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 concealed 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 Khaggavisānasutta, 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 ‘Khargavisāṇa’ 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 Kharoshti Fragment 3B. 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. 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:

\[abhibhuyya \ldots careyya;\]

\[(räjä va raṭṭhanit) pahāya \ldots eko care (khaggavisāṇakappo).\]

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 (mätan‘ araṇīne 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 Khargavisāṇa] 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 *huvāḥḥavitvā*), 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 *saccavādi 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 ‘*Khargavisāṇa*’, in preference to ‘Rhinoceros Horn’, so that the wording of the refrain *eko care Khaggavisāṇakappo* 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, 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 *care*: ‘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’ (Nidda II E 129):

\[ \text{yathā khaggassa nāma visānaṁ ekam hoti adutiyam, evam eva so paccekauddho takkappo tassadiso tapaṭibhāgo ... eko adutiyo muttabandhano sammā loke carati.} \]

‘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’ 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 khaggavisāna ‘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 visāna is as implausible as its gloss ‘one single horn’. Feminine visānā, possibly also visānākā (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 (svayamśrasta goṣṭīga in Kaush.), 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 viśāṇa, since the image of a fleet-footed deer is specifically invoked in connection with harts horn in AV 3.7.1(hariṇāsyā raghuṣyādo ‘dhi sīrśāni bheṣajāṁ, sā ... viśāṇayā ... anānasati). 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, kargādan (Steingass), karkadān (EWA), Greek kar[k]azōnos,5 Ga. khargavisāṇa and Skt. khāḍga, khāḍgavisāna are all adaptations. This tends to imply that viśāṇa 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 evaṁ dutiyena saha ..., with the sentiment ‘two is a crowd’, that inspired the Niddesa’s etymology based on ‘visāṇam ekam adutiyaṁ’. 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 khaggas’ (p.77, etc.) in lieu of attested Ga. kharga needs to be modified. The PTS Dictionary cited the word as feminine khaggavisāṇa ‘rhinoceros’s horn’: but there is no point in accepting the commentator’s interpretation, while rejecting the imagined neuter viśāṇa ‘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 (pabhassarāṇī ... 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 prabhavara and citra. 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 kāmaguneśu verses (16-17):

| Pa. 11-13 | sahāya ... pahāya | Ga. 25-27 |
| Pa. 14    | disvā ... duve     | Ga.16    |
| Pa. 15    | dutiyena saha ... pekkhamāno | Ga.40 |
| Pa. 16    | kāmaguneśu disvā   | Ga.17    |
| Pa. 17    | kāmaguneśu disvā   | (not in Ga.) |

The appearance of Pa. 15 after 14 (so separating 13 sahāya- from 15 saha, and 14 pabhassarāṇī 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 khaṅga-viṣāṇa, has lost its status as part of the text’s framework.

6. As catchword for Ga. 16 *dispa-suvarṇa ... the Uddāna used the significant term prabhavaranī; 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 -tapa, 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 *dispā 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. Āṭṭhakavagga. The reading in Ga. 20b (*jālam ... saunto), as against Pa. 28b (jālam va bhētvā salil' ambucāri), 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 oḵṣitacakhu yaṣacari gramo gutimāriyo ... and Pa. 29ab okkhitacakkhūna ca pādalolo guttindriyo ..., implies that the Gandhari has inaccurately adapted Sn’s gutto yatacāri gānie, in preference to the expression pādalolo. When it is a question of the arrangement of verses, however, the contiguity of two similar phrases in Dhp 331be 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 Āṭṭhakavagga.

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 *oḥārana 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 oḥariṇam, 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 oṣaḍāita, but its second has oṣīna.

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
sāṃśīnapatto yathā kovidāro,
chetvāna viro gihibandhanāni
eko care khaggavisāṇakappo.
Pa. 30 ohārayitvā ghīvyañjanāṇi
sāṃchinnapatto yathā pārīchatto,
kāsāyavattho abhinikkhamitvā
eko care khaggavisāṇakappo.

Ga. 19 ośādaita ghīvyañjanāṇi
ośinapatro yasa kovirado,
ka[ṣa ... ...].

Skt. 4 otārayitvā ghīvyañjanāṇi
sāṃśīnnapatro yathā pāripātro,
kāsāyavastro abhinīskramitvā
eko care khadgavīṣāṇakalpo.

In Ga. ośinapatro, 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 ośinapatro so as to read aśinapatro 'not devoid of leaves'. This (with *aśīna- or aśīna-) would be an emendation of Pa. 30, following the Niddesa's forced explanation of its reading sāṃchannapatto as 'leaf-covered'. The scribe's original graph ośīna-, which no doubt prompted the alliterative ośādaita, would intend *avaśīna- or avaśīna in agreement with Pa. 10, where the Niddesa reads sāṃchīnna-, understood as 'fallen'. The Pa. 10 variant readings sāṃhinapatto (Cᵇ: altered to sāṃśīna-) and sāṃbhinnapatto (Bᵃ) have clearly a similar aim.

The Ga. text seems certain to be more original in having only one verse. The construction of Pa. 10 sāṃchīnna- ... chetvāna and Pa. 30 sāṃchānna- ... pārīchatto kāsāyavattho presupposes the correctness of the Niddesa readings; but the Pa. 10 version oropayitvā ghīvyañjanāṇi ... chetvāna viro ghībandhanāni is repetitious and (like its use of sāṃchīnna-)
unlikely to be original. There is no similar objection to Pa. 30 samchannapatto yatha pārichatto, providing one does not like Niddesa, try to explain it with *pattasamchādita ‘leaf covered’. Here Norman (in The Group of discourses, II, PTS, 1992) opted for samchanna- as <*samśanna ‘fallen’ (E ś samchinna-). The coincidence with AV parnasadā ‘leaf-fall’ is indeed notable: the form pannasata 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 vyāñjanāni ‘manifestations’.

The poet has succeeded in contriving a pun on *śannapatra and channalvyakta. This would lead to difficulty, when sad- developed into saḍ- (and saṭ-), and makes it likely that Pa. 10 is basically a drastic emendation using samchinna. 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 samchinna- ‘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 samsīna- as < samśīrṇa ‘fallen’. The form -sīna occurs, however, only in C⁵ (emending saṁhīna), in the Niddesa (Thai ed. sina for Sā sinna), and in Ga. in the alliteration oṣad- / oṣī-. Its reading oṣaḍaita may be derived from the attested word apaśātaya- ‘despatch’ AV, Pali sāte- ‘dispel’ (again an instance of defensive retroflexion). Since the gloss samśīrṇa ‘fallen’ in Skt. 4 shares the semantic artificiality of Niddesa’s samchinna ‘fallen’, it seems probable that it is a back-formation from Prakrit sīna ‘fallen’ (whose existence is possibly confirmed by these Pa. and Ga. readings: cf. CDIAL, 12494, and EWA, II, 607). Association
of oṣṭādaya- with oṣina 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 *ōhārana 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. That Sn has 41 could be precisely due to its duplication of the samchanna 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 citteṇa hitāṇukampi) 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 putrami like Skt. 11, possibly 14c has rather *nātīṁ 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. The former pair are emboxed within verses which seem to emphasize the power of the animal (thāmabalūpañno, 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 miscellaneous 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 (kāṣṭhayavastro abhinisīkramitvā) must have the sense ‘like a solitary ascetic (covered) in ash’. The loose locative bhasmani would reflect the commentary’s misunderstanding of the Pali version’s compound salil’ambucārī ‘sea-fish’ (Pa. 28b jālam va bhetvā 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(*maitrām ..., maitreṇa ...) and 3 (sarveṣu ...) respectively, in effect conflating Ga. 36, Pa. 39 (mettam ..., 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 tophknot’ is elsewhere correlated with mūṅḍa, jaṭila, etc., and it can denote a Brahmin sage (in Brahmapaniṣad) or one of the Tathāgatas. Pj II 115 has nadiśalīte ambucārī. This fits the syntax almost as badly as the mechanical salila udakam + ambucārī maccho of Niddesa (N II E 274+95), which makes no sense grammatically (and so may as well reflect an original correct gloss *salīla-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' araṅñe va ‘as in an elephant-forest’ in Dhp 329. For this, Norman, The word of the doctrine, PTS, 1997, 141, prefers the commentators’ nominative mātaṅgō ... nāgo, although his explanation ‘mātaṅga is a particular sort of elephant’ contradicts his ‘nāga is a special sort of elephant’ at Dhp 320. He reverses both Ps, where mātaṅga is taken to be the generic term and the word-order is corrected to nāgo va, and Dhp-a, where the issue is complicated with a popular etymology (‘... mātaṅgo ti laddhanāmo ... ayaṁ hatthināgo’) and the problem of word-order is evaded. (In Dhp 322., however, according to Dhp-a ‘mahānāgā ti ... mahāhatthino’, nāga is generic.) Hypermetric mātaṅg' araṅñe looks like a misguided emendation of *gaj’araṅñe, that seeks to improve upon the tautological reading *gajʃo] ... nāgo.

Ga. 20b seems to have felt obliged to replace the fish of Pa. 28b with a *bālo saumto ‘youngbird’, whose triṣṭubh-ending scansion would mimic, and hence support, that of Pa. 28a saṃyojanāni (for which Skt. grhivyamjanāni and Ga. gihibamahan[ā]ni, 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 (jf[ā]lam yaʃ[ā] bhūv[ā] balaṃ sa[un]m[to] would still be corrupt (even if the compounding error, yaʃa for Pāli va, is disregarded); and the word-order would be awkward. The passage Jā V 268, 15*, to which he refers for the adjective, is presumably to be read as saṃā ca sonā sabalā ca gijjhā (with sabala as another inauspicious colour), as apparently conjectured instead of ca balā in Bd 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 khadgavisāṇa might be multiplied with slight variations in order to provide individual enlightenment for 500 `Pratyekabuddhas': sarvā khadgavisāṇa-gāthā vistareṇa kartavyā. pañcānāṃ pratyekabuddhaśatānāṃ 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 ‘Khadgavisāṇagāthā’ 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 yūan-i-chüeh must be more original than yūan-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 < *abbbhabhavi). Sanskrit pratyayabuddha (patteyabuddha, yūan-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.

---
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