

MISCELLANEOUS FRAGMENTS

EDITED BY H. LÜDERS.

[THE manuscript fragments dealt with in this section belong to two consignments, marked by me Nos. 142 and 148. Both were transmitted by Sir G. Macartney, K.C.I.E., British Consul-General in Kashgar, to the Government of India, who forwarded them to me in May, 1903, and January, 1906, respectively.

The fragments are stated by Sir G. Macartney to have been purchased by him from Badruddin, Aksakal of Khotan, who had himself bought them from 'treasure seekers', but could give no information regarding their precise find-place. On the whole it is probable that they belong to the proceeds from the diggings by treasure seekers in the ruins of Khadalik, which are referred to on pp. 2 and 85.—R. H.]

1. SADDHARMA-PUNḌARĪKA

Hoernle MSS., No. 148, SA. 22-25. (Plate XVIII, No. 1, Fol. 253, Obverse.)

A preliminary notice of this fragment was published in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society for 1906, pp. 695 ff., by Dr. Hoernle, who from the mentioning of the Bodhisattva Prajñākūṭa was enabled to identify the leaves as having belonged to a manuscript of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka and containing portions from the end of chapter xi and the middle of chapter xii of that work.

The fragment consists of four leaves of strong and rather smooth dun-coloured paper measuring about 567×180 mm. (or $22\frac{1}{4} \times 7\frac{1}{8}$ inches), and numbered on the left-hand margin of the obverse 253, 254, 259, 260, the hundreds, tens, and units being placed one below the other as commonly done in Central-Asian manuscripts. Each page contains seven lines. In order to make the lines quite straight and equally distant from one another, the scribe has used an instrument like the modern Indian ruler, the impressions still being clearly visible. On the left side a circle measuring about 40 mm. (or $1\frac{1}{2}$ " in diameter was drawn before the writing was commenced, and its centre was pierced with a large hole for the passage of the string which was to hold the leaves of the manuscript together. The akṣaras, (e. g. *yā* and *ṣyā*, fol. 253, obv. ll. 1, 2,) measure 22-30 mm. (or $1-1\frac{1}{5}$ ").

The leaves are perfect, although small holes, apparently due to the corrosive action of the ink, are found in many places. In the transcript all letters that on this account have been more or less damaged are printed in italic type.

The characters belong to the Upright Gupta script of the calligraphic type. The most striking feature of this alphabet is the variety of signs for medial *ā*. In our fragment there are no less than four distinct forms. There exists, however, even a fifth form in this species of script, though no example of it happens to occur in our fragment; but an example is found in the third fragment described below (p. 168), and may be seen in *nā* at the end of line 4 on Pl. XVIII, No. 3, obv. l. 4. The most frequent form is an acute-angular rightward prolongation of the head-line of the māṭṛkā (see e. g. *gā*, 253 *a*^{vi}). It is regularly used in *kā*, *khā*, *gā* (*gryā*), *cā* (253 *a*^v), *ñcchā*, *tā* (253 *a*ⁱⁱⁱ, or *tthā*, *trā*, *tvā*), *dā* (253 *a*^{vii}, or *dyā*, *drā*, *dvā*), *nā* (*nyā*, 253 *a*ⁱⁱⁱ), *bdhā*, *bhā* (Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *a*, l. 7), *rā* (Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *b*, l. 2, or *rtā*, *ryā*, *rhā*), *lā* (Pl. XVIII, No. 2, l. 5), *vā* (Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *a*, l. 1, or *vyā*), *śā* (*ścā*, *śvā*), and is added also to the sign for initial *a* to form initial *ā* (Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *a*, l. 7). Once only the second form is used in *kā* (260 *b*ⁱⁱ) and the fourth form in *tvā* (260 *a*^v), but in both cases the akṣara stands at the end of the line, and the regular sign would have protruded on the margin. The second form, a vertical stroke resembling the modern Nāgarī sign, occurs regularly in *mā* (e. g. 253 *a*^{vi}), and *dhā*, there being only one case where *dhā* shows the first form (259 *a*^{vii}). The *thā* sometimes shows the first form, but sometimes also a form which might be called intermediate between the first and second (253 *a*^{vi}). The third form consists of a curve, rising above the head of the māṭṛkā, and turning to the right. It is used in *pā* (254 *b*ⁱⁱⁱ, or *prā* 254 *a*^v), *yā* (Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *a*, l. 8), *śmā*, *śyā* (254 *a*ⁱ), *sā* (Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *a*, l. 7, or *stā* 254 *a*ⁱⁱ, *sthā* 254 *a*^{vi}, *syā*, Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *a*, l. 6, *srā*), and *hā*; but never in *jā* (or *jñā*) and *nā* (or *nyā*). In the latter cases, there is always in use a fourth form, which is a strong exaggeration of the third form, and which appears to have originated in Central Asia, though the germs of it are already apparent in the Northern Indian script of the seventh century (see Bühler's Indian Palaeography, table IV, 14ⁱⁱ. xii *jā*, 17^{xvi}. xix *ṭā*, 21^{iv}. xiv *nā*, 26^{xv} *nā*, 27^{viii}. xiv *pā*, 37^{viii}. xv *śā*). In this form the original curve is made to rise, in two parallel lines, high above the head of the māṭṛkā. So we have it always in *jā* (253 *a*ⁱⁱⁱ, and Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *b*, l. 4), or *jñā* (253 *a*^{iv}, and Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *a*, l. 5), and in *nā* (253 *a*ⁱⁱⁱ), or *nyā* (Pl. XVIII, No. 2, l. 5), and optionally interchanging with the third form, in *tpā* (253 *a*ⁱⁱ), *pā* (254 *b*ⁱⁱⁱ, or *ptā*, or *prā*), *yā* (253 *a*ⁱ, but with the third form 254 *a*ⁱ, *b*ⁱ), *śmā* (254 *a*ⁱⁱ), *śyā*, *sā* (254 *b*ⁱⁱⁱ, but with third form 254 *a*ⁱ), or *stā*, or *sthā*, or *smā*, or *syā* (253 *a*ⁱ, but with third form 254 *b*^{vii}), or *srā* (254 *a*^{iv}), and *hā* (253 *a*^{vii}). Sometimes, indeed, these two forms are found to alternate in the same letter in the same line, as e. g. in *pā* (254 *b*ⁱⁱⁱ) and in *sthā* (254 *a*^{vi}, twice with the third, and once with the fourth

form)—a fact which shows them to be mere varieties of an essentially identical form. A modification of the fourth form appears in *jñā* (253 a^{vi}), in which the down-stroke of the two parallels is so reduced as to form a mere hook at the top of the up-stroke.

A similar variety of forms exists in the case of medial *u* and *ū*. Medial *u* is generally expressed by a sort of wedge added at the foot of the mātrkā (see e. g. *ju*, 253 aⁱ). This form is found in *cu*, *ju*, *dhhu*, *nu* (253 aⁱ, or *nnu*), *pu* (253 a^v), *bu* (Pl. XVIII, No. 2, l. 4), *mu* (253 a^v), *yu* (Pl. XVIII, No. 3 b, l. 8), *lu* (253 a^{iv}), *śru*, *ṣu* (*kṣu*), *su* (Pl. XVIII, No. 2, l. 2, or *nsu*), *hu*. But in other cases medial *u* is denoted by a curve or a hook. In *ku* (253 a^{vi}), *du* (254 a^{iv}, b^{vi}) and *ru* (259 a^{vi}) the sign exactly resembles the modern Nāgarī sign. In *gu* (253 a^{ii.iii}) and *śu* (253 aⁱⁱⁱ) the *u* is expressed by an upward curve attached to the lower part or the middle of the second vertical of the mātrkā. The same sign is added below to the foot of the letter in *ḍhhu* (259 b^{iii.vi}) and mostly in *tu* (254 a^{vii}, b^{i.ii}, 259 b^{iv}, 260 a^{iv} in *dhātu*), but in *tu* (254 aⁱⁱⁱ and 260 a^{iv} in *samprakāśayitum*) the *u*-sign has the shape of the modern Nāgarī sign for medial *ū*.

For medial *ū* we find four different forms, which are apparently nothing but the forms for medial *u* doubled. (1) The wedge-shaped form is doubled in *pū* (e. g. 253 aⁱⁱ), *mū* (260 b^{iv}), *sū* (253 b^{vi}), and *hū* (253 bⁱⁱⁱ), the two wedges being placed one before the other and the first one being connected by an ascendant line with the foot of the mātrkā. (2) The sign for *ū* in *kū* (253 a^{iv}) is the doubled *u*-sign used in *ku* with shortening of the second sign. (3) The sign used in *śu* is doubled to denote the long vowel in *śū* (253 a^{vii}), and (4) the sign found in *ḍhhu* is doubled with enlarging of the lower sign in *ḍhū* (253 a^{vi}).

The ordinary form of medial *i* takes the form of an erect acute angle, seen e. g. in *ti* (253 aⁱⁱⁱ). Twice, however, it occurs in a modified form, in which the angle appears to be laid on one of its sides, viz. on the right side in *li* (260 bⁱ) and on the left in *bhī* (253 b^{vii}). The former prone alternative seems to be restricted to combination with *l*, while the latter does not seem to be subject to any particular restriction. All the three forms occur in the third fragment, see p. 168.

A modified form of medial *o* is found in *lo* (e. g. 253 bⁱ, 259 a^{v.vii}), the right part of the ordinary sign being attached to the upper end of the vertical bar of the *la* and drawn out into a long downward straight line, exactly as in the fourth form of the medial *ā*.¹

The rest of the medial vowels appears in one form only.

As regards consonantal signs, it will be observed that the wedge at the foot of the second vertical of *ga* (e. g. 253 a^v) and *śa* (Pl. XVIII, No. 3 a, l. 1), and mostly also the faint side-stroke of *śa*, disappear whenever another consonant is joined to

¹ [Most of these vowel signs occur also in the Sanskrit Vajracchedikā MS., see p. 178.—R. H.]

those letters at the bottom; see e.g. *gra* (253 *b^{iv}*, 254 *b^{vii}*), *śrī* (253 *a^{iv}*), *ści* (253 *bⁱ*, Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *b*, l. 1). Under the same condition the *ta* also generally loses its side-stroke, and in such cases the sign for *ta* does not differ from that for *na*; see e.g. *tta* (253 *aⁱ*), *tra* (253 *a^v*), *tva* (253 *a^{iv}*); also *tr* (253 *bⁱ*). Occasionally in the case of *tra*, the side-stroke is optionally retained; thus in *tatra* (253 *aⁱ*), *putra* (254 *aⁱⁱ*, *b^{iv}*), and *yatra* (253 *bⁱⁱ*) with the side-stroke; but *tatra* (254 *aⁱ*) and *putra* (253 *a^v*) without it. See also the introductory remarks to the second Saddharma-puṇḍarīka fragment (*infra*, p. 162). If *ka* is combined with another consonant, or with the vowels *u*, *ū*, or *ṛ*, its lower portion is dropped altogether, the *ka* again closely resembling the *na*; see e.g. *ksa*, *kṣī* (Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *a*, l. 4), *kya* (253 *bⁱⁱⁱ*), *ku* (253 *a^v*), *kū* (253 *a^{vi}*), *kr* (253 *a^v*). In this case, however, a confusion with *na* can rarely arise, as in ligatures with *ka* the subscript letter is generally attached to the left (e.g. *ksa* 253 *aⁱ*, Pl. XVIII, No. 2, l. 4), not to the right side of the letter as in ligatures with *na* (e.g. *nyā* 253 *aⁱⁱⁱ*, *na* Pl. XVIII, No. 2, l. 4); also the forms for medial *u* and *ū*, used in *ku* and *kū*, are quite different from those occurring in combination with *na* (comp. *ku* 253 *a^v* with *nu* 253 *aⁱ*).

