with Ga. 1 merged with 36ab (Pa. 39ab) and inflated into two verses, Skt. 2-3; and with Pa. 1cd (via Ga. 14cd **nātim* and 23cd **putram*?) merged with Ga. 3ab and equally facilely reduplicated as its concluding verses, Skt. 11-12.⁸ The former pair are emboxed within verses which seem to emphasize the power of the animal (*thāmabalūpa-panno, ohārayitvā, sandālayitvā*) as a metaphor for the power of asceticism. The prominence given to this complex notion, the antithesis of peaceful isolation, could be a symptom of its relative lateness. The material is more miscellaneously incorporated in Ga. and Pa. (Skt. 1 corresponding to Pa. 34, Ga. 11; and Skt. 4-5 corresponding to Pa. 30 + 28, Ga. 19-20).

Neither Senart nor Salomon has recognized that in Skt. 5 the words *śikhir yathā bhasmani ekacārī (kāṣāyavastro abhiniṣkramitvā)* must have the sense 'like a solitary ascetic (covered) in ash'.⁹ The loose locative *bhasmani* would reflect the commentary's misunderstanding of the Pali version's compound *salil'ambucārī* 'sea-fish' (Pa. 28b *jālaṃ va bhettvā salil'ambucārī*) as containing a locative. For *salila* as 'salt water', cf. Thieme's discussion in his *Kl. Schr.*, I, 178f. The

8. Ga. 36ab + 1cd and Ga. 1ab (banally duplicated) yield Skt. 2(**maitram* ..., *maitreṇa* ...) and 3 (*sarveṣu* ...) respectively, in effect conflating Ga. 36, Pa. 39 (*mettaṃ* ..., *sabbena*) with Ga. 1 (**sarveṣu* ..., *metreṇa* ...). Cf. Salomon, p.39f.

9. Senart (*Le Mahāvastu*, 1882, I, 630) thought of *śikhin* 'fire', Salomon (p. 149f.) of 'peacock', etc.; but neither is able to relate this to the rest of the Sanskrit pāda. The basic adjective *śikhin* 'wearing a topknot' is elsewhere correlated with *muṇḍa*, *jaṭila*, etc., and it can denote a Brahmin sage (in *Brahmopaniṣad*) or one of the Tathāgatas. Pj II 115 has *nadīsalile ambucārī*. This fits the syntax almost as badly as the mechanical *salila udakaṃ + ambucārī maccho* of Niddesa (N II E^c 274+95), which makes no sense grammatically (and so may as well reflect an original correct gloss **salila-maccho* as anything else).

intention of the Niddesa is unclear, but it does not construe *salila-* as an implausible locative. The problem is reminiscent of *mātaṅg' araññe va* 'as in an elephant-forest' in Dhṛp 329. For this, Norman, *The word of the doctrine*, PTS, 1997, 141, prefers the commentators' nominative *mātaṅgo ... nāgo*, although his explanation '*mātaṅga* is a particular sort of elephant' contradicts his '*nāga* is a special sort of elephant' at Dhṛp 320. He reverses both Ps, where *mātaṅga* is taken to be the generic term and the word-order is corrected to *nāgo va*, and Dhṛp-a, where the issue is complicated with a popular etymology ('... *mātaṅgo ti laddhanāmo ... ayam hatthināgo*') and the problem of word-order is evaded. (In Dhṛp 322., however, according to Dhṛp-a '*mahānāgā ti ... mahāhatthino*', *nāga* is generic.) Hypermetric *mātaṅg' araññe* looks like a misguided emendation of **gaj'araññe*, that seeks to improve upon the tautological reading **gaj[o] ... nāgo*.

