

XVIII

THE SUTTA NIPĀTA IN A SANSKRIT VERSION FROM EASTERN TURKESTAN

By A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE

WHILE preparing a descriptive register of the manuscript fragments recovered by Sir Aurel Stein from the sand-buried ruins of Khadalik in the course of his second tour of exploration in Eastern Turkestan, I have recently discovered a portion of the Sanskrit version of the Sutta Nipāta. It is contained in fragments of five consecutive folios.¹ According to Fausböll, in the reasoned statement in the Introduction to his Translation of the Sutta Nipāta (in SBE., vol. x), certain portions of that work, including the Aṭṭhavagga, are "very old", containing as they do "some remnants of Primitive Buddhism" (loc. cit., p. xi). It is just the Aṭṭhavagga which happens to be preserved in the fragments, and it is this fact which imparts a particular interest to the discovery.

The fragments measure about 6 × 3 inches, and are corresponding parts of the middle of their respective folios. Their right and left ends are broken off, and with the left end the folio numbers and string-holes are lost. As may be seen from the first fragment (obv., ll. 5, 6; rev., ll. 1, 2, quoted below), the maximum number of the surviving akṣaras in a line is 21-3. The text of that fragment is written in śloka verses; and that fact enables us, by comparing the surviving Sanskrit text with the full Pāli text, to determine that the full number of akṣaras in

¹ By Sir A. Stein they are marked Kha. 0012. b, and belong to those Khadalik finds which he purchased from the Khotanese trader Badruddin; see his *Ruins of Desert Cathay*, vol. i, pp. 236-7. In the Register they are No. 517.

a complete line of the Sanskrit text must have been from about 56 to 60. It follows that the surviving fragments represent about one-third of the complete folios. The latter accordingly must have measured about 18 × 3 inches. The lower margin (looked at from the obverse side) is intact, but the upper margin is badly damaged, though marks of the full width of the folio having been 3 inches are left, showing that the page bears six lines of writing. The writing, unfortunately, is much sand-rubbed, so as to render it in some places only faintly visible, or even altogether illegible. In other places, especially in the better preserved bottom lines of the obverses and top lines of the reverses, the writing is well preserved and thoroughly legible. Moreover, in many places the faintly visible writing can be confidently restored on the basis of the corresponding Pāli text, though in other places where the two versions differ, the identity of the faintly visible letters is very doubtful. The most severely damaged by sand-rubbing is the fourth fragment.

In the subjoined romanized transcript the limits of the surviving text in the several lines are indicated by ringlets; illegible akṣaras are shown by asterisks, and semi-legible ones are placed in round brackets, while missing akṣaras which can be readily restored from the Pāli are placed in square brackets. The Pāli version is given in parallel columns, and such portions of it as actually correspond to portions of the surviving Sanskrit text are printed in italics. It is extracted from the Pāli Text Society's "New Edition", published in 1913. The verse numbers (shown in antique type), of course, are an editorial addition; neither the Pāli nor the Sanskrit original has any continuous numbering of the verses. In the (now discovered) Sanskrit MS. there is no numbering of them even within each chapter (*varga*), such as there appears to be in the Pāli MSS. The surviving Sanskrit version corresponds to four suttas of

the Aṭṭhavagga, or the Fourth Section of the Sutta Nipāta, viz. the 7th, 8th, 9th, and 10th suttas, printed on pp. 160–6 of the New Edition.

Fragment I. Obverse

PTS. Edition, p. 160

1. 1. °*o madgībhūto visva*o
 1. 2. °praśnam [pr]ṣṭavān¹ ||
 Mai(thune)hyanu(yukta)° [814] *Methunam anuyuttassa,*
 1. 3. °ttau ajñātārthās ca me
 śrāvaka(ā) bhaviṣya(nt)i
 sūtrapadaṃ ca° etc.
 1. 4. °[ta]syam velāyām idam
 arthakavargīyam sūtram
 bhāṣate sma² ~ Maithu° [815] *Methunam anuyuttassa*
 mussat' evāpi sāsanam |
 miccā ca paṭipajjati etam
 tasmim anāriyam ||
 [816] *Eko pubbe caritvāna*
methunam yo nivesati |
yānam bhantaṃ va taṃ
loke hīnam āhu puthuj-
janam ||
 1. 5. °yo niṣevate ~
 yānam bhr(ā)ntam yathā
 loke hīna(m āhuḥ) pṛthag-
 janam° [817] ³ *Yaso kitti ca yā pubbe*
 hāyat' evāpi tassa sā |
 etam pi disvā sikketha
 methunam vippahātave ||
 [818] *Saṃkappehi pareto so*
kapaṇo viya jhāyati |
sutvā paresam nigghosam
mamku hoti tathāvidho ||
 1. 6. °[ka]panam dhyāyato
 bata :² śrutbā dhīrasya
 nāgghoṣam⁴ mam(ku)r
 bhavati ta(dvi)° [819] ³ *Atha satthāni kurute*
 paravādehi codito | esa

¹ Prose introductory narrative to the 7th varga, or the Tissametteyya-sutta in PTS. ed., p. 160. Verse 814 is included in it, similarly, e.g., to v. 450 included in the prose narrative of the Subhāsita-sutta in the Mahāvagga, PTS. ed., p. 78.

² Prone comma and double dot as marks of interpunction, here and elsewhere.

³ Verses 817, 819, lost in Sanskrit MS.

⁴ *Sic*, read *nirgghoṣam*.