The superscript *r* is placed above the line if added to *ka*, *na*, *ta*, and *bha* (see e.g. *rna* 253 *aⁱⁱⁱ*, *rti* 254 *a^{vii}*, *rtiā* 254 *aⁱⁱⁱ*), and upon the line if added to *tha*, *dha*, *ma*, *ya*, *la*, *va*, *ṣa* and *ha* (see e.g. *rma* 253 *aⁱⁱⁱ*, *rya* Pl. XVIII, No. 2, l. 1, *rva* 253 *aⁱⁱⁱ*). In this connexion, it may be noted that the peculiar sign which indicates the special *r* of the Khotanese and Kucuan languages of Eastern Turkestan, and which in the sequel is transcribed by *rr*,¹ occurs seven times in our four folios. As a rule it is found in the subscript position, with *k* (e.g. in *śakrra* 254 *a^{vi}*, *cakrra* 254 *a^{vii}*, 260 *a^{vi}*, *upasaṃkrraminsu* 260 *bⁱ*), *gh* (in *śighrra* 254 *b^v*. vi. vii), but once it occurs also in the superscript position with *l*, in *durrlabham* (254 *a^{iv}*).² Its shape may be seen in Pl. XVIII, No. 2, l. 5 *prra*, and l. 6 *srre*. See also the introductory remarks to the second Saddharma-puṇḍarīka fragment (*infra*, p. 163).

The subscript *v* is sometimes written *b*; thus with *t* in *satba* 253 *a^v* (but *satva* 253 *a^{vi}*), 259 *aⁱⁱⁱ*, 260 *a^v*. vi; *śrutbā* 259 *bⁱⁱⁱ*; with *ḍ* in *ḍbā* 253 *b^{vi}*.

Absence of vowel in the case of *t* (253 *a^{iv}*, and Pl. XVIII, No. 2, l. 3), *n* (253 *bⁱ*, 259 *a^{vi}*), and *m* (253 *bⁱⁱⁱ*, 254 *aⁱ*. iv. vii) is indicated by writing a half-sized letter without the serif below the line and placing a curve above it. The letters *t* and *n* can hardly be distinguished.

A few remarks are called for by the punctuation. The full stop is generally indicated by a dot placed on the line (e.g. 253 *aⁱⁱⁱ*. iv; also Pl. XVIII, No. 3 *b*,

¹ [See Professor Leumann's dissertation *Zur nordarischen Sprache und Literatur*, pp. 41, 57; also *infra*, p. 217.—R. H.]

² [For an instance of superscript *rr* in Khotanese writing, see p. 397.—R. H.]

ll. 7, 8).³ Four times, after *saindrīyate* in 253 a^{vi}, after *abhāṣata* in 253 b^v, after *lokadhātāu* in 259 a^{vii}, and after *parivṛtā* in 259 b^v, we find the double dot, which occurs also in inscriptions⁴ and in the Bower MS.⁵ In 253 b^v it is followed by a double vertical stroke, which appears also alone to mark the end of a sentence in 259 bⁱ,^{vii}, 260 aⁱ,^{vii}. In 253 b^v, 260 aⁱ,^{vii} the two vertical strokes are joined at their lower ends by a slanting line; in 259 bⁱ,^{vii} they are not connected. The use of all these signs is rather arbitrary. They are frequently wanting where we should expect them, while once (259 a^v) it is found in a place where it is superfluous. See also the remarks on blundered dots on p. 156.

Before entering into a discussion of the contents of the fragment, I give the text of the four leaves, with the text of the Nepalese manuscripts printed opposite, and a translation. For the Nepalese text I beg to offer my sincerest thanks to Professor Kern, who, when I showed him the fragment, at once promised to copy out for me the corresponding passages from the edition of the Saddharma-punḍarīka, which he had ready for publication. Of the manuscripts used by Professor Kern, A belongs to the Royal Asiatic Society, B to the British Museum, C^a C^b to the University of Cambridge, K to Mr. Kawaguchi, W to Mr. Watters.

[Note. It is due to Professor Lüders to explain that his quotation of the Nepalese text, printed below, was completed before the Bibliotheca Buddhica edition appeared in print, and that after a delay, for which he is in no wise responsible, it is now, for considered reasons, published exactly as it was originally written out by him. Professor Lüders states that 'his Nepalese text reads exactly as it was copied for him by Professor Kern, but that the text which is now published in the Bibliotheca Buddhica shows several discrepancies which he is unable to account for. If the readings of the text in the Bibliotheca Buddhica should be correct, that would affect more or less his remarks on *sañjānanti* (253 aⁱⁱⁱ, p. 159), *sañsṛitavān* (253 a^{vii}, p. 161), the missing *anuttarām* (253 bⁱⁱⁱ, p. 157), *saṃprakāśayaty* (254 a^{iv}, p. 161), *pravartikānām* (260 a^{vi}, p. 161), but not the general results arrived at.' But the fact is that the Bibliotheca Buddhica print does not present a pure

³ I think it highly probable that this dot occurs also in the fragments of a block-print from Idytkutsari, edited by Pischel (Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1904, p. 807 ff.). In these fragments the virāma is generally expressed by a dot placed above the letter, the dot in such cases corresponding to the semicircle employed in our fragment. Three times, however, after *avocat* in 161 a^{iv} and after *duskṛtam* in 171 a^v, 171 bⁱⁱⁱ two dots appear, one above and the other after the last letter. Pischel considered this to be the original designation of the virāma, but as *avocat* stands at the end of a sentence and *asti duskṛtam* apparently are the last words of a verse, I feel almost sure that the second dot is the sign of punctuation.

⁴ Bühler, Indische Palaeographie, p. 84.

⁵ See e.g. Part V, fol. 2 a, l. 4; fol. 3 b, ll. 1, 3, &c.

Nepalese text, but incorporates a number of Eastern Turkestani readings (denoted by O; see Prof. Kern's Add. Note, p. v), such as *sraṃsayaty* (p. 264, l. 9) for *saṃprakāśayaty*. The two portions of text preserved in our fragment are in that print on p. 261, l. 14–p. 265, l. 3, and on p. 269, l. 7–p. 271, l. 3.—R. H.]

TEXT

HOERNLE MS. No. 148.

Fol. 253 Obv.

- 1 (*sarv*)e ca (*te*) Mañjuśriyā Kumāra-bhūtena vi(n)ī(t)ā anuttarasya¹ samyak-sambodhau tatra ye bo-
- 2 *dhisatvā mahāyāna-saṃprasthitāḥ pūrvam abhūvaṃs te mahāyāna-guṇā*² ṣaṭ-pārami-
- 3 *tāḥ saṃvarṇayanti* •
- sarve ca
te sarva-dharmāḥ śūnyān³ iti
saṃjānanti mahāyāna-guṇāṃ
- 4 ś ca • *atha khalu Mañjuśriḥ kumāra-bhūtaḥ Prajñākūṭaṃ bodhisattvam etad avocat, sarvo*
- 5 *'yaṃ kulaputra mayā samudramadhya-gatena satba-vinayaḥ kṛtaḥ sa cāyaṃ saṃdr-*
- 6 *śyate* : *atha Prajñākūṭo bodhisattvo Mañjuśriyaṃ kumāra-bhūtaṃ gāth-ābhigītena pari-prccha-*

¹ Read *anuttarasyaṃ*.² Read *guṇān*.³ Read *dharmāḥ śūnyān*.

NEPALESE MSS.

- sarve ca te Mañjuśriyā kumāra-bhūtena vinitā anuttarāyāṃ samyak-sambodhau | tatra ye bo-
- dhisattvā¹ mahāyāna-saṃprasthitāḥ pūrvam abhūvaṃs te mahāyāna-guṇān, ṣaṭ-pārami-tāḥ saṃvarṇayanti | [*ye śrāvaka-pūrvā bodhisattvās*² *te śrāvaka-yānam eva saṃvarṇayanti*] sarve ca te sarva-dharmāṃ³ chūnyān iti saṃjānate sma mahāyāna-guṇāṃ-
- ś ca | *atha khalu Mañjuśriḥ kumāra-bhūtaḥ Prajñākūṭaṃ bodhisattvam etad avocat, | sarvo*
- 'yaṃ kulaputra mayā samudra⁴-madhya-gatenasaṃvinayaḥ kṛtaḥ sa cāyaṃ saṃdr-*
- śyate* | *atha khalu Prajñākūṭo bodhisattvo Mañjuśriyaṃ kumāra-bhūtaṃ gāth-ābhigītena pari-prccha-*

¹ C^b adds *mahāsattvā*.² AW °*pūrva-bodhi*°.³ BK *sarvān dhā*°.⁴ AW *mahā-samu*°.

HOERNLE MS. No. 148.

7 t mahāsamudra¹ mahāprajña mahā-
hāsūra mahābala • asaṁkhyeyā
vinitā

NEPALESE MSS.

ti sma¹ || mahābhadrā prajñayā
sūra-nāmann asaṁkhyeyā² ye
vinitās [tvayśādyā | sattvā amī kasya
cśāyam prabhāvas tad brūhi pṛṣṭo
naradeva tvam etat, || 47 || Kaṁ vā
dharmaṁ deśitavān asi tvam kiṁ vā
sūtraṁ bodhi-mārg-ōpadeśeyam | yac
chruvśāmī bodhaye jāta-cittāḥ sarva-
jñatve niścite labdha-gāthāḥ³ || 48 ||
Mañjuśrīr āha | samudra-madhye Sad-
dharma-puṇḍarikaṁ sūtraṁ⁴ bhāṣi-
tavān na cśānyat, | Prajñākūṭa āha |
idaṁ sūtraṁ gambhīraṁ sūkṣmaṁ
durdṛṣaṁ⁵ na cśānena sūtreṇa kimcid
anyat sūtraṁ samam asti | asti kaścit
sattvo ya idaṁ sūtra-ratnaṁ⁶ satku-
ryād avaboddhum anuttarāṁ samyak-
saṁbodhim abhisamboddhum | Mañju-
śrīr āha | asti kulaputra Sāgarasya
nāga-rājño duhitśāṣṭa-varṣā jātyā
mahā-prajñā tikṣṇ-ēndriyā jñāna-
pūrvāṅgamaṇa kāya-vān-manas-kar-
maṇā samanvāgatā sarva-tathāgata-
bhāṣita-vyañjan-ārth-ōdgrahaṇe dhā-
raṇī-pratīlabdhā sarva-dharma-sattva-
samādhāna-samādhi-sahasr-ākṣa-lak-
ṣaṇa-pratīlabhinī | bodhicitt-āvinivar-

¹ Read mahābhadrā.

¹ C^b paryaprecchata, K paryaprecchat.

² KW °khyayā.

³ A °gā, B °lābhāḥ, C^b °nābhāḥ, K °gādhāḥ.

⁴ BC^b K om.

⁵ W durdaśanaṁ.

⁶ BK ratna-sūtraṁ.

HOERNLE MS. No. 148.

kadācid vīryam sraṁ-

Fol. 253 Rev.

- 1 sitavān, tṛsāhasra - mahāsāhasrā-
yām loka-dhāto¹ nāsti sa ka-
ścid antamaśaḥ sarṣapa-mā-
2 tro pradeśaḥ yatṛānena śarīraṁ
na nikṣiptaṁ satva-hetoḥ pa-
ścād bodhim abhisambuddha² •
ka e-
3 taṁ (śra)ddadhāsyati yaḥ śākya³
muhūrtenānutta(rā)⁴ samyak-
sambodhim abhisamboddhum,
atha tasyām
4 velāyām Sāgara-nāga-rāja-duhitā
agrataḥ sthitā dṛśyate sā bha-
gavata-

¹ Read °dhātau.² Read °buddhaḥ (see p. 156).³ Read śākyaṁ.⁴ Read °nuttarām.