Ga. 20b seems to have felt obliged to replace the fish of Pa. 28b with a **bālo śaumto* 'youngbird', whose triṣṭubh-ending scansion would mimic, and hence support, that of Pa. 28a *saṃyojanāni* (for which Skt. *gr̥hivyaṃjanāni* and Ga. *gihibaṃdhaṅ[ā]ṇi*, as in Pa. 10a and 30a, would then be prosodic emendations, less appropriate to the rhinoceros metaphor). Salomon postulates instead an improbable phrase *jālam ... balaṃ* 'strongnet' (p.149), but the metre of Ga. 20b (*[jā]lam yaṣ[ā] bhiv[ā] balaṃ śau[m]to*) would still be corrupt (even if the compounding error, *yaṣa* for Pali *va*, is disregarded); and the word-order would be awkward. The passage Ja V 268, 15*, to which he refers for the adjective, is presumably to be read as *sāmā ca soṇā sabalā ca gijjhā* (with *śabala* as another inauspicious colour), as apparently conjectured instead of *ca balā* in B^d and as translated by H. T. Francis (*sabalā* 'with ravens too'). A spelling like *balaṃ* for nominative *bālo* cannot be ruled out (p.95).

The 12-verse Sanskrit text has been understood to at-

test 500 verses, but appears rather to survive as a demonstration that any given *gāthā* involving *khadgaviṣāṇa* might be multiplied with slight variations in order to provide individual enlightenment for 500 'Pratyekabuddhas': *sarvā khadgaviṣāṇa-gāthā vistareṇa kartavyā. pañcānām pratyekabuddhaśatānām eka-ekā gāthā*. The instruction that the text can be expanded in this way justifies neither the inference that all 500 verses were already in existence nor N. A. Jayawickrama's idea that the specimen dozen verses might be evidence of an original nucleus. Certainly it does not justify his imputation of a title '*Khadgaviṣāṇagāthā*' to the Sanskrit text (*Univ. of Ceylon Review*, 1949, 120, = *Pali Buddhist Review*, 1977, 23), which leads to Salomon's suggestion (p. 10) that Ga. might have borne such a title.

The view that *paccekabuddha* represents original '*pratyayabuddha* / *patteyabuddha*' is cited non-committally by Salomon (p. 9, n., referring to Norman, *Coll. papers*, II, 233ff.). The evidence, however, points rather strongly in the opposite direction. De Jong, in his discussion of the Chinese renderings (*The Eastern Buddhist*, Oct. 1977, 173f.) was insistent that the transcription *yüan-i-chüeh* must be more original than *yüan-chüeh*, i.e. that something interpreted as *pratyaya-eka-buddha* preceded any notion of *pratyayabuddha*; and that the basis for this would be the eminently appropriate term *pratyeka* (rather than **prātyayika*, which in any case would give the inappropriate sense 'reliable').

Despite Norman, the aberrant palatalization in Prakrit *patteya* < *pratyaya* is rather a matter of dissimilation in that particular word (and no more evidence of a non-palatalizing dialect than *dosinā* < *jyotsnā*, where *-ts-* may be subject to palatalization, or *addhabhavi*, which is clearly < **abbhabhavi*). Sanskrit *pratyayabuddha* (*patteyabuddha*, *yüan-chüeh*) would have been substituted for *pratyekabuddha*, on the assumption that *paccekabodhi* 'individual enlightenment' (Salomon, p. 8)

required *pratyaya* 'an external cause' (Norman, op. cit., 244). The distinction that attested Gandhari orthographies make between *prace'a* = *pratyaya* and *pracagabudha* = *pratyeka-buddha* could be an indication that the confusion was restricted to Sanskrit (and hence also Jain Prakrit and Chinese) sources.

The remarkable success of the rescue and conservation by British Library staff, and of the decipherment and reconstruction by the team in Seattle, holds a promise of yet more revolutionary insights into the construction and meaning of the earliest Buddhist texts, with opportunities to identify more certainly, and to appreciate more directly, the intentions and skills of the poets.

✍ PROFESSOR J. C. WRIGHT
c/o SOUTH ASIA DEPT., SOAS,
THORNHAUGH ST., RUSSELL SQ.
LONDON WC1H 0XG.