Reverse

1. 1. °*ca sarvbaśaḥ
sa c-āiva maithune yukto
ma(ndava)t paridr(śyate •)
**°

1. 2. °[pūrvba](pare)sadā ◡
ten-ānyam n=[ā]va man-
yeta (ni)rvbāṇa** (hā bha)-
vet**°

1. 3. °² (tam) ekasmim sama(ye bhagavām Śrāva)styām var(śam
atigato deva)*°
1. 4. °rbhūto bhagavatā sārdham sa(unmoditya)*i ** (na puna)
varsā*°
1. 5. °mā (dā)ya pātracīvaram ye°
1. 6. °r*aṭha (pra)da*i*°

Fragment II. Obverse

PTS. Edition, p. 161

1. 1. °***tyā bud[dha]śara°
1. 2. °*ya*****buddha*(agarā)
*** (riṇām) pravraj[i]°

1. 3. °ṣu viśuddhim āhuh
yan ni(śr)[tās ta]tra (śu)-
[bham va]da(nto) pra(tye-
kasa)°

khv-assa mahāgedho mo-
savajjam pagāhati ||

[820] Paṇḍito ti samaññāto
ekacariyam adhiṭṭhito |
athāpi methune yutto
mando va parikissati ||

[821]¹ Etam ādinavam nātva
muni pubbāpare idha |
ekacariyam dalham ka-
yirā na nisevetha methu-
nam ||

[822] Vivekam yeva sikketha
etad ariyanam uttamaṃ |
tena seṭṭho na maññetha
sa ve nibbānasantike ||

[823]¹ Rittassa munino carato
kāmesu anapekhino | og-
hatiṇṇassa pihayanti kā-
mesu gathitā pajā ||

[824] Idh' eva suddhi iti vādi-
yanti nāñhesu dhammesu
visuddhim āhu | yam
nissitā tattha subham
vadānā paccekasaccesu
puthū nivīṭṭhā ||

¹ Verses 821, 823, lost in Sanskrit MS.

² Line 3 contains a part of the prose narrative which introduces the 8th varga, or the Pasīrasutta in PTS. ed., p. 161, and which extends down to obv. 1. 2 of frag. II. The 7th varga must have concluded in the lost portion of 1. 2.

1. 4. °kāmā'pi sado vigā(hya ~) [825] *Te vādakāmā parisam vigayha bālaṃ dahanti mithu aññamaññaṃ | vādenti te aññasitā kathojjaṃ pasamsakāmā kusalā vadānā ||*
- Yuktaḥ kathāyām(sadaso [826] *Yutto kathāyām parisāya majjhe pasamsam icchāṃ vinighāti hoti | apāhata smim pana maṅku hoti nindāya so kuppāti vandhamesī ||*
hi madhye)*°
1. 5. °(t pa)ridevate dīnamanā [827] *Yam assa vādaṃ parihīnam āhu apāhataṃ pañhavimamsakāse | paridevati socati hīnavādo upaccagāman'ti anutthunāti ||*
'nuthāyām (ya)to 'sya v(ā)daṃ (pa)rihi(ṇa)*°
1. 6. °*ttān [828] *Ete vivāda samaṇesu jātā etesu uggahātinighāti hoti | etam pi disvā virame kathojjaṃ na h'aññadatth'atthi pasamsalābhā ||*
eteṣu c = ôdgh(ā)tanighātam eti ~
- Prasāmsito vā punar attra [829] *Pasamsito vā pana tattha hoti akkhāya vādaṃ parisāya majjhe | so hassati unnamati-cca tena pappuyya tam atṭhaṃ yathā mano ahū ||*
bha°

Reverse

PTS. Edition, p. 162

1. 1. °bhūmir [830] *Yā unṇati sāsā vighāta bhūmi mānātimānaṃ vadate ca mūḍhaḥ evaṃ hi dṛṣṭbā na vighā(ta)°*
- [831] *Sūro yathā rājakhādāya puṭṭho abhigajjam eti paṭisūram icchāṃ | ye-*

1. 2. ^{o*} n'eva so tena palehi sūra
 (dr)ṣṭim ca mānañ ca *pubbeva n'atthi yad idam*
 sametya mūḍhaḥ *yudhāya* ||
 Ye drṣṭim ūḍhāhya ¹ vivā- [832] *Ye diṭṭhim uggayha vivā-*
 da(yethā) ²° *diyanti idam eva sacca-*
ti ca vādiyanti | te tvañ
vadassu na hi te'dha atthi
vādamhi jāte paṭiseni-
kattā ||
 [833] *Visenikatvā pana ye ca-*
ranti diṭṭhihi diṭṭhim avi-
rujhamānā | tesu tvañ
kim labhetho Pasūra
yes'idha n'atthi param
uggahitāñ ||
 [834] *Atha tvañ pavitakkam*
āgamā manasā diṭṭhiga-
tāni cintayanto | dhonena
yugañ samāgamā na hi
tvañ sagghasi sampayā-
tavā ||
1. 3. ^o(tb)ād aviruddhyamānā(ḥ
 te)ṣān nu ki(n tbam) vada
 Siha(śu)ra (ye)ṣāñ hi^o

1. 4. ^os=īti • Aṣṭa(mo va)rgaḥ ⊙³ (Evañ mayā) śrutam
 ekas[m]im sa^o
 1. 5. ^o(M)ā[ga]ndi[ka] nāma parivrā^o
 1. 6. ^o(bh)iḥ (s)ārtha^o

Fragment III. Obverse

PTS. Edition, deest

1. 1. ^ona(ma) [ja]gāma^o
 1. 2. ^oidam *** (śayyāśa)yita rūpam i^o
 1. 3. sammyak⁴sambuddha śayyāśayi[^otarū](pam idam ukte) eka-
 p[ār]śva^o

¹ Read *udgrhya*.

² One expects *vivādayanti*, 3rd plur. parasm. ; but the dotted circle ⊙, indicating *th*, preceded by *e*, which points to the 2nd sing. ātm., is very fairly visible.

³ Here begins the prose narrative introducing the 9th varga, or the Māgandiya-sutta in PTS. ed., p. 163, which extends down to obv. l. 4 of frag. IV. It was the name Māgandika which furnished to me the first clue to the identity of the text of these fragments.

⁴ Read *samyak*.

1. 4. °kasya¹ patnī Māgandikam parivrājakam etad avocāt||
°Raktasya*^o
1. 5. °raktasya hi syād avakṛṣṭaśayyā mūḍhasya śayyā sabas(ā-
nupī)^{o3}
1. 6. paḍeṣu cakkrāṇi sahasrāṇi : sanābhikāni sanemikā(ni)^o

Reverse

1. 1. °Māgandikasya parivrājakasya patnī tasyām velāyām
gāthām bhā(ṣate)^o
1. 2. °(drīsaṁ) padaṁ Atha bhaga[vā]n utkāśanaśabdā⁴ ak[ā]rṣīd
a(tha) Māgandika*^o
1. 3. °[ve]lāyām gāthām bhāṣa(te sma) || Rakto (naro bhavati) hi
(gadga)dasvaro (dvi)^{o5}
1. 4. °[r]ivrājakaḥ (bhagavantam) ***** (gacchantam dṛṣṭvā ca)
punaḥ^o
1. 5. °bhāṣate sma ~ || (Rakto naro bha)^{o6}
1. 6. °(ye)*ya**i^o

Fragment IV. Obverse

PTS. Edition, p. 164

1. 1. °nā (āśliṣṭa ?)^{o7}
1. 2. °(lāyām) **** (arthaka)-
[vargī](yām) gāth[ām]
(bhāṣita ?)^{o8} || *****^o
1. 3. °Atha bhagavān asmin
nidāne [a]smin pra(karaṇe)
a[nyam] arthōtp(ā)^o [836] Etādīsaṁ ce ratanaṁ na
icchasi nāriṁ narindehi
bahūhi patthitam | diṭṭhi-
gataṁ śīlavatānujivitaṁ
1. 4. °*bahujanyam pṛthusrū-
tam yāvad deva manuṣy(e-

¹ Complete *Māgandikasya*.

² See *Divyāvadāna*, p. 517, l. 18; also PTS., *Comm. on Dhammapada*, vol. i, pt. ii, p. 201; vol. iii, p. 195.

³ Complete *sahasānupīḍitā* (Pāli *sahasānupīḍita*).

⁴ See *Divyāvadāna*, p. 517, ll. 25, 26.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 518, l. 1.

⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 518, l. 12.

⁷ Reading of faint traces uncertain; might be *asreṣṭha*.

⁸ The traces, though faint, seem clear enough, but are not intelligible; one expects *bhāṣate sma*, or such like. The *gāthā* in question, which stood on the lost portion of the folio, must have been v. 835 in PTS. ed., p. 163.

bhyaḥ) samyak(prārth?)^{o1}

1. 5. °(gr)hītaṃ
dr̥ṣṭbā hi dr̥ṣṭir vya(pa)-
hāya sarvbā (hy ā)dhy-
ātmat(o)ṣa^o

1. 6. °(pra)vadanti santaḥ
Na dr̥ṣṭato na śrut(i)t(o
na) c=āpi silavraten=
(aiva)^o

bhavūpapattiṃ ca vadasi
kīdisaṃ ||

[837] Idam vadāmi'ti na tassa
hoti dhammesuniccheyya
samuggahītaṃ | passaṇ
ca diṭṭhīsu anuggahāya
ajjhata-santiṃ pacinaṃ
adassaṃ ||

[838] Vinicchayā yāni pakappi-
tāni te ve muni brūsi
anuggahāya | ajjhata-
santi'ti yam etam atthaṃ
kathan nu dhīrehi pave-
ditāni taṃ ||

[839] Na diṭṭhiyā na sutiyā
na ñāṇena sīlabbatenāpi
na suddhim āha | adiṭṭhi-
yā assutiyā aññāṇā asilatā
abbatā no pi tena ||

[840] Ete ca nissajja anugga-
hāya santo anissāya bha-
vaṃ na jappe | ²[No ce
kira diṭṭhiyā na sutiyā
na ñāṇena sīlabbatenāpi
visuddhim āha | adiṭṭhiyā
assutiyā aññāṇā asilatā
abbatā no pi tena ||]

Reverse

1. 1. °mando⁸ py aha(m) m(o)-
mu(ha) eva dharm(o)
(dr̥)ṣṭād (i)h=ā[ke] p[r]-
(ati)[yā]n[t]i śuddhi(m)

PTS. Edition, p. 165, l. 3

maññe-m-ahaṃ momu-
ham eva dhammaṃ
diṭṭhiyā eke paccenti
suddhiṃ ||

¹ Line 4 clearly contains a paraphrase of v. 836, as part of the prose introductory narrative.

² The four lines, within square brackets, in the Pāli version, would seem to be an interpolation. There was, apparently, no counterpart to them in the Sanskrit version. See below, p. 720.

³ Read *manyē*.

1. 2. Satyam it[y] e(va va)deta
(brāhma) (mṛṣ=êti) vā kim
prava(detha ke)[na •] ***°
1. 3. g[r]āme * na sâ * (pata ?)
***** sa ***** °
1. 4. °*** (vicareta) loke vigr̥hya
*** ai ***** °
- [841] Diṭṭhiñ ca nissāya anu-
pucchamāno samuggahī-
tesu pamoham āgā | ito ca
nāddakkhi aṇum pi sañ-
ñam tasmā tuvañ momu-
hato dahāsi ||
- [842] Samo vivesī uda vā ni-
hīno yo maññatī so viva-
detha tena | tisu vidhāsu
avikampamāno samo vi-
sesī'ti na tassa hoti ||
- [843] *Saccan'ti so brāhmaṇo
kim vadeyya musā 'ti vā
so vivadetha kena | yas-
sīm samañ visamañ cāpi
n'atthi sa kena vādañ
paṭisaṃyujeyya ||*
- [844] Okañ pahāya aniketasāri
gāme akubbañ muni *san-
thavāni* | kāmehi ritto
apurekkharāno katham na
viggayha janena kayirā ||
- [845] Yehi vivitto *vicareyya
loke* na tāni *uggayha
vadeyya* nāgo | elambu-
jañ kaṇṭakam vārijam
yathā jalena paṃkena
c'anūpalittam || [evam
munī santivādo agiddho
kāme ca loke ca anūpa-
litto ||]
- [846] Na vedagū diṭṭhiyā na
mutiyā sa mānam eti
nahi tammayo so | na
kammanā no pi sutena
neyyo *anūpanīto* so *nive-
sanesu* ||
- [847] Saññāvirattassa na santi
ganthā paññāvimuttassa
1. 5. °a(nūpa) ***** (nive)°

na santi mohā | saññañ ca
 diṭṭhiñ ca ye aggahesuñ
 te ghaṭṭayantā vicaranti
 loke ||