NEPALESE MSS.

tinī vistīrṇa-prañidhānā sarva-satt-
veṣv ātma-prem-ānugatā guṇ-ōtpā-
dane¹ ca samarthā na ca tebhyaḥ pari-
hīyate | smita-mukhī paramayā śubha-
varṇa-puṣkaratayā samanvāgatā mai-
tra-cittā karuṇām ca vācaṁ bhāṣate |
sā samyak-sambodhim abhisambod-
dhum samarthā || Prajñākūṭo bodhi-
sattva āha | dṛṣṭo mayā bhagavān
Śākyamunis tathāgato bodhāya ghaṭa-
māno bodhisattva-bhūto 'nekāni puṇ-
yāni kṛtvān anekāni ca kalpa-saha-
srāṇi na] kadācid vīryam sraṁ-

- śritavān | tri-sāhasra-mahāsāhasrā-
yām loka-dhātau nāsti kaścid
antaśaḥ sarṣapa-mā-
tro [pi pṛthivi-]pradeśo yatṛānena
śarīraṁ na nikṣiptaṁ sattva-
[hīta-]hetoḥ | paścād bodhim abhi-
sambuddhaḥ | ka e-
vaṁ² śraddadhyād³ yad [anayā]⁴
śākyaṁ muhūrtena samyak-sam-
bodhim abhisamboddhum, || atha
[khalu] tasyām
velāyām Sāgara - nāga-rāja - duhitā
agrataḥ sthitā [sam]dṛśyate [sma]⁵ |
sā bhagavata-

¹ BK °nenā.² BK enām, W etām.³ B śraddhāsyati, K śraddhadhyāt,

C śraddadhāt.

⁴ BK yat tayā, C yadā' nayā.⁵ AW om.

HOERNLE MS. No. 148.

- 5 *h* pādaḥ śirasā vandy¹śākhānte
'sthāt tasyām velāyām² imā
gāthā abhāṣata : ॥ puṇyam
puṇya-
- 6 (*gab*)īraṁ ca diśaḥ spharati sar-
va(śa)ḥ sūkṣmaṁ (*śar*)īraṁ
dbātrīṁśa-lakṣaṇais samalaṁ-
kṛtam, anuvyañ-
- 7 (*jana*)-yuktaṁ ca sarv-asatva-na-
maskṛ tv³ābhī(*gamyā*)ṁ ca
antarāpaṇavad yathā yaṁ

Fol. 254 Obv.

- 1 yā(*mī*) sambodhiṁ sākṣī me tatra
tathāgata⁴ • vistīrṇaṁ deśayi-
ṣyāmi sarva-duḥkha⁵-pramoca-
nam, a-
- 2 tha tasyām velāyām āyuṣmāñ
Cchāripuṭras tām nāgarāja-du-
hitaram etad avocat, kevalaṁ
- 3 kula-duhite bodhāya cittam ut-
pannam avivar(*ty*)āprameya-
prajñā cāsi samyak-sambud-
dhatvaṁ tu du-
- 4 rrlabham, asti kula-duhite strī na
ca vīryaṁ sraṁsayati anekāni

¹ Originally *vedyāi*^o was written, but the scribe seems to have corrected *ve* into *vam* by effacing the down-stroke of the *e*-sign.

² Read *velāyām*.

³ See p. 156.

⁴ Read *gataḥ*.

⁵ The visarga in *duḥkha* has been added afterwards above the line.

NEPALESE MSS.

- h* pādaḥ śirasābhivandy¹śākhānte
'sthāt tasyām velāyām imā gāthā
abhāṣata ॥ puṇyam puṇyam
- gambhīraṁ ca diśaḥ sphurati sarva-
śaḥ | sūkṣmaṁ śarīraṁ dvātrīṁ-
śal-lakṣaṇaiḥ samalaṁkṛtam 49 ॥
anuvyañ-
- jana-yuktaṁ ca sarva-sattva-nama-
skṛ[*tam* | *sarva-sa*]ttvābhigamyāṁ
ca antarāpaṇavad yathā 50 ॥ ya-

[*th-éccha*]yā me sambodhiḥ sākṣī me
'tra tathāgataḥ | vistīrṇaṁ deśa-
yīṣyāmi dharmāṁ duḥkha-pra-
mocaṇam, 51 ॥ a-

tha [*khalu*] tasyām velāyām āyuṣ-
māñ Śāripuṭras tām [*Sāgara*]-nā-
ga-rāja-duhitaram etad avocat, |
kevalaṁ

bhagini² bodhāya cittam utpannam
avivarty āprameya-prajñā cāsi
samyak-sambuddhatvaṁ tu du-

rlabham | asti bhagini³ strī na ca
vīryaṁ saṁprakāśayaty⁴ [*anekāni*

¹ AW °sā vanditvā.

² BC^bK te kulaputri.

³ BC^bK kulaputri.

⁴ C^b janayati, BK saṁmayati, W
praśayati.

HOERNLE MS. No. 148.

ca kalpa-sahasrā-

- 5 ni puṇyāni karoti ṣaṭ-pāramitāḥ
paripūrayate • na cādyāpi
buddhatvaṁ prāptobhi¹
- 6 kiṁ (kā)raṇaṁ pañca sthānāni
adyāpi stri na prāpnoti • pra-
thamaṁ brahma-sthānaṁ dvi-
tīyaṁ śakrra-sthā-
- 7 naṁ • tṛtīyaṁ mahārāja-sthā-
naṁ,² caturthaṁ cakravarti-
sthānaṁ pañcamam avaiivarti-
ka-bodhisatva-

Fol. 254 Rev.

- 1 sthānam, atha tasyāṁ velāyāṁ
Sāgara-nāgarāja-duhitur ekaṁ
maṇi-ratnam asti ya³ kṛtsnaṁ
- 2 trisāhasra-masāhasraṁ⁴ lokadhā-
tuṁ mulyaṁ⁵ kṣamati sa ca
maṇis tayā nāgarāja-duhitrā
bha-
- 3 gavato datto bhagavatā cānu-
kampām upādāya pratigṛhīta⁵ •
atha Sāgara-nāgarāja-
- 4 duhitā Prajñākūtaṁ bodhisatvaṁ
sthaviraṁ ca Śāriputraṁ etad
avocat, yo 'yaṁ mayā bha-

¹ Read *prāpnoti*.² Read *sthānam*, or *sthānaṁ*.³ Read *ya*.⁴ Read *mahāsāhasraṁ*.⁵ Read *mūlyaṁ*, and *ḡṛhītaḥ*.

NEPALESE MSS.

ca kalpa-śatāny] anekāni ca kalpa-
sahasrā-

- ni puṇyāni karoti ṣaṭ-pāramitāḥ
paripūrayati na cādyāpi bud-
dhatvaṁ prāpnoti •
- kiṁ-kāraṇaṁ | pañca sthānāni stṛy
adyāpi na prāpnoti | [*katamāni*
pañca |] prathamaṁ brahma-sthā-
naṁ dvitīyaṁ śakra-sthā-
naṁ tṛtīyaṁ mahārāja-sthānaṁ¹
caturthaṁ cakravarti-sthānaṁ
pañcamam avaiivartika-bodhisat-
tva-

- sthānam, u atha [*khalu*] tasyāṁ velā-
yāṁ Sāgara-nāgarāja-duhitur eko
maṇir² asti yaḥ kṛtsnaṁ
trisāhasraṁ mahāsāhasraṁ loka-
dhātuṁ mūlyaṁ kṣamate | sa ca
maṇis tayā [*Sāgara*]nāgarāja-du-
hitrā bha-
- gavate dattaḥ | [*sa*] bhagavatā cā-
nukampām upādāya³ pratigṛhī-
taḥ | atha Sāgara-nāgarāja-
duhitā Prajñākūtaṁ bodhisattvaṁ
sthaviraṁ ca Śāriputraṁ etad
avocat, yo 'yaṁ maṇir mayā bha-

¹ C^b °*rājika*°.² BK °*ka-maṇi-ratnam*.³ B °*ānukampām upādāya*.

HOERNLE MS. No. 148.

- 5 gavata¹ maṇir dattaḥ sa ca bhagava(tā ś)īghraṃ pratigrhīto n=ēti sthavira āha • tvayā ca śīghraṃ datto bhagavatā ca śīghraṃ pratigrhītaḥ Sāgarānāgarāja-duhitāha • bhadaṃta Śāripu-
- 6 tra yady ahaṃ mardhinī² syāṃ śīghratarā³ samyak-sambodhim abhisambuddhye yaṃ na cāśya maṇeḥ pratigra-

Fol. 259 Obv.

- 1 prativitarkam ājñāya Yaśodharāṃ bhikṣuṇīm etad avocat, ārocayāmi te Yaśodhare
- 2 itaś cavitvā strī-bhāvaṃ vivartayitvā da(ś)ānāṃ buddha-koṭīnāyuta-śata-sahasrāṇāṃ
- 3 sântike bodhisatvo dharmā-bhāṇako bhaviṣyasi • anupūrveṇa ca bodhisatva-caryāṃ paripūrya³ Raśmi-śata-sahasra-paripūrṇa-dhvaḥ nāma

¹ Read *bhagavato*.² Read *maharddhinī*.³ Read *śīghratarāṃ*.

NEPALESE MSS.

- gavato dattaḥ sa ca bhagavatā śīghraṃ pratigrhīto n=ēti¹ • tvayā ca śīghraṃ datto bhagavatā ca śīghraṃ pratigrhītaḥ • Sāgarānāgarāja-duhitāha • yady ahaṃ bhadaṃta Śāripu-
- tra maharddhikī syāṃ śīghratarāṃ samyak-sambodhim abhisambuddhye yaṃ na cāśya maṇeḥ pratigrā-

[hakaḥ syāt, ॥]

- [Atha khalu bhagavān Yaśodharāyā bhikṣuṇyāś cetasaiva cetah-] parivitarkam ājñāya Yaśodharāṃ bhikṣuṇīm etad avocat, ārocayāmi te Yaśodhare
- [pravedayāmi te • tvam api] daśānāṃ buddha-koṭī-sahasrāṇāṃ

- antike [satkāraṃ gurukāraṃ mānanāṃ pūjanāṃ arcanāṃ apacāyanāṃ² kṛtvā] bodhisattvo dharmā-bhāṇako bhaviṣyasi • bodhisattva-caryāṃ cānupūrveṇa paripūrya³ Raśmi-śata-sahasra-paripūrṇa-dhvaḥ nāma

¹ K °to utteti; W °ta utareti; B °ta uta; A °ta.² arcanāṃ apacāyanāṃ only in K.³ ACW paripūryatvā.

HOERNLE MS. No. 148.

- 5 tathāgato 'rhān samyak-sambud-
dho loke bhaviṣyasi • vidyā-
caraṇa-saṃpannaḥ sugato lo-
6 ka-vid anuttaraḥ puruṣa-damya-
sārathih śāstā deva-manuṣyā-
nā¹ buddho bhagavān, bhā²-
7 drāyām loka-dhātau : aparimitam
ca tasya bhagavato Raśmi-
śata-sahasra-pari-

Fol. 259 Rev.

- 1 pūrṇā - dhvajasya tathāgatasya
āyus-pramāṇam bhaviṣyati ||
atha khalu Mahāprajāpati bhi-
2 kṣuṇī ṣaḍ-bhikṣuṇī-sahasrai³ • sa-
parivārā bhagavataḥ sāntikād
ātmano vyāka-
3 raṇam śrutv-ānuttarāyām sam-
yak-sambodhau āścarya-prāp-
tā abhūd adbhuta-prāptā Ya-
śodharā
4 bhikṣuṇī Rāhula-mātā catur-bhik-
ṣuṇī-sahasrai³ parivṛtā : pura-
5 skṛtā bhagavataḥ sāntikāt sam-
mukham ātmano vyākaraṇam
śrutv-ānuttarāyām
6 samyak-sambodhau āścarya-prāp-
tā abhūsi adbhuta-prāptās ta-
syām velāyām tā bhikṣuṇya i-

¹ Read °ṇāni.² Read bha°.³ Read °sraiḥ (see p. 156).

NEPALESE MSS.

- tathāgato 'rhan samyak-sambuddho
loke¹ bhaviṣyasi vidyā-caraṇa-
saṃpannaḥ sugato lo-
ka-vid anuttaraḥ puruṣa-damya-sā-
rathih śāstā devānām ca manu-
ṣyāṇām ca buddho bhagavān
bha-
drāyām loka-dhātau | aparimitam ca
tasya bhagavato Raśmi-śata-sa-
hasra-pari-

- pūrṇa-dhvajasya tathāgatasya [ārha-
taḥ samyak-sambuddhasya] āyus-pra-
māṇam bhaviṣyati || atha khalu
Mahāprajāpati [Gautamī] bhi-
kṣuṇī ṣaḍ-bhikṣuṇī-sahasra-parivārā
Ya-
śodharā ca
bhikṣuṇī catur-bhikṣuṇī-sahasra-
parivārā
bhagavato 'ntikāt svakaṃ vyāka-
raṇam śrutv-ānuttarāyām

- samyak-sambodhau āścarya-prāp-
tā adbhuta-prāptās ca tasyām
velāyām i

¹ AC^aW om.