1. 6. ◉¹ **** ◉

Fragment V. Obverse

PTS. Edition, deest

1. 1. °jagāma • (tadā brā)°
1. 2. °(s)ya ** śa * kramati • Atha * (v)isū°
1. 3. °tamañ vṛkṣamū(lam) niśṛtya niṣaṇṇo di(vā vi)hārāya ~ a*°
1. 4. °pasamhr̥ty=āikānte nyaṣīdaṭ Eka(m nyā)² Vaiśāla kulam
(bhūtvā)³ ya*°
1. 5. °(samn)hr̥ty⁴=āikānte nyaṣīdaṭ Eka(m) nyāyena bhagavāms
te(n=āñja)līm praṇami°
1. 6. °* (pṛ)echāmo bhavantam Gauta(mam) kañcid eva ppra-
desā(m) saved avak(ā)sam kra°

Reverse

1. 1. °* niṣṭhā na pṛthāniṣṭhā na(nu) bhavān Gautamo niṣṭhā-
vādi vayam api ni°
1. 2. °** (na)ra niṣṭhām samjānā(ti) yaduta Gautamaḥ nāva
(sam)jñā(nā)⁵ * e *°
1. 3. °maḥ kiñ manyasi vā ni(ṣṭhā) Mṛgaśirāḥ parivr(ā)jako
(niṣṭhā) **°
1. 4. °hi parivrā(jako) niṣṭhāprāpta(h) evam u(kt)e bhagavām vā
ni(ṣṭhā)°
1. 5. °(va) ** ye ** (ma) Mṛga(śirā na) *°
1. 6. °(m ayam pa) * Mṛgaśi(r)am°

1. Comparing the preceding two texts, the outstanding difference between them is the existence of prose narratives prefixed to the verses of the several sections (*varga*) in the Sanskrit text. Not that prose introductory narratives

¹ Here ends the 9th and begins the 10th *varga*. A small surviving portion of a double concentric circle is the sole indication. The last four lines are so badly sand-rubbed as to be practically illegible; but the still visible akṣaras in l. 5 point to the last line of v. 846.

² Apparently an error for *nyāyena*; see l. 5.

³ The identity of these two akṣaras is quite uncertain.

⁴ Read *samhr̥tya*.

⁵ Or *samjñātā*.

are foreign to the Pāli Sutta Nipāta, but they are practically restricted to its earlier sections, the Uragavagga (suttas 4, 6, 7, 10), Cūlavagga (suttas 4, 5, 7, 12, 14), and Mahāvagga (suttas 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 12). In its fifth, or last section, the Pārāyanavagga, which comprises eighteen suttas, it is only the 18th sutta which has a prose introduction, and in its fourth section, the Aṭṭhavagga, none of its sixteen suttas is introduced with a prose narrative. It is just in this fourth section that the Sanskrit version shows prose narrative introductions to the several *varga* (= Pāli *sutta*). What is particularly noteworthy is that in two of these prose introductions, viz. those of the 7th and 9th *vargas*, there is a specific reference to the verses of the (Pāli) Aṭṭhakavagga. Probably there was a similar reference to the introductory narrative of the 8th *varga*, which has disappeared with the damaged portion of the obv. ll. 1 and 2 of frag. II. In the 7th *varga* (frag. I, obv. l. 4), when the prose narrative comes to the point of introducing the verses, it says, "at this time he spoke this *arthavargīya sūtra*." Similarly, in the 9th *varga* (frag. IV, obv. l. 2) it says, "at this time he spoke this *arthavargīya gāthā*." Unfortunately the *gāthā* itself is utterly illegible, but no doubt it was a Sanskrit version of the 835th verse of the Pāli Māgandiya Sutta (PTS. ed., p. 163), for the Sanskrit text in l. 4 gives the purport of v. 836. The conclusion seems unavoidable that the Sanskrit text is a translation from some vernacular (not necessarily the *existing* Pāli) original; and that the translator, observing the absence of an introductory narrative, himself supplied that narrative, and pointed out the exact place where he came to the translation of the verses of his original text. It is significant that in this connexion he speaks of a "sūtra", not a "varga"; for it shows that his vernacular original (just as the existing Pāli text) used the term *sutta* where the Sanskrit translator uses the term *varga*; see frag. II, rev. l. 4.

2. But there are also other more or less serious differences. To dispose of some minor ones first: we have in frag. I, rev. l. 1, *ca sarvbaśah*; in frag. II, obv. l. 4, *pi sado*, for Pāli *parisaṃ*, where a double sandhi must be assumed in *kāmāpi* (for *kāmāḥ api*) and *sado* renders *parisaṃ*; *ibid.*, rev. l. 1, we have *vighāta* for Pāli *vivāda*. *Ibid.*, rev. l. 3, we seem to have a more serious difference. The Sanskrit version seems to read *tesān nu kin tbaṃ vada Sihaśura* (or *Sihaśūra*) for Pāli *tesu tvaṃ kiṃ labhetha Pasūra*, and to suggest a different name. *Ibid.*, rev. l. 4, points to a similar difference in the use of *varga* in the Sanskrit version for *sutta* (*sūtra*) in Pāli. Far more important are some instances which show that the vernacular text underlying the Sanskrit version must, in some places, have differed considerably from the existing Pāli text. In frag. II, rev. l. 2, the last line of v. 831, *drṣṭīm ca mānaṃ ca sametya mūḍhaḥ*, has no counterpart in the Pāli text. It would seem that the whole of that verse continued the description of the disputatious fool, and contained no advice to the non-disputatious wise. Again, a comparison of the exceptional length of the blank interval in frag. IV between obv. l. 6 and rev. l. 1, with the length of the blank in the same place in frag. II, suggests that the original vernacular text, underlying the Sanskrit version, must have been much shorter than the existing Pāli text. In the latter, both of the two verses 839 and 840 consist of six lines (as printed in the PTS. ed., pp. 164–5), while the usual number is four lines. This shows that there must be four redundant lines somewhere. Now four of the twelve lines of those two verses are duplicated, viz. those bracketed in my transcript (above, p. 716, n. 2). Their excision not only reduces the two verses to four lines each, but yields a perfectly good text. It would seem, then, that such a shorter vernacular text was the original of the Sanskrit translation. Further, for a similar reason, it seems not improbable that in place

of the two Pāli verses 841 and 842 the vernacular original of the Sanskrit version can have had only one verse. In some other cases it is not so much a difference in the text as in the sequence of the lines of the verses of the text. Thus, in frag. I, rev. l. 2, the remains of the Sanskrit version point to the lines of verses 821 and 822 having stood in the original vernacular text in the following order:—

Ekacariyaṃ dalhaṃ kayirā na nisevetha methunaṃ |
etam ādinavaṃ ñatvā muni pubbāpare sadā ||

Tenānyaṃ nēva maññetha nibbānasantike bhave |
vivekaṃ yeva sikkhetha etad ariyānam uttamaṃ ||

Again, in frag. II, obv. ll. 4, 5, the order of the lines of the vv. 825–7 would seem to have been as follows:—

Pasaṃsakāmā kusalā vadāna vadenti te aññasitā kathojjaṃ |
bālaṃ dahanti mithu aññamaññaṃ te vādakāmā parisam
vigayha || 825

Yutto kathāyaṃ parisāya majjhe pasaṃsam icchaṃ vinighāti
hoti ||
apāhatasmiṃ pana maṅku hoti nindāya so kuppatti
randhamesī || 826

Upaccagā man'ti anutthūṇāti paridevati socati hīnavādo |
yam assa vādaṃ parihīnam āhu apāhataṃ pañhavimaṃsa-
kāse || 827

In v. 827, moreover, the Sanskrit translation presupposes some variation in the reading and other peculiarities in the original vernacular text. The *t* before *paridevate* points to the final *t* of some preceding word; *dīnamanā*, for Pāli *hīnavādo*; and *anuthāyāṃ*, a semi-vernacular form for Skt. *anuṣṭhāyāṃ*, “in the standing behind,” “in the inferiority” of himself, “in his inferiority he bewails dejectedly.”

3. Some readings involve curious scribal blunders; e.g., in frag. I, obv. l. 6, *nāgghoṣaṃ* is clearly a *lapsus pennæ* for *nirgghoṣaṃ* (Pāli *nigghosaṃ*). In frag. II, rev. l. 2, we have the perfectly clear reading *dr̥ṣṭim*

udhāhya for the Pāli *ditthim uggayha*. The former makes no sense, and I can explain it only as a thoughtless blunder of the copyist induced by the immediately preceding *mūḍhaḥ*; *udhāhya* should, no doubt, be *udgrhya*. Again, in frag. IV, rev. l. 2, we have the reading *vadeta brāhma*. The Pāli version shows that the reading should be *brāhmaṇo*, and this is confirmed by the fact that the line as it stands is short by one syllable. The blunder may be due to the initial *m* of the following word *mṛṣā*.

4. Attention may be called to the very rare word *madgībhūta* in frag. I, obv. l. 1. The only other place where it is known to occur are two passages in the Divyāvadāna, p. 633, ll. 24, 27; and p. 636, l. 7, where, however, it has the form *madgubhūta*. Its meaning must be "become confounded", as may be deduced from the phrase *visva[rībhūtā]*, "become soundless," or (in the Divyāvadāna) *tuṣṇībhūta*, "become silent," with which it is joined. Its base is *madga*, which itself, however, has been found only once, in the name *Puru-madga*, apparently meaning "very languid", and the etymology of which is unknown. If it should be a compound of *mad* and *ga*, the alternative *madgu* would be a semi-vernacular form, similar to, e.g., Pāli *addhagū* for Sanskrit *aḍhvaga*.¹

The word *nāga* which occurs in the Pāli verse 845 (*ante*, p. 717) is found often in early Buddhist literature as an epithet of the houseless wandering monk. Its meaning is explained in the two verses 518 and 522 of the Sutta Nipāta (PTS. ed., p. 96). Verse 518 asks *nāgo ti katham pavuccati?* "why is he called *nāga*?" and v. 522 replies *āguṃ² na karoti kiñci loke, nāgo tādi pavuccate tathattā*,

¹ The M. W. Sanskrit Dictionary, rather arbitrarily, takes *madgubhūta* to be a false reading for *mañkhubhūta*. It appears to be connected with the $\sqrt{\text{mand}}$ (*mad*), "be languid."

² *Āgu* for *āgas*, as *sajju* for *sadyās*, probably through intermediate *o* in *āgo*, *sajjo*. See Müller, *Pāli Grammar*, pp. 6-7.

“he commits nothing blameable in the world; for that reason such a one is called *nāga*.” *Nāga* therefore means “blameless”, being derived from *na* and *āga* (for *āgas*, cf. *śira* for *śiras* in *Mṛgaśira*, etc.). It must not be confounded with *nāga*, “elephant,” which is sometimes used with the meaning “eminent, chief”, but in that case always at the end of a compound; the Śabdakalpadruma says, *uttarapadasthite śreṣṭhaḥ*. *Nāga*, with the meaning “blameless”, occurs in the Sutta Nipāta also in verses 421 (*nāga-saṅgha-purakkhato*, “attended by the congregation of the blameless” or the bhikṣus),¹ 573 (as an epithet of the bhikṣus), 1058 (as an epithet of Buddha). See also Childers’ Pāli Dictionary, s.v. *nāga*, where from the Pātimokkha is quoted *ete nāgā mahāpaññā*, “these blameless very learned (monks).”

5. As it happens, the prose narrative introducing the 9th varga, which is absent from the Pāli Māgandiyasutta, occurs in other Buddhist works, in a Sanskrit as well as in a Pāli recension. The Sanskrit recension is in the Divyavadāna, where it forms, in the Cowell & Neil edition, the 36th section, on pp. 515–20 and 528 ff. In abstract it runs as follows:—

Buddha, wandering in the Kuru country, came to the place Kalmāṣadāmya. There lived at that place a brāhman parivrājaka, called Mākandika, with his wife Sākali. They had a daughter who, on account of her extraordinary beauty, was named Anupamā, “the Incomparable,” and whom Mākandika had determined to give in marriage to none but one of equal or greater beauty. One day when Mākandika was out to gather flowers and firewood, he saw Buddha, who was resting from his begging tour at the foot of a tree, and was struck by his attractive appearance.

¹ In this verse Fausböll (in SBE. x, p. 68) translates by “chiefs”, as if the phrase referred to the king; but, as the technical *saṅgha* shows, it refers to Buddha, to whom, attended by his congregation of monks, the king promises to give wealth.

Returning home he told his wife of his discovery of the man whom he considered worthy of his daughter. His wife proposed to have a look at him; so they both went, and seeing Buddha from afar she quoted to her husband a stanza to the effect that such a holy man was not likely to be enamoured of a young woman. She suggested that they had better return home. Mākandika, roughly disagreeing, opined that even a devotee was open to the sexual impulse. However, going home, Sākali dressed up her daughter, and all three went back to interview Buddha. The latter, in the meanwhile, had moved on to another grove of trees. Mākandika, seeing him there in the act of preparing a spread of grass, suggested to his wife that he was preparing it for her daughter. Thereupon she quoted the following stanza (No. I):—

*Raktasya śayyā bhavati vikopitā dviṣṭasya śayyā sahasā
nīpīḍitā |
mūḍhasya śayyā khalu pādato gatā svvītarāgeṇa nisevitā
nv iyam ||*

i.e., The bed of one in love is tumbled; that of one in hate is violently pressed down;
the bed of a fool, again, is trodden by his foot; but this is a bed used by one quit of passion.

She again suggested to return home, but Māgandika, again disagreeing, and now noticing Buddha's footprints, said to his wife, "See, these are the footprints of thy son-in-law." She now quotes another stanza (No. II)—

*Raktasya puṃsaḥ padam utpātam syān nīpīḍitam dveṣa-
vataḥ padam ca |
padam hi mūḍhasya viśṣṭadeham svvītarāgasya padam tv
ihēdṛsam ||*

i.e., The footprints of a man in love should be wide-spaced; and those of one in hate, pressed down;
the footprints of a fool point to an erratic body; but those here look like the footprints of one quit of passion.

She suggested returning, and he disagreed as before. At this moment there came from Buddha the sound of clearing his throat (*utkāśana-śabda*). On Mākandika calling his wife's attention to it, she spoke the stanza (No. III)—

*Rakto naro bhavati hi gadgadasvaro dviṣṭo naro bhavati
hi khakkhaṭāsvaraḥ |
mūḍho naro hi bhavati samākulasvaro Buddhō hy ayam
brāhmaṇadundubhisvaraḥ ||*

i.e., The voice of a man in love is stammering; that of a man in hate is harsh;

the voice of a fool is flurried; but this Buddha has the drumming voice of a brāhman.

Again she suggests returning, and he roughly disagrees. Buddha now saw Māgandika from afar, and Māgandika, noticing that they were being observed, said to his wife, "There is thy son-in-law, he is looking our way." Whereupon she spoke the stanza (No. IV)—

*Rakto naro bhavati hi cañcalēkṣaṇo dviṣṭo bhujagaghoraviṣo
yathēkṣate |
mūḍho naras samtamasīva paśyati dvija vītarāgo yuga-
mātradarśī ||*

i.e., A man in love has an unsteady eye; a man in hate eyes one as does a poisonous snake;

a foolish man sees as one in a dark place; a dispassioned man, O brāhman, sees only the length of a yuga.

She suggests returning, and he roughly disagrees, as before. Buddha now walks to and fro. Māgandika, seeing it, says to his wife, "There, thy son-in-law is walking to and fro"; and she quotes the stanza (No. V)—

*Yathāsya netre ca yathāvalokitam yathāsya kāle sthita eva
gacchataḥ |
yathāḥva padmam stimate jale 'sya netram viśiṣṭe vadane
virājate ||*

i.e., As in the eye can be seen with what feelings one looks; as one who walks stops in the course of time;

as a lotus in still water, so the eye shines forth in a distinguished face.

Once more she suggests returning, and he roughly disagrees, quoting the case of the sage *Vaśiṣṭha*, who succumbed to temptation. So now *Māgandika* went up to Buddha and tempted him with the beauty of his daughter. Buddha, beholding her, reflected, "If I say to her civil words, she will only become excited with passion; so I will say to her rude words," and thereupon spoke the following stanza (No. VI)—

*Drṣṭā mayā Mārasutā hi vipra tṛṣṇā na me nāpi tathā
ratiś ca |
chando na me kāmaguṇeṣu kaścit tasmād imām mūtrapuriṣa-
pūrnām ||
Praṣṭum hi yattām api nōtsaheyam |*

i.e., *Māra's* daughters I saw, O *brāhman*; but there was no desire in me, nor passion;
nor any wish for sexual enjoyment; therefore her, a fill of urine and excrements, even if she were prepared for me, I could not endure.

Māgandika replied with the following stanza (No. VII):

*Sutām imām paśyasi kiṁ madīyām hīnāṅginīm rūpaguṇair
viyuktām |
chandam na yenātra karoṣi cārau viviktabhāveṣv iva
kāmahogī ||*

i.e., Why dost thou look upon this daughter of mine as a vile-bodied woman, bereft of beauty's graces,
in that thou evincest no desire for this lovely object, like one (i.e. *Vaśiṣṭha*) did who, in the midst of his abstraction, enjoyed sexual pleasure?

Buddha rejoined with the following three stanzas (No. VIII)—

*Yasmād ihārthī viśayeṣu mūḍhaḥ sa prārthayed vipra
sutām tavēmām |
rūpōpapannām viśayeṣu śaktām avītarāgo 'tra janaḥ
pramūḍhaḥ ||*

*Ahaṃ tu Buddhho munisattamaḥ kṛtī prāptā mayā bodhir
anuttarā śivā |*

*padmaṃ yathā vārikaṇair aliptam carāmi loke 'nupalipta
eva ||*

*Nīlāmbujam kardamavārimadhye yathā ca pañkena vanō-
paliptam |*

*tathā hy ahaṃ brāhmaṇa lokamadhye carāmi kāmeṣu
viviktaḥ ||*

i.e., Because it is a fool that desires sensual pleasures ; he might,
O brāhman, demand this thy daughter
with her beauty and her skill in sensual pleasures ; a great
fool is he who is not quit of passion.

But I am the Buddha, a sage true and learned ; I have
obtained knowledge incomparable and gracious :

like a lotus with no drop of water adhering, even so
I wander through the world undefiled.

Like a blue water-lily in the midst of slimy water remains
undefiled with mud :

even so, O brāhman, I wander in the midst of the world,
pure of sexual enjoyment.

In consequence of Buddha's rude refusal, the affection of Mākandika's daughter was turned into implacable hatred. Her father now took her away to Kauśambī (pp. 528 ff.), and there married her to Udayana, the king of Vatsa, who, in return, made him one of his chief ministers. Now follows a long story — not relevant, however, to the Sutta Nipāta verses — describing an intrigue of Anupamā, by which, as her revenge on Buddha, she contrived the destruction of her co-queen, Syāmāvati, who was a devoted adherent of Buddha, in a conflagration of the royal palace in the absence of the king, though eventually she repented of her evil deed and became a convert to Buddha.

The Pāli recension is found in the PTS. edition of the Commentary on the Dhammapada, vol. i, pt. ii, pp. 199–203, repeated in a practically identical form in

vol. iii, pp. 193–9. According to this recension, the girl was the daughter of a brāhman of the Māgandiyā sect; her mother was known simply as Māgandiyā, or “a woman of the Māgandiyā sect”; and her father’s younger brother (*cūlapitā*, lit. junior father, uncle) was similarly known only as *cūlamāgandika*, or “a junior Māgandika man”. On account of her great beauty, the father determined to wed her only to a person worthy of her. One day, meeting Buddha on his begging tour, and deeming him worthy to marry his daughter, he went home to announce his discovery to his wife. In the meantime Buddha moved on to another place. Māgandiyā, on his return with his wife, missing Buddha, but noticing his footprints, pointed them out to his wife, who, seeing them, quoted the stanza (No. II)—

*Rattassa hi ukkuṭikam padam bhava duṭṭhassa hoti
sahasānupīḷitam |
mūḷhassa hoti avakaddhitam padam vivattacchadassa
idam idisam padam ||*

i.e., The footprints of one in love are wide-spaced; those of one in hate are violently pressed down;
the footprints of a fool are dragging; these are like the footprints of one quit of desires.

Māgandiyā roughly told her to “shut up”. Then, looking about, he saw Buddha, and going up to him offered him his daughter. Buddha refused her, and by way of explanation quoted the stanza (No. VI) about his earlier attitude towards Māra’s three daughters, in the exact form as it stands at the beginning of the Māgandiyasutta in the Sutta Nipāta (PTS. ed., v. 835, p. 163). On hearing it, Māgandiyā’s daughter, deeply offended with Buddha’s rude description of her as “a fill of urine and excrements”, conceived a violent hatred to him, and resolved to compass his destruction, but her parents, becoming converts to Buddha, adopted the life of a pravrajaka, entrusting their

daughter to the "junior Māgandika". The latter, taking her to Kośambī, married her to king Udena, who made her his chief wife. Of Anupamā's subsequent revenge on Buddha, the Pāli recension knows nothing.

Of the two recensions, the Sanskrit one agrees much more nearly with what survives of the story in our fragment. While the Pāli recension gives only one (No. II) of the four stanzas which are quoted by Māgandiya's wife, our fragment contains remains of all the four stanzas as given in the Sanskrit recension of the Divyāvadāna. The beginning (*raktasya*) of the first stanza is on l. 4 of the obverse of frag. III. The end of the second (*°driśam padam* for *īdriśam pa°*) is on l. 2 of the reverse. The beginning of the third (*rakto naro bhavāti hi gadgadasvaro*) is on l. 3, and the beginning of the fourth (*rakto naro bha°*) on l. 5 of the reverse. Particularly striking is the mention in our fragment (rev. l. 2) of the incident of the sound of clearing the throat (*utkāśanaśabda*), which was heard between the third and fourth stanzas, exactly as it is related in the Divyāvadāna recension (p. 517, ll. 25, 26), while the Pāli recension makes no mention of it whatsoever. On the other hand, the word *avakṛṣṭa* in our fragment (obv. l. 5) agrees more nearly with the Pāli *avakādḍhita* than with the Sanskrit *pādato gatā* of the Divyāvadāna.

Also the name Māgandiya, as our fragment has it, agrees with the Pāli recension rather than with the Divyāvadāna, which has Mākandika. The latter would seem to be intended for a metronymic from Makandika,¹ while the former seem clearly to imply a reference to the Māgandiya sect, as to which see Professor Rhys Davids' *Dialogues of the Buddha*, p. 220 (SBB., vol. ii), and which is much more probable.

¹ There is, however, in it also something reminiscent of the comic story in the Kathāsaritsāgara (ed. Tawney), vol. i, p. 102, of the ascetic in the city of Mākandikā.

As regards the stanzas (Nos. VI, VII, VIII) which contain Buddha's conversation with Māgandiya, and which form the contents of the Māgandiyasutta in the Sutta Nipāta, the evidence, unfortunately, is rather indistinct owing to the mutilations in our fragments. The stanza (No. VI) about Māra's daughters is in the Pāli recension (loc. cit., vol. i, p. 202; vol. iii, p. 199) identical with the Sutta Nipāta verse 835, while in the Divyāvadāna recension (*ante*, p. 726), though the same in substance, it is rather different in detail. Māgandiya's reply is much mutilated in our fragment IV, obv. l. 4, still it seems to have been substantially identical with the Sutta Nipāta verse 836, though differing in detail, while the Divyāvadāna version of it (No. VII) has only a very faint resemblance, and in the Pāli recension it is absent altogether. Buddha's rejoinder in three stanzas (No. VIII), also, is altogether absent in the Pāli recension; but in our fragment IV there seems to be an indication that something like it did exist in the fragmentary Sanskrit recension of our manuscript. For at the end of the obverse, l. 3, we have the mutilated word *arthōpa*, which probably should be completed *arthōpāda*, "production of meaning; explanation." The surviving context says: "Then the Blessed One, on that subject, on that topic, [gave] another explanation." It may be suggested that this "other explanation" was some statement (now lost) equivalent to those three stanzas of the Divyāvadāna, though more concise, because the missing portion of the folio is too small to admit three stanzas. Moreover, this hypothetical statement must have come in between verses 835 and 836, not after verse 836 as in the recension of the Divyāvadāna. In the latter the sequence is as follows: (a) Buddha's refusal of Māgandiya's daughter, and its justification by reference to his earlier treatment of Māra's daughters (stanza VI), corresponding to verse 835 of the Sutta Nipāta; (b) Māgandiya's reply

(stanza VII), corresponding to verse 836; (c) Buddha's rejoinder in three stanzas (VIII), the contents of which virtually express the sentiments contained in verses 837-47; accordingly the latter verses are omitted. The sequence in the mutilated recension, preserved in our fragments, may be suggested to be as follows: (a) Buddha's refusal, and justification, corresponding to verse 835, but missing in fragment IV, obv. l. 2; (b) his further explanation (*anya arthôpāda*), corresponding probably to Divyāvādāna's (c), indicated in fragment IV, obv. l. 3; (c) Māgandiya's reply, corresponding to verse 836, partly preserved in obv. l. 4; (d) Buddha's rejoinder, and exposition, identical with verses 837-47, which are omitted in the Divyāvādāna. This evidence, such as it is, gives one the impression that the introductory prose narrative about Māgandiya is the Sanskrit translator's own composition, and is of very early date; further, that the recension of that narrative which we have in the Divyāvādāna, is derived from that translator's composition, but with a somewhat altered sequence of its parts in order to suit the omission of the verses 837-47.

6. On the fifth fragment there are the remains of a prose narrative introduction referring to a conversation between Mṛgaśīras, a parivrājaka, and Gautama (Buddha). The only Mṛgaśīras who appears to be known to Buddhist tradition is a Thera, of whom two verses (*sloka*) are included in the Theragāthā, viz. verses 181-2 (in the PTS. edition, p. 24). Dharmapāla, in his commentary on the Theragāthā, the Paramattha Dipani, explains that Mṛgaśīras was a brāhman of Kośala, who had his name from being born under the homonymous nakṣatra. Becoming tired of domestic life, he turned a parivrājaka, and made his living by the practice of the skull-spell; that is, by professing to be able to tell the character of the rebirth of a dead person by tapping the latter's skull with his nails. Hearing about Buddha's activities, he

went to call on him, and told him of his divining power. They had a conversation on their respective "skill" (*niṣṭhā*). Buddha demonstrated to him the futility of his skill by asking him to exercise it on the skull of a deceased bhikṣu. Of course he failed to do so, and Buddha telling him that he knew he would fail, Mṛgaśiras asked him how that was; and on Buddha telling him that the reason was his knowing that the bhikṣu was an arhat and as such not subject any longer to being reborn, Mṛgaśiras acknowledged the superiority of Buddha's knowledge, and consented to join his order.¹

I suppose there cannot be much doubt that the narrative of our fragment and that of Dhammapāla's commentary refer to the same Mṛgaśiras. And the further fact that both Mṛgaśiras' verses 181-2 in the Theragāthā and the verses 846-61 which constitute the tenth sutta, the Purābheda-sutta, in the Sutta Nipāta (PTS. ed., pp. 166-8), are ślokas, may be taken as rendering it probable that the narrative in our fifth fragment is the introduction to the tenth varga or the above-mentioned Purābheda-sutta. In that case our fifth fragment follows immediately upon the other four fragments, which contain the seventh, eighth, and ninth vargas; and we have thus fragments of five consecutive folios of a Sanskrit version of the Sutta Nipāta.

¹ Dhammapāla's commentary on the Theragāthā is not yet published. The above given abstract is itself founded on an abstract by Mrs. Rhys Davids in her Translation of the Theragāthā, *The Psalms of the Early Buddhists*, vol. ii, p. 138.