HOERNLE MS. No. 148.

7 *mā*¹ *gāthām bhāṣiṃsu* ॥ bhagavān si netāsi vināyako 'si śāstāsi lokasya sa-deva-

Fol. 260 Obv.

- 1 *kasya* • āśvāsa-dātā nara-deva-pūjīti² *vayam* ti samtoṣita adya nāyaka ॥ *atha*
- 2 *khalu tā bhikṣuṇya imā gāthā*¹ *bhāṣitvā bhagavantam* etad avocu • *vayam* api *bhagavan* utsahāma imam dharma-paryāyam paścime kāle tathāgate parinivṛte³ *iha Sa-*
- 4 *he loka-dhātu samprakāśayitum* *apy anyeṣu loka-dhātuṣu* • *atha khalu bhagavān*⁴ *ye-*
- 5 *ta*⁵ *tāny aṣīti-bodhisatba-koṭi-nayuta-śata-sahasrāṇi* pratilabdhanām *bodhisatbā-*
- 6 *nām mahāsatbānā*⁶ *avaivartika-dharma-cakrā-pravartakā* *bodhisatbā mahāsatvās ten* āvalo-
- 7 *kayati sma* ॥ *atha khalu te bodhisatvā*⁷ • *samanantar-āvalokitā* *evam bhagavatā sarve utthā-*

NEPALESE MSS.

*mām gāthām abhāṣanta*¹ ॥ *bhagavān* *vinetāsi vināyako 'si śāstāsi lokasya sa-deva-*

kasya | āśvāsa-dātā nara-deva-pūjito *vayam* pi samtoṣita adya nātha ॥ 1 ॥ *atha*

khalu tā bhikṣuṇya imām gāthām bhāṣitvā bhagavantam etad ūcuḥ | *vayam* api *bhagavan*

*van samutsahāmaha*² *imam dharma-paryāyam samprakāśayitum* paścime kāle [*paścime samaye*] 'pi [*tv*'] *anyeṣu loka-dhātuṣv* [*iti*] ॥ *atha khalu bhagavān* *ye-*

na tāny aṣīti-bodhisattva-koṭi-nayuta-śata-sahasrāṇi [*dhāraṇi*] *pratilabdhanām bodhisattvānām* *avaivartika-dharma-cakra-pravartikānām*

ten āvalokayāmāsa | *atha khalu te bodhisattvā* [*mahāsattvāḥ*] *samanantar-āvalokite bhagavatā utthā-*

¹ Read *imām*, and *imām gāthām*.

² Read *pūjito*, and for the same blunder see the third fragment, rev. l. 8, *śaili* for *śailo*, p. 171, and Notes, p. 173.

³ Read *parinivṛte*.

⁴ Read *bhagavān*. ⁵ Read °*na*.

⁶ Read *mahāsattvānām*.

⁷ Read *bodhisattvāḥ* (see p. 156).

¹ W °*śataḥ*; AB °*śata*.

² BC^bK om. *sam*.

HOERNLE MS. No. 148.

Fol. 260 Rev.

- 1 yāsanebhyo yena bhagavāms ten-
āmjalī¹ praṇāmayitvā bhaga-
vantam upasamkrāmsu • e-
2 vaṁ cintayaty² asmākam api bha-
gavān adhyeṣaty³ asya dhar-
ma-paryāyasy ānāgate 'dhvani
samprakā-
3 śana(tā)ya • atha khalu te sarve
bodhisatvā evam anuvicintayi-
tvā samprakāmpayiṣu (pa)-
4 rasparasy āivam ūcuḥ katham
kariṣyāma kulaputrāho ayam
bhagavann³ asmākam adhye-
5 ṣaty asya dharma-paryāyasy ānā-
gate 'dhvani samprakāśanatā-
ya • atha khalu te sarve bodhi-
6 satvā bhagavatā⁴ gauraveṣātma-
naś ca pūrva-caryā-praṇidhā-
naena sāmagryā bhagavatau⁴
'bhimukhā
7 sthitvā simha-nādam nadinsu •
vayam bhagavann imam dhar-
ma-paryāyam tathāgate pari-
nirvṛte daśa-

¹ Read *āmjalīm*.
² Read *cintayanti*.
³ Read *bhagavān*.
⁴ Read *bhagavato*.

NEPALESE MSS.

- yāsanebhyo yena bhagavāms ten-
āñjalīm praṇāmyāi-¹
vaṁ cintayāmāsuḥ | asmān² bhaga-
vān adhyeṣaty³ asya dharma-
paryāyasya samprakā-
śanatāyai⁴ | te khalv
evam anuvi-
cintya samprakāpitāḥ pa-
rasparam ūcuḥ | katham [*vayam*] ku-
laputrāḥ kariṣyāmo yad bhaga-
vān adhye-
ṣaty asya dharma-paryāyasy ā-
nāgate 'dhvani samprakāśana-
tāyai⁵ || atha khalu te kula-
putrā bhagavato gauraveṣātmanaś
ca pūrva-caryā-praṇidhānaena
bhagavato
'bhimukham
simha-nādam nadante sma | vayam
bhagavann [*ānāgate 'dhvan-*]imam
dharma-paryāyam tathāgate pari-
nirvṛte daśa-

[*su dikṣu gatvā sarva-sattvāḥ lekha-*
ṣyāmaḥ pāṭhayiṣyāmaś cintāpayi-
ṣyāmaḥ prakāśayiṣyāmo bhagavato ev-
ānubhāvena]

¹ K *praṇamyāi*.
² ABC^aK *asmākam*. ³ K *adhyeṣaty*.
⁴ AW *śanāyeti*, B *śanāya*.
⁵ BK *śanāyeti*, C^b *śanāyati*.

TRANSLATION.¹

(Fol. 253 a.) And all these had been instructed by Mañjuśrī, the royal prince, so that they had reached the highest perfect enlightenment. The Bodhisattvas among them, who had previously set out in the Great Vehicle, praised the virtues of the Great Vehicle, the six perfections.² And all of them recognized the voidness of all objects and the virtues of the Great Vehicle. Thereupon Mañjuśrī, the royal prince, spoke thus to the Bodhisattva Prajñākūṭa: 'Noble youth, all this instruction of beings has been done by me while I was staying in the midst of the ocean, and this is seen (as the result thereof).' Thereupon the Bodhisattva Prajñākūṭa asked Mañjuśrī, the royal prince, by chanting the (following) Gāthās:

'Most excellent one,³ most wise one, great hero, most mighty one, innumerable (beings) have been instructed'⁴

[The Bodhisattva Prajñākūṭa said: 'I have seen the Lord Śākyamuni, the Tathāgata, striving after enlightenment. He did many meritorious works, when he had become a Bodhisattva, and during many thousands of ages] he never slackened in his energy. (Fol. 253 b.) In the Trisāhasra-Mahāsāhasra world there is not even a spot as large as a grain of mustard-seed where he has not sacrificed his body for the sake of beings. Afterwards he has attained enlightenment. Who will believe that⁵ it will be possible to attain the highest perfect enlightenment in one moment?' Now at that instant the daughter of Sāgara, the King of Nāgas, appeared standing in front (of them). Having bowed her head to the feet of the Lord, she stood aside. At that time she spoke the following Gāthās:

'The holy, subtle body, gifted with profound virtues, adorned with the thirty-two signs, pervades the regions in all directions;

'(The body,) provided with the secondary signs, worshipped by all beings, accessible to [all] beings like a market-place.

'According to my wishes was (Fol. 254 a) my enlightenment;⁶ the Tathāgata

¹ All passages in square brackets have been supplied from the Nepalese text; those in round brackets are explanatory.

² Here the Nepalese text adds: Those of the Bodhisattvas who had been formerly Śrāvakas praised the Vehicle of Śrāvakas. [See Index, p. 210.—R. H.]

³ *Mahāsamudra* must be a clerical error for *mahābhadra*.

⁴ After this there is a long gap; see the remarks below, p. 156.

⁵ I have translated *yat* instead of *yaḥ*; see footnote 1 on p. 159.

⁶ I have followed the Nepalese text, as the passage is corrupt in the fragment.

is my witness to it. I shall make known the great (Law) that delivers from all sufferance.'

Now at that time the exalted Śāriputra said to the daughter of the King of Nāgas: 'Noble maid, thou hast only conceived the idea of enlightenment without turning back, and thou art of unfathomable wisdom, but perfect enlightenment is difficult to attain. There may be, noble maid, a woman that does not slacken in energy and performs meritorious acts and fulfils the six perfections during many thousands of ages, and yet until now none reaches Buddhaship. Why? There are five ranks that a woman until now cannot attain: firstly, the rank of Brahman; secondly, the rank of Śakra; thirdly, the rank of a Mahārāja; fourthly, the rank of a Cakravartin; fifthly, the rank of a Bodhisattva unable to turn back.' (Fol. 254 b.) Now at that time the daughter of Sāgara, the King of Nāgas, possessed an excellent jewel that equalled in value the whole Trisāhasra-Mahāsāhasra world, and this jewel was given by the daughter of the King of Nāgas to the Lord, and the Lord mercifully accepted it. Then the daughter of Sāgara, the King of Nāgas, said to the Bodhisattva Prajñākūṭa and the Sthavira Śāriputra: 'Was the jewel which I gave to the Lord promptly accepted by the Lord or not?' The Sthavira said, 'It was promptly given by thee and promptly accepted by the Lord.' The daughter of Sāgara, the King of Nāgas, said: 'Venerable Śāriputra, if I were gifted with great magic power, I should have attained perfect enlightenment sooner, and [there would have been] no one to receive this jewel.'

(Fol. 259 a.) [Then the Lord,] recognizing [in his mind] the thoughts [in the mind of the nun Yaśodharā], spoke thus to the nun Yaśodharā: 'I announce to thee Yaśodharā: Having left this world, you will give up the nature of woman and in the presence of ten hundred thousands of myriads of millions of Buddhas become a Bodhisattva, a preacher of the Law. And in due course, having accomplished the course of a Bodhisattva, thou shalt in thy last existence become in the world a Tathāgata named Raśmīśatasahasraparipūrṇadhvaja, an Arhat, perfectly enlightened, endowed with knowledge and conduct, a Sugata, knowing the world, supreme, a driver of the unbroken bulls of men, a teacher of gods and men, a Buddha, a Lord in the Bhadrā world. And boundless shall be the measure of life of that Lord, the Tathāgata Raśmīśatasahasraparipūrṇadhvaja.' (Fol. 259 b.) Then the nun Mahāprajāpatī, surrounded by six thousand nuns, having heard from the Lord the prophecy with regard to her attaining the highest perfect enlightenment, was struck with wonder and amazement. The nun Yaśodharā, the mother of Rāhula, surrounded, accompanied by four thousand nuns, having heard from the Lord the prophecy referring to her attaining the highest perfect enlightenment, was struck with wonder. Struck with amazement, those nuns at that time spoke the following Gāthā:

‘Thou art the Lord, thou art a leader, thou art an instructor, thou art a teacher of the world including the gods, (Fol. 260 a) a giver of comfort, worshipped by men and gods. To-day we have been gladdened by thee, O leader.’

Then, having spoken this Gāthā, those nuns spoke thus to the Lord: ‘We also, O Lord, will exert ourselves to proclaim this Dharmaparyāya in the last time, when the Tathāgata has become wholly extinct, in this Saha world and also in other worlds.’ Then the Lord looked towards the eighty hundred thousands of myriads of millions of Bodhisattvas Mahāsattvas, who had obtained [magical spells], the Bodhisattvas Mahāsattvas who made roll on the wheel of the Law that never rolls back. As soon as those Bodhisattvas had thus been looked at by the Lord, all of them rose from their seats, (Fol. 260 b) raised their folded hands towards the Lord, and approached the Lord. They reflected thus: ‘We also are invited by the Lord to proclaim this Dharmaparyāya in future.’ When they had thus reflected, all those Bodhisattvas trembled. They asked one another thus: ‘What shall we do, noble youths? the Lord here invites us to proclaim this Dharmaparyāya in future.’ Thereupon, out of respect for the Lord and on account of their own vows in their previous course, all those Bodhisattvas together, turning their faces towards the Lord, roared a lion’s roar: ‘When the Tathāgata has become wholly extinct, we, O Lord, [want to go in the] ten [directions and make all beings write, read, think over and proclaim] this Dharmaparyāya [by the power of the Lord].’

NOTES.

The orthography of the fragment calls for few remarks. After *r* a consonant is never doubled; nor after *rr* (in *durrlabham* 254 a^{iv}). As the first letter in a group a consonant is doubled only once in *abhisambuddhyeyam* (254 bⁱⁱ). In *āyusmāñ Cchāripuṭras* (254 aⁱⁱ) the *cha* is doubled after *ñ* against the common rule. On the other hand, the etymological double consonant is simplified in the word *salva* everywhere (e. g. 253 aⁱⁱ. iv. v. vi) and in *ma[ha]rdhinī* in 254 b^{vii}. The *jihvāmūliya* and *upadhmaniya* do not occur, and a sibilant before another sibilant appears as *visarga*, except in *lakṣaṇais samalainkṛtam* (253 b^{vi}). Before *s* followed by a consonant, *visarga* is dropped once in *°bhimukhā sthītā* (260 b^{vi}). As frequently in manuscripts and inscriptions, *r* is written for *ri* in *ṛsāhasra*° (253 bⁱ, 254 bⁱⁱ). Clerical errors seem to abound. In 254 a^v we find *prāptobhi* for *prāpnoti*, and in 260 a^v *yeta* for *gena*. Twice the syllable *ha* or *hā* is missed out, viz. in 254 bⁱⁱ *masāhasram* for *mahāsāhasram*, and in 254 b^{vi} *mardhinī* for *maharddhinī*. The short vowel is written instead of the long one in *°dharmaḥ* (253 aⁱⁱⁱ), *śunyān* (253 aⁱⁱⁱ), *mulyam* (254 bⁱⁱ), and the long vowel instead of the short one in *bhādrāyām* (259 a^{vi}). *O* takes the place of *au* in *loka-dhāto* (253 bⁱ), and *au* the place of *o* in *bhagavatau*

(260 *b^v*). Instead of *o* we find *a* in *bhagavata* (254 *b^v*), *ā* in *bhagavatā* (260 *b^{vi}*), and *i* in *°pūjiti* (260 *aⁱ*). Anusvāra is missing in *anuttarasya* (253 *aⁱ*), *śakya* (253 *bⁱⁱⁱ*), *°anuttarā* (253 *bⁱⁱⁱ*), *śighrratara* (254 *b^{vii}*), *°manuṣyānā* (259 *a^{vi}*), *imā* (259 *b^{vii}*), *imā gathā* (260 *aⁱⁱ*), *mahāsambhānā* (260 *a^{vi}*), *°āṃjalī* (260 *bⁱ*), *cintayaty* (260 *bⁱⁱ*), and on the other hand superfluously added in *velāyāṃm* (253 *b^v*), *°sthānāṃm* (254 *a^{vii}*), *bhagavāṃm* (260 *a^{iv}*). Visarga is omitted in *abhisaṃbuddha* (253 *bⁱⁱ*), *tathāgata* (254 *aⁱ*), *pratigrhīta* (254 *bⁱⁱⁱ*), *°sahasrai* (259 *bⁱⁱ*), and *bodhisatvā* (260 *a^{vii}*), but it is to be observed that in all these cases the word is followed by a single dot which appears to be a blunder for the double dot of the visarga,¹ while in the case of *°sahasrai* (259 *b^{iv}*) that double dot (or visarga) is misplaced after *parivṛtā*. Final *n* is missing in *guṇā* (253 *aⁱⁱ*), final *t* in *ya* (254 *bⁱⁱ*), and medial superscribed *r* in *parinivṛte* (260 *aⁱⁱⁱ*).² In 260 *b^{iv}* we have *bhagavann* for *bhagavān*.

Considering the limited extent of the fragment, this is rather a long list, but it must be borne in mind that it is not quite sure that in all these cases we really have to assume mere clerical errors. Some of those forms, such as *pūjiti*, *guṇā*, &c., may after all be Prākṛit, and others, such as *śunyān*, *mulyān*, *bhādrāyān*, &c., may be imperfect and incorrect Sanskrit renderings of Prākṛit forms, due, not to a mistake of the scribe, but to the ignorance of the author of the text.

A certain want of care on the part of the scribe, however, is undoubtedly proved by a number of omissions,³ especially on the first two leaves. The largest lacuna occurs in 253 *a^{vii}*, where the text suddenly breaks off after *vinitā* in the middle of a Gāthā. The Nepalese text shows that about 420 akṣaras are omitted, so that it becomes almost certain that a whole leaf of the original manuscript was missing or overlooked by the scribe. In 253 *aⁱⁱⁱ* the Nepalese MSS. add after *saṃvarṇayanti* : *ye śrāvaka-pūrvā bodhisattvās te śrāvaka-yānam eva saṃvarṇayanti*, and the context shows that such a supplementary sentence is absolutely necessary. It is highly probable, therefore, that the scribe of our manuscript inadvertently omitted it by passing from the word *saṃvarṇayanti* of the preceding sentence to the same word in the next one. Similarly in 253 *bⁱⁱ* the words *°pi pṛthivī* seem to have been left out between *sarṣapa-mātro* and *pradeśaḥ*, which would account for the *o* of *sarṣapa-mātro*. In 253 *b^{vii}* four akṣaras (*taṃ | sarvasa*) are omitted. In 253 *b^{vii}*, 254 *aⁱ* two akṣaras are missing in *yaṃ yāmi sambodhiṃ*, for which the Nepalese MSS. read *yath-ēchayā me sambodhiḥ*. In 260 *a^v* the word *dhāraṇī* is omitted before *pratilabdhanāṃ*, probably because the word preceding *dhāraṇī* ended in *ṇi*. For a similar reason *abhūṣi* is probably omitted in 259 *b^{vi}*, in the Nepalese text, before *adbhuta-prāptāś*.

¹ [So also probably in the case of the prākṛitic, or semi-Sanskrit, forms *avocu* (260 *aⁱⁱ*), *upasaṃkraminsu* (260 *bⁱ*), *nadinsu* (260 *b^{vii}*) with a single dot, for *avocūḥ*, &c. ; but see the remarks on pp. 159-60.—R. H.]

² The correct form *parinivṛte* is found in 260 *b^{vii}*.

³ Shown in italic type within square brackets, in the transcript of the Nepalese text.

In spite of these inaccuracies the fragment is of the highest importance for the history of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka. Even a cursory comparison with the text of the Nepalese MSS. reveals the fact that there are numerous passages where one or more words have been added either in the fragment or in the Nepalese MSS. The fragment adds: 253 \bar{b}^i *sa*, 253 \bar{b}^{iii} *anuttarā[m]*, 254 \bar{b}^i *ratnam* (in *ekam maniratnam* instead of *eko manir*), 254 \bar{b}^v *sthavira āha*, 259 a^{ii} *itaś cavitvā stri-bhāvaṃ vivartayitvā, °nayuta-śata°* (between *buddha-koṭi°* and *°sahasrāṇām*), 259 a^{iv} *paścime samucchraye*, 259 \bar{b}^{iv} *Rāhulamātā*, 259 \bar{b}^v *saṃmukham*, 260 $a^{iii. iv}$ *tathāgate parinir[ṛ]vṛte iha Sahe loka-dhātau*, 260 a^{vi} *mahāsatvānā[m]*, *bodhisatvā mahāsatvās*, 260 a^{vii} *evam, sarve*, 260 \bar{b}^i *bhagavantam upasaṃkraminsu*, 260 \bar{b}^{ii} *api, anāgate 'dhvani*, 260 \bar{b}^{iii} *atha, sarve bodhisatvā*, 260 \bar{b}^{iv} *evam* (in *parasparasy-āvam*), *asmākam*, 260 \bar{b}^v *sarve*, 260 \bar{b}^{vi} *sāmagryā*, 260 \bar{b}^{vii} *sthitvā*. The Nepalese MSS. add¹: 253 \bar{b}^{ii} *°hitā°*, 253 \bar{b}^{iii} *anayā* (or *tayā*), *khalu*, 253 \bar{b}^{iv} *saṃ°*, *sma*, 254 a^{ii} *khalu, Sāgara°*, 254 a^{iv} *anekāni ca kalpaśatāny*, 254 a^{vi} *katamāni pañca*, 254 \bar{b}^i *khalu*, 254 \bar{b}^{ii} *Sāgara°*, 254 \bar{b}^{iii} *sa*, 259 a^{ii} *prativedayāmi te | tvam api*, 259 a^{iii} *satkāraṃ gurukāraṃ mānanāṃ pūjanāṃ arcanāṃ apacāyanāṃ kṛtvā*, 259 \bar{b}^i *arhataḥ samyak-saṃbuddhasya, Gautamī*, 260 a^{iii} *paścime samaye*, 260 a^{iv} *tv, iti*, 260 a^{vii} *mahā-sattvāḥ*, 260 \bar{b}^v *vayam*, 260 \bar{b}^{vi} *anāgate 'dhvani*.

These divergences sufficiently show that we have to acknowledge two different versions of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, the one represented by the fragment, the other by the Nepalese MSS. The number of additions being about the same in either of the two versions, it cannot be said that the one is either an amplification or an abridgement of the other; both must have developed from a common source. The original certainly had one of the readings preserved in the fragment, viz. *maṇi-ratnam* in 254 \bar{b}^i , which is supported also by the MSS. BK of the Nepalese version, while the *sma* in 253 \bar{b}^{iv} , omitted in the fragment, probably was missing also in the original, as it is omitted also in some of the Nepalese MSS. (AW). As for the rest of the additional matter, it seems to me impossible to decide whether it was already contained in the original or added afterwards.

The existence of two recensions is further proved by occasional differences in the order of words. In 254 \bar{b}^{vi} the fragment reads *bhadanta Śāriputra yady ahaṃ*, the Nepalese MSS. *yady ahaṃ bhadanta Śāriputra*, in 259 a^{iii} the fragment *anupūrveṇa ca bodhisatva-caryāṃ*, the Nepalese MSS. *bodhisattva-caryāṃ c'ānupūrveṇa*, in 260 a^{iii} the fragment *paścime kāle . . . saṃprakāśayitum*, the Nepalese MSS. *saṃprakāśayitum paścime kāle*, in 260 \bar{b}^{iii} the fragment *khalu te*, the Nepalese MSS. *te khalu*, in 260 \bar{b}^{iv} the fragment *karisyāma kulaputrāho*, the Nepalese MSS. *kulaputrāḥ karisyāmo*.

Of even greater importance are the differences in Gāthā 47 of chapter xi (253 a^{vii}) and in a prose passage in chapter xii (259 $\bar{b}^{ff.}$). In the Nepalese MSS. Gāthā 47 is in the Triṣṭubh metre:

¹ See footnote 3 on p. 156.

*mahābhadrā prajñāyā sūra-nāmann
asaṅkhyeyā ye vinītās tvayśādyā ।
sattvā amī kasya eśāyaṁ prabhāvas
tad brūhi prṣṭo nara-deva tvam etat ॥*

In the fragment only the first portion of the Gāthā is preserved, but this is sufficient to show that the stanza was composed in the Anuṣṭubh metre :

*mahāsamudra*¹ *mahāprajña mahāśūra mahābala ।
asaṅkhyeyā vinītā × × × × × — × × ॥*

In 259 ^b ff. it is said that the nuns Mahāprajāpatī and Yaśodharā were struck with wonder and amazement when they heard the Lord's prophecy concerning their attaining supreme perfect enlightenment. What is said conjointly of the two nuns in the Nepalese MSS. is narrated first of Mahāprajāpatī and then repeated once more with regard to Yaśodharā in the fragment. In these cases it seems to me impossible to say what was the original reading.

As was to be expected, there are also numerous various readings. Only a very small portion of them can be accounted for as blunders on the part of the copyists. Thus in the fragment, *mahāsamudra* in 253 ^a vii is certainly a mistake for *mahābhadrā*, *bhagavann* in 260 ^b iv for *bhagavān*, perhaps also *me tatra* in 254 ^a i for *me 'tra*, which suits the metre, and *sarva-duḥkha-pramocanam* in 254 ^a i for *dharmaṁ duḥkha-pramocanam*. On the other hand, *satva-vinayaḥ* in 253 ^a v, *punya-gabhīraṁ* in 253 ^b v, and *ti* which represents *te* (=Skt. *tvayā*) in 260 ^a i, seem to be better readings than *saṁvinayaḥ*, *punyaṁ gambhīraṁ* and *pi*, found in the Nepalese MSS., and there can be no doubt that *asmākam* and *adhyeṣaty* (*adhyeṣyaty*) in 260 ^b ii. iv are the correct readings instead of *asmān* and *adhyeṣaty*, as they are supported by some of the Nepalese MSS. themselves (ABC^aK). But in most cases both readings, shown in the subjoined list, are equally justifiable.

FRAGMENT.

253 ^b i *antamaśaḥ*
253 ^b vii *yaṁ . . . yāmi saṁbodhiṁ*³
254 ^a v *paripūrayate*

NEPALESE MSS.

*antaśaḥ*²
yath-ēcchayā me saṁbodhiḥ
paripūrayati

¹ Read *mahābhadrā*.

² *Antamaśaḥ* agrees with Pāli *antamaso*, while *antaśaḥ* is found also in other Buddhist works in mixed dialect.

³ The correctness of this reading is doubtful, as I am unable to restore the missing syllables.

FRAGMENT.	NEPALESE MSS.
254 <i>l</i> ⁱⁱ <i>kṛtsnām trisāhasra-ma[hū]sāhas- raṁ lokadhātum</i>	<i>kṛtsnām trisāhasrām mahāsāhasrām lokadhātum</i>
254 <i>l</i> ⁱⁱⁱ <i>bhagavato</i>	<i>bhagavate</i>
254 <i>l</i> ^{vii} <i>ma[ha]rdhinī</i>	<i>maharddhikī</i>
254 <i>l</i> ^{vii} <i>pratigra[hītā]</i>	<i>pratigrāhakaḥ</i>
259 <i>a</i> ⁱ <i>pravivitarakam</i>	<i>parivitarakam</i>
259 <i>a</i> ⁱⁱ , 260 <i>a</i> ^v ° <i>koṭi</i> ^o	° <i>koṭi</i> ^o
259 <i>a</i> ^{vi} <i>deva-manuṣyānā[m]</i>	<i>devānām ca manuṣyānām ca</i>
259 <i>l</i> ⁱⁱ , <i>v</i> <i>ātmano</i>	<i>svakam</i>
259 <i>l</i> ^{iv} ° <i>sahasrai[h]</i> <i>parivṛtā</i>	° <i>sahasra-parivārā</i>
260 <i>a</i> ⁱ <i>nāyaka</i>	<i>nātha</i>
260 <i>a</i> ^{vi} ° <i>āvalokayati sma</i>	° <i>āvalokayāmāsa</i>
260 <i>a</i> ^{vii} ° <i>āvalokitā</i>	° <i>āvalokite</i>
260 <i>l</i> ⁱⁱ <i>cintaya[m]</i> <i>ty</i>	<i>cintayāmāsuḥ</i>
260 <i>l</i> ^v <i>bodhisa[t]</i> <i>tvā</i>	<i>kulaputrā</i>
260 <i>l</i> ^{vi} ° <i>bhimukhā</i>	° <i>bhimukham</i>

This list, however, is not complete. There is still another group of various readings which are of peculiar interest and, on that account, require to be treated separately. As will appear from the following list, there are numerous passages where the fragment exhibits either pure Prakrit or bad Sanskrit forms instead of the correct Sanskrit forms appearing in the Nepalese MSS.

FRAGMENT.	NEPALESE MSS.
253 <i>a</i> ⁱⁱⁱ <i>samjānanti</i>	<i>samjānate</i> (Pān. I. 3, 46)
253 <i>a</i> ^{vi} <i>paripṛcchat</i>	<i>paripṛcchati sma</i> (C ^b <i>paripṛcchata</i> , K <i>paripṛcchat</i>)
253 <i>l</i> ⁱⁱⁱ <i>etaṁ</i> ¹	<i>evam</i> (BK <i>enam</i> , W <i>etām</i>)
253 <i>l</i> ⁱⁱⁱ <i>śraddadhāsyati</i>	<i>śraddadhāt</i> (B <i>śraddhāsyati</i> , K <i>śrad- dhadhāt</i> , C <i>śraddadhāt</i>)
253 <i>l</i> ^v <i>vāṁdyśārkānte</i>	° <i>ābhivāndyśārkānte</i>
253 <i>l</i> ^{vi} <i>spharati</i> (compare Pāli <i>pharati</i>)	<i>sphurati</i>

¹ The fragment reads: *ka etaṁ śraddadhāsyati yaḥ śakya muhūrten-ānuttarā samyak-sambodhim abhisamboddhum*, the Nepalese MSS. *ka evam (enam, etām) śraddadhāyād yad anayā śakyaṁ muhūrtena samyak-sambodhim abhisamboddhum*. *Etaṁ* apparently is the Prakrit form of the accusative of the neuter (= Skt. *etat*), which, when no longer understood, was changed into *evam (enam, etām)* in the Nepalese MSS., while in the fragment it caused *yaḥ* to be substituted for *yat*, whereby the sentence became perfectly unintelligible.

FRAGMENT.	NEPALESE MSS.
254 a ^{iii. iv} <i>kuladukhite</i>	<i>bhagini</i> (BC ^b K <i>kulaputri</i>)
254 b ⁱⁱ <i>kṣamati</i>	<i>kṣamate</i>
259 a ⁱⁱⁱ <i>sāntike</i>	<i>antike</i>
259 a ⁱⁱⁱ <i>anupūrveṇa</i> (compare Pāli <i>anupubbeṇa</i>) <i>ca</i>	<i>csānupūrveṇa</i> ¹
259 a ^{iv} <i>paripūrayitvā</i>	<i>paripūrya</i> (AC ^b W <i>paripūrayitvā</i>)
259 a ^v <i>’rhān</i>	<i>’rhan</i>
259 b ^{ii. v} <i>°taḥ sāntikād (sāntikāt)</i>	<i>°to’ntikāt</i>
259 b ^{vii} <i>bhāṣiṃsu</i>	<i>abhāṣanta</i> (W ° <i>ṣataḥ</i> , AB ° <i>ṣatu</i>)
259 b ^{vii} <i>bhagavān</i> ²	<i>bhagavān</i>
260 a ⁱⁱ <i>avocu</i>	<i>ūcuḥ</i>
260 a ⁱⁱⁱ <i>utsahāma</i>	<i>samutsahāmaha</i> (BC ^b K <i>utsa</i> °)
260 b ⁱ <i>praṇāmayitvā</i>	<i>praṇāmyśāi</i> ° (K <i>praṇamyśāi</i> °)
260 b ^{ii. v} <i>saṃprakāśanatāya</i>	<i>saṃprakāśanatāyai</i> (AWK ° <i>śanāyeti</i> , B ° <i>śanāyeti</i> and ° <i>śanāya</i> , C ^b ° <i>śanāyati</i>)
260 b ⁱⁱⁱ <i>anuvicintayitvā</i>	<i>anuvicintya</i>
260 b ⁱⁱⁱ <i>saṃprakāṃpayiṣu</i>	<i>saṃprakampitūḥ</i>
260 b ^{iv} <i>karīṣyāma</i>	<i>karīṣyāmo</i>
260 b ^{iv} <i>kulaputrāho</i>	<i>kulaputrāḥ</i>
260 b ^{vii} <i>nadinsu</i>	<i>nadante sma</i> ³

Similarly instead of faulty or clumsy constructions in the fragment the correct ones appear in the Nepalese MSS. In 253 aⁱⁱⁱ we read in the fragment : *sarve ca te sarva-dharm[ā]ḥ ś[ū]nyān iti saṃjānanti* ; the Nepalese MSS. have correctly *sarva-dharmāñ*. The words *ṣaḍ-bhikṣuṇī-sahasrai[ḥ] saparivārā* in 259 bⁱⁱ are replaced by *ṣaḍ-bhikṣuṇī-sahasra-parivārā* in the Nepalese MSS. In 260 b^{iv} the fragment has *parasparasyśāvam ūcuḥ*, the Nepalese MSS. *parasparam ūcuḥ*. In 260 a^v the words *avaivartika-dharma-cakrra-pravartakā bodhisa[t]tvā mahāsa[t]tvās* stand quite unconnectedly in the fragment, as if added by an afterthought ; in the Nepalese MSS. they are incorporated into the period by putting the first epithet into the genitive and dropping *bodhisattvā mahāsattvās* altogether. In the same way the words *ayaṃ saṃprakāśanatāya* in 260 b^{ii. v} are connected with the preceding sentence in the Nepalese MSS. by substituting *jad* for *ayaṃ*.

¹ Provided that this is to be dissolved into *ca ānupūrveṇa*.

² This form is found also in the Mahāvastu and in the fragments edited by Pischel ; see Pischel, *loc. cit.*, p. 6.

³ To these may be added a few forms which have no equivalents in the Nepalese MSS., but seem to be foreign to the language of that recension, viz. *cavitvā* (259 aⁱⁱ), *vivartayitvā* (259 aⁱⁱ), *abhūṣi* (259 b^{vi}), *upasaṃkramiṃsu* (260 bⁱ).

In my opinion there can be no doubt that, as regards single forms, at any rate, the fragment has preserved the older readings. There is no reason conceivable why e. g. such forms as *abhāṣanta*, *ūcuḥ*, *saṃprakampitāḥ*, *naḍante sma*, should have been altered into *bhāṣiṃsu*, *avocu*, *saṃprakampayiṣu*, and *naḍiṃsu*, whereas the reverse is easily intelligible as an attempt at sanskritizing the text. But I am far from believing that the fragment exhibits the text in its original state. There are certain facts which tend to show that to a certain extent the process of sanskritization has taken place also in the fragment. In 253 aⁱ we find *anuttarasya[m]*, for which the Nepalese MSS. read *anuttarāyām*,¹ and the readings °*śūra* in 253 a^{vii}, °*pravartakā* in 260 a^{vi}, which must be compared with *śūra*° and °*pravartikānām* in the Nepalese MSS., are perhaps to be judged in the same way.² In 253 a^{vii} it is said of the Buddha that during many thousands of ages he never slackened in his energy: [na] *kaḍācid vīryam sraṃsitavān*. For *sraṃsitavān* the Nepalese MSS. read *saṃśritavān*. The correct reading undoubtedly is *sraṃsitavān*, but it is difficult to understand how this should have been replaced by *saṃśritavān*, unless we assume that the original reading was a Prākṛit form, such as e. g. *saṃsitavā*. This has been correctly sanskritized into *sraṃsitavān* in the fragment, whereas in the Nepalese version it was wrongly rendered by *saṃśritavān*. The root *sraṃs* occurs once more in connexion with *vīryam* in 254 a^{iv} *na ca vīryam sraṃsayati*. Here the Nepalese MSS. offer the readings *saṃprakāśayati*, *praśayati* (W), *janayati* (C^b), *saṃmayati* (BK), all of which are wrong, but the last-mentioned one makes it probable that the original reading was *saṃsayati*, which has been sanskritized in the fragment into *sraṃsayati*.

In the Gāthās, where naturally it was often impossible on account of the metre to replace the Prākṛit forms by Sanskrit forms, the text itself appears to have been changed occasionally in the Nepalese MSS. to avoid the Prākṛit forms. In the fragment the first Gāthā of chapter xii (259 b^{vii}) begins: *bhagavām si netśāsi vināyako* 'si, with the second person sing. of the present of *as* preserved in its true Prākṛit form after *bhagavām*. In the Nepalese MSS. we read *bhagavān vinetśāsi vināyako* 'si. Here *si* has been altered into *vi* without regard to the perfect tautology which arose in this way.

From these facts we may safely conclude that the text of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka to which both the Central-Asian and the Nepalese MSS. go back, was written in a language that had far more prākṛitisms than either of the two versions. I am even inclined to believe that the original was written in a pure Prākṛit dialect which was afterwards gradually put into Sanskrit. But I admit that the materials

¹ In 259 b^v both versions have *anuttarāyām*.

² The form *śūra*, however, may have been the original Māgadhī form which was wrongly rendered into *śūra* in the Nepalese MSS. (see the remarks below), and °*pravartikānām* may be a simple corruption due to the influence of the preceding *avaivartika*°.

which are at present at our disposal are not sufficient to prove this ; in fact, I do not see how it ever could be proved definitely except by discovering that Prākṛit version itself.

But apart from this question, we can, with the help of the fragment, determine the Prākṛit dialect which must be at the bottom of the language of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka. In 260^{biv} we find a vocative plur. *kulaputrāho*. Vocatives in *-āho* from bases in *a* are found only in Māgadhī.¹ We may therefore assert that the original text of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka was written, if not in pure Māgadhī, in a 'mixed Sanskrit' which was based on that dialect.

2. ANOTHER FRAGMENT OF THE SADDHARMA-PUṆḌARĪKA

Hoernle MSS., No. 142, SB. 12. (Plate XVIII, No. 2, Reverse.)

This fragment, one of the smaller of the Hoernle Collection, is the right side of a leaf belonging to another manuscript of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka. The preserved portion of the text is found in the beginning of chapter xxii.

The fragment, measuring 170 × 132 mm. (or $6\frac{7}{10} \times 5\frac{1}{2}$ inches), is only about one-third of the whole leaf, as it contains on an average eleven akṣaras in each line, whereas about twenty-four akṣaras are missing in the beginning of each line.² There are six lines on either side.

The characters are of the same type as those of the larger fragment, Hoernle MS., No. 148, SA. 22-5. There are only four points of difference. First, the four varieties of medial *ā* are reduced here to three, *mā* and *dhā*, which in the larger fragment are combined with the second form, here showing the first form (obv. ll. 1, 5). In *rhā* also the first form is employed (obv. l. 4). With this exception the use of the different forms is the same as in the larger fragment. The third form is found once only, in *syān* (rev. l. 4). Secondly, of the two forms of medial *i*, the prone never occurs, but only the erect (e.g. *mi*, obv. l. 2). Thirdly, the sign placed above the small letter to denote absence of vowel is not a semicircle, but a dot with a tail slanting down to the right (obv. l. 3, rev. l. 2). Fourthly, the retention of the side-stroke in conjunct *t* appears to be almost regular. There are altogether seven cases. Among them there is only one in which the side-stroke is clearly

¹ See Pischel, Grammatik der Prākṛit-Sprachen, § 372.

² This estimate is based on line 4 of the obverse and ll. 5, 6 of the reverse, taking into account such divergences from the text of the Nepalese MSS. as appear absolutely certain.

omitted, viz. in *tta*, in obv. l. 3, °*dattam*. In four cases it is retained, viz. in *tva*, obv. l. 2 and rev. l. 4, °*satva*; in *tsa*, rev. l. 2, *tatsādhu*; and in *tra*, rev. l. 3, *tatra*. The remaining two cases are indistinct, viz. *tva* in obv. l. 1 and rev. l. 6. Below the *jā* in obv. l. 3 and the *lyā* in obv. l. 5 there is a small sign, apparently added afterwards, which looks like *sa*, but the meaning of which is unknown to me. The peculiar sign of the special Khotanese *r* occurs thrice in the subscript position, in obv. l. 5 *prratī*°, l. 6 *sahasrrebbhiḥ*, and in rev. l. 6 *prradakṣi*, while we have the ordinary *r* in obv. l. 2 *priya*, rev. l. 1 °*srebbhis*.

The text, with that of the Nepalese manuscripts printed opposite, runs as follows:—¹

TEXT

HOERNLE MS.

NEPALESE MSS.

Obverse.

- 1 [tva (*samā*)dhi labdhaḥ vīryaṃ
drdhaṃ hy āra-
- 2 [saṃkusumita sa Sarvasatva-
priya-
- 3 [jānaṃ Vimaladattam etad avo-
cat,
- 4 [āgato 'rhān samyak-saṃbud-
dhaḥ tiṣṭha-

[ayaṃ mamā caṅkrama rāja-śreṣṭha yas-
min mayā sthi]tva samādhi lab-
dhaḥ | vīryaṃ drdhaṃ āra-

[bhitaṃ mahāvratāṃ parityajitvā priyam
ātma-bhāvaṃ || 1 || Atha khalu Nak-
ṣatrarāja]saṃkusumitā [bhijña] sa
Sarvasattvapriya-

[darśano bodhisattva imāṃ gāthāṃ
bhāṣitvā] tau sva-mātā-pitarāv¹
etad avocat, |

[ady-āpy amba tāta sa bhagavānś
Candrasūryavimalaprabhāsaśrīs tath-]
āgato 'rhan samyak-saṃbuddha
[etarhi] tiṣṭha-

[ti dhriyate yāpayati dharmāṃ deśayati
yasya mayā bhagavataś Candrasūrya-
vimalaprabhāsaśriyas tathāgatasya²

¹ v.l. *taṃ svaṃ mātā-pitaram*.

² Some MSS. omit *Candra*°-tathā-
gatasya.

¹ For the text of the Nepalese MSS. my thanks are again due to Professor Kern. [See also the Note on p. 143. The corresponding text of the Bibliotheca Buddhica edition is on p. 408, l. 14—p. 409, l. 12.—R. H.]

HOERNLE MS.

5 ॥lyāyā dhāraṇyāḥ prratilābho

6 ॥nayuta-śata-sahasrrebhiḥ

Reverse.

1 ॥srebhis tasya bhagavataḥ sānti-

2 ॥cat, tat sādhu mahārāja gamiṣyā-

3 ॥tatra gatvā bhūyas tasya bhagava-

4 ॥hāsattvas tasyām velāyām sapta-ra-

5 ॥bhyudgama tasya bhagavataḥ sakā-

6 ॥taṁ bhagavantaṁ sapta-kṛtva pradakṣi-

NEPALESE MSS.

pūjām kṛtvā sarva-ruta-kausa]ya-dhāraṇī prratilabdḥ

[āyaṁ ca Saddharma-puṇḍarīko dharmaparyāyo 'śitibhir gāthā-koṭi-]nayuta-śata-sahasraih

[kaṅkaraiś ca vivaraiś c'ākṣobhyaiś ca] tasya bhagavato 'nti-

[kac chruto 'bhūt, |] tat sādhu amba tāta gamiṣyā-

[my ahaṁ tasya bhagavato 'ntikaṁ] tasmimś ca gatvā bhūyas tasya bhagava-

[taḥ pūjām kariṣyāmīti | atha khalu Nakṣatrarājasamkusumitābhijña sa Sarvasattvapriyadarśano bodhisattvo ma]hāsattvas tasyām velāyām [sapta-tāla-mātraṁ vaihāyasam] abhyudgama sapta-ra-

[tnamaye kūṭāgāre paryāṅkam ābhujya] tasya bhagavataḥ sakā-

[śam upasaṁkrānta¹ upasaṁkrāmya tasya² bhagavataḥ pādaḥ śirasābhivandya³] taṁ bhagavantaṁ sapta-kṛtvaḥ pradakṣi-

[nikṛtya yena bhagavāṁś tenśāñjalim praṇāmya bhagavantaṁ namaskṛtvā ānāyā gāthayābhīṣṭauti sma ||]

¹ v.l. upasaṁkrāmad.

² Some MSS. omit tasya.

³ v.l. °vanditvā.

TRANSLATION.¹

(Obv.) ' [This, O excellent king, is my walk] standing [in which] I have acquired meditation. I have strenuously accomplished an act of heroism, [a great vow, by giving up my own dear body].'

[After having spoken this stanza], Nakṣatrarājasauṅkusumita, [the Bodhisattva] Sarvasattvapriyadarśana spoke thus to the great King Vimaladatta: ' [Even now, great king, the Lord Candrasūryavimalaprabhāsaśrī], the Tathāgata, the Arhat, the perfectly enlightened one, is living, [staying, existing, by worshipping whom] I have obtained the Dhāraṇī Sarvarutakaūśalyā [and this Dharmaparyāya of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, consisting of] hundred thousands of myriads of thousands (Rev.) [of stanzas, which I have heard] from that Lord.' [Then the Bodhisattva Sarvasattvapriyadarśana] spoke [thus]: ' Therefore, great king, I should like to go [to that Lord, and] having gone there, [worship] that Lord again.' At that instant [the Bodhisattva] Mahāsattva [Sarvasattvapriyadarśana, having sat down cross-legged on a tower consisting] of seven precious substances, rose [seven tālas into the sky and went] to the presence of that Lord. [Having gone there, he bowed his head to the feet of that Lord], circumambulated that Lord seven times, [stretched his joined hands towards the Lord, and having thus paid his homage, praised him with the following stanza].

NOTES.

The differences between the two texts are of the same kind as those existing between the larger fragment and the Nepalese MSS. Instead of the correct forms 'rhan, °sahasraih, antikāt, we find in the fragment the incorrect, but certainly more original forms 'rhān (obv. l. 4), °sahasrrebhik (obv. l. 6, rev. l. 1) and sānti[kāt] (rev. l. 1). Perhaps also °kṛtva (rev. l. 6) for °kṛtvah is to be added to these, but it may be merely a clerical error. On the other hand dr̥ḍham ārabhitam in the Gāthā has been changed into dr̥ḍham hy āra[bhitam] in the fragment, as in Sanskrit the anusvāra cannot stand before a vowel, and yet a long syllable was required by the metre.

The words [sarva-ruta-kaūśa]lyāyā dhāraṇyāḥ pṛratilābho (obv. l. 5) compared with sarva-ruta-kaūśalya-dhāraṇī pṛratilābhā in the Nepalese MSS. show that the construction of the sentence was different in the fragment.

A difference in the order of words occurs in ll. 4 and 5 of the reverse. Line 4 ends *saptara*, line 5 begins *bhyudgama*. The text therefore is to be restored to

¹ All words in square brackets have been supplied from the Nepalese version or from the context.

sapta-ra[*tnamaye kūtāgāre paryāṅkam ābhujya sapta-tāla-mātram vaihāyasam a*] *bhyud-gamya*, twenty-four akṣaras being missing at the beginning of line 5, just as twenty-five akṣaras are missing at the beginning of line 6. In the Nepalese MSS. the two gerunds together with the words dependent on them are reversed, but the reading of the fragment is undoubtedly the correct one. Sarvasattvapriyadarśana first sits down on the tower and from thence rises seven tālas into the sky to meet the Lord Candrasūryavimalaprabhāśrī. In the Nepalese version the story is quite unintelligible.

A rather indifferent various reading is *tatra* (rev. l. 3) for *tasmimś ca* in the Nepalese MSS. Larger differences affecting the sense occur in rev. l. 1, where [*saha*] *srebhiḥ* shows that the number of Gāthās ascribed to the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka was not the same as in the Nepalese version, and in obv. l. 3, rev. l. 2, where from the readings [*mahārā*] *jānaṁ Vimaladattam* and *mahārāja* instead of *tau sva-mātāpitarau* and *amba tāta* it appears that in the Central-Asian version Sarvasattvapriyadarśana addressed his speech not to his parents, but to his father, King Vimaladatta, alone.

Additions in the Nepalese MSS. are *etarhi* in obv. l. 4 and *abhijña* at the end of the name of Nakṣatrarājasamkusumita in obv. l. 2, both of which are quite superfluous, although the name of the Bodhisattva seems to be used always in the longer form in the Nepalese version. In the fragment the rest of an additional sentence is found in rev. l. 2, where *cat* apparently is to be restored to something like *atha sa Sarvasattvapriyadarśano bodhisattva etad avocat*. Other and considerable additions in either version may be inferred from the fact that the number of akṣaras corresponding to the missing akṣaras of the fragment varies from ten (rev. l. 3) to forty-nine (obv. l. 5) in a line in the Nepalese MSS.

This little fragment thus tends to confirm the conclusions we have drawn from the larger fragment with regard to the existence and character of the two versions of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, and it would be interesting to know in what relation these two versions stand to the Tibetan and the several Chinese translations of the work.

3. A FRAGMENT OF THE SANSKRIT CANON OF THE BUDDHISTS

Hoernle MSS., No. 142, SB. 35. (Plate XVIII, No. 3, Obv. and Rev.)

Tradition asserts that the Buddhist school of the Mūlasarvāstivādins, who traced their origin back to Rāhula, the son of the Master, used Sanskrit as the language of their holy scriptures. Until recently this Sanskrit canon seemed to have been lost, but the archaeological exploration of Central Asia so vigorously

carried on during recent years has shown that fortunately this is not the case. After Professor d'Oldenbourg had first pointed out, in fragments originating from Kashgar, single verses that had their parallels in the Pāli Suttapiṭaka,¹ Pischel, in an excellent paper in the Transactions of the Royal Prussian Academy,² was able to show that fragments of a block-print purchased by Professor Grünwedel at Idyikutšari contained portions, both in prose and in verse, of the Saṃyuktāgama, a division of that part of the ancient Sanskrit canon which was concerned with matters of Dharma and corresponded to the Suttapiṭaka of the Vibhajjavādins. A supplement to these discoveries is the fragment which I now lay before the public. It is the Sanskrit version of a text which in the Pāli canon is found in the Vinayapiṭaka, as well as in the Suttapiṭaka, and therefore in all probability a fragment of the Sanskrit canon.

The fragment, measuring about 313 × 135 mm. (or 12¼ × 5¼ inches), is the left side of a single leaf.³ The missing portion contained about sixteen akṣaras in each line. Unfortunately on the left side also a piece has been torn off, which has caused the loss of one or two akṣaras in the last three lines of the obverse and the first four lines of the reverse. In a few places, especially on the reverse, the writing has become indistinct by the rubbing off of the ink, but on the whole the reading presents no difficulties. About 130 mm. from the left margin is the string-hole, surrounded by a circle, 27 mm. (or 1⅛") in diameter. There are eight lines on either side. The number of the folio, unfortunately, is obliterated on the damaged left-hand margin.

The characters are of the same type as those of the preceding two fragments of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, but, as may be seen from Plate XVIII, they are somewhat more rounded and cursive. There are besides some special points of difference. The *ḷha* here shows a distinct loop; of which there is no trace in the two fragments of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, compare *ḷha* and *ḷhā* in Pl. XVIII, No. 3 a, ll. 4 and 6, with *ḷhū* and *ḷhi* in No. 1, l. 6, and *ḷho* and *ḷhi* in No. 2, ll. 5 and 6. The same loop appears, e. g., also in the variety of the alphabet used in the block-print from Idyikutšari.⁴ Of the four forms of medial *ā* appearing in the first fragment of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, only three are found here, the second form being absent, and their distribution is quite regular. The first form is employed in *cā* (obv. l. 5), *tpā* (rev. l. 7),

¹ Записки Восточнаго Отдѣленія Императорскаго Русскаго Археологическаго Общества VIII, 59 f.; 151 f. As this publication is not accessible to me, I quote it from Pischel's paper mentioned below.

² Sitzungsberichte der Kgl. Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 1904, p. 807 ff.

³ Only a portion of the fragment, being rather more than the right half, is shown in Plate XVIII, No. 3.

⁴ See, e. g., *l.c.* Plate VII, fol. 158^b, ll. 1, 2.

tyā (rev. l. 4), *tvā*, *thā* (obv. l. 1), *dhā* (rev. l. 3, *dhyā*, rev. l. 6), *nā* (rev. l. 5), *bdā* (obv. l. 6), *bhā* (obv. l. 7), *mā* (obv. l. 6), *rā* (*rgā* rev. l. 3, *rmā* obv. l. 8, *rvā* rev. l. 4), *vā* (obv. l. 1, *vyā* rev. l. 6), and also in initial *ā* (obv. l. 7). The third form occurs in *ghrā* (obv. l. 1), *yā* (obv. l. 7), *ṣṇā* (rev. l. 6), *sā* (obv. l. 7, *syā* obv. l. 1), *hvā* (obv. l. 7). The fourth form is found only in *jā* (rev. l. 4), and *jñā* (obv. l. 5). In addition to these forms we find here a new and quite peculiar one in *ṇā* (obv. l. 4). It consists in the right wing of the letter turning rightward and upward in a long leftward sweeping curve. The beginnings of this form may be seen in Northern Indian inscriptions from the fifth century onward, especially in Mahānāman's Bodhgaya Inscription of A.D. 588-9, l. 3, *nirvāṇā*^o, l. 5, *guṇā*^o, l. 7, *śaraṇā*^o (see Dr. Fleet's *Gupta Inscriptions*, Pl. XLI).¹ Medial *i* also appears in all three forms in which it is found in the first fragment of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka. Thus the erect form may be seen, e.g., in *dī* (obv. l. 1), *ktī* (obv. l. 5), *nī* (rev. l. 3), *dhi* (rev. l. 6). Of the two prone forms, the rightward occurs only in *lī* (rev. l. 8), while the leftward is found, e.g., in *ṣlī* (obv. l. 2), *cī* (obv. l. 4), *jī* (obv. l. 7). But in *sci* (rev. ll. 1 and 7) we have both the prone and erect forms; so also in *tī* (rev. ll. 1 and 3) and *vī* (obv. ll. 5 and 6); in fact with *tī* and *vī* the erect form is more usual; so that it is quite clear that the use of the two forms depended not on any fixed principle, but on the momentary whim of the scribe.² The signs for medial *u* and *ū* call for no remarks with the exception of the *ū* in *bhū* (obv. l. 1), which is quite different from the angular sign found in the same akṣara in the fragments of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka.³ Superscript *r* is always written above the line, except in *rśī* (rev. l. 3), where it is added behind the *śa* to avoid its running into the *śya* of the line above; a regular *rśī* is found a little further on in the same line.⁴ The virāma in *t* of *vepayet* in obv. l. 2 (not seen in Pl. XVIII, No. 3) shows the same form as in the larger fragment of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka. The sign for the upadhmaniya occurs in *mānaḥ-pratyā*^o (rev. l. 4). The dot serves as a sign of punctuation (rev. ll. 7, 8).

The Pāli text corresponding to the fragment is found in the Mahāvagga of the Vinaya-piṭaka, V, 1, 26-7, and in the Aṅguttara-nikāya, VI, 55, 11. To

¹ See also the Mandasor inscription of the time of Kumāragupta I, *ibid.*, Plate XI, ll. 3, 4, &c., and Bühler, *Indische Palaeographie*, Plate IV, transverse 21, cols. xii, xiv, xxii.

² [The same two forms are found also in the Sanskrit Vajracchedikā MS., and may be seen on Pl. XXI, No. 1, l. 5, the prone form in the first, and the erect form in the second of the two *cī* in *cīṭadhārā cīṭadhārā*.—R. H.]

³ [It is, however, found not infrequently in the Sanskrit Vajracchedikā MS., and may be seen on Plate XXI, No. 1, l. 2, in *Subhūta*.—R. H.]

⁴ [The same peculiar sideward position of *r* is found also in other manuscripts coming from the Khotanese area, in connexion with *ś* as well as other consonants; see footnote 8 on p. 90, and footnote 18 on p. 183.—R. H.]

facilitate a comparison, the text of the Mahāvagga is printed opposite to that of the fragment, with the few various readings of the Aṅguttara-nikāya added below.

Conjectural restorations of lost portions of the text are shown in small italic type.

TEXT

HOERNLE MS.

Obverse.

- 1 same bhūmi-bhāge pratiṣṭhitaḥ
athāgacchet pūrvasyā diśaḥ
śighrā vāta-vṛ(ṣṭī) || r na c
ānaṁ kampayen na saṁprakampa-
- 2 yen na saṁpravepayet, paścīmāyā
diśaḥ śighrā vāta-vṛṣṭīr na
cānaṁ ka || mpayen na saṁpra-
kampayen na saṁpra-
- 3 vepayed uttarasyā diśaḥ dakṣiṇ-
asyā diśaḥ śighrā vāta-vṛṣṭīr
na cānaṁ ka || mpayen na saṁ-
saṁprakampayen na saṁ-
- 4 pravepayed evam evānaṁ vi-
mukta-cittasya bhadaṁta ar-
hataḥ kṣiṇ-ā(sra) || vasya bhṛsaṁ
cakṣur-vijñeyā rūpās ca-
- 5 kṣ(u)ṣa ābhāsam āgacchanti na
cāsyā cetovimuktiṁ prajñā-
vimuktiṁ (pa) || ryāharanti ¹
amīśrikṛtam eva tac-cittaṁ bhavati
vyayaṁ
- 6 ca || samanupaśyati bhṛsaṁ c
āva śrotra-vijñeyāḥ śabdāḥ
śrotrasyābhāsam ā(ga) || ccha-

¹ The syllable *ryā* is doubtful.

MAHĀVAGGA.

- seyyathāpi bhante selo pabbato
acchiddo asusiro ekaghano
- ¹ puratthimāya ce pi disāya āgac-
cheyya bhusā vātavutṭhi | n'eva
naṁ saṁkampeyya na sampā-
kampe-
yya na sampavedheyya | ¹ pacchi-
māya ce pi disāya -la-
- ¹ uttarāyace pi disāya-la- ¹ dakkhiṇā-
ya ce pi disāya āgaccheyya bhusā
vātavutṭhi | n'eva naṁ saṁkam-
peyya na sampakampeyya na sam-
pavedheyya | evam eva kho bhante
evaṁ [sammā] vimuttacittassa
bhikkhuno bhusā ce pi cakkhu-
viññeyyā rūpā ca-
kkhussa āpāthaṁ āgacchanti |
n'ev'assa cittaṁ pariyādiyanti |
amissikataṁ ² ev'assa cittaṁ hoti
[tṭhitam ānejjappattam] vaya-
- ñ c'assānupassati || bhusā ce pi sota-
viññeyyā saddā ghāna viññeyyā
gandhā

¹ Aṅg. inserts *atha*.

² Aṅg. *amissikatam*.

HOERNLE MSS.

- nti bhṛśaṃ c'āva ghrāṇa-vijñeyā
gandhā ghrāṇasy'ābhā-*
- 7 *sa* *m* āgacchaṃti bhṛśaṃ c'āva
jīhvā-vijñeyā rasā jīhvāyā
ābhāsam āgaccha^{nti} bhṛśaṃ
c'āva kāya-vijñeyāḥ sparsāḥ kā-
- 8 *ya* *sy* ābhāsam āgacchaṃti bhṛ-
śaṃ c'āva mano - vijñāyā²
dharmā manasa ābhāsam *āga-*
cchanti na c'āsya ceto-vimuktiṃ
prajñā-vimuktiṃ

Reverse.

- 1 *paryā*¹ *m* haramti amīśrikṛtam eva
taś-cittaṃ³ bhavati vyayaṃ ca
samanupaśyati ta^m⁴
- 2 *x* *tad*-vyaya-dharmam eva sa-
manupaśyati virāga-dharmam
eva samanupaśyati ni^{rodham}
eva samanupaśyati pratinīhsarga⁵
- 3 *m* *e* *va* samanupaśyati vyay-
ānudarśi nirodh-ānudarśi pra-
tinihsarg-ānuda^{rśi}⁶
- 4 [*tra*] *syate* aparitasamānaḥ⁷ pra-
tyātman eva nirvāti kṣīṇa-
jāti^m⁶

² Read *vijñeyā*.³ Read *tac-cittaṃ*.⁴ I am unable to supply the missing words at the end of this line, and at the beginning of line 2.⁵ The gap is here filled up conjecturally.⁶ See footnotes 2 and 3, p. 172.⁷ Read *°trasyamānaḥ*.

MAHĀVAGGA.

jīvhāviññeyyā rasā kāyaviññeyyā
phoṭṭhabbā

manoviññeyyā dhammā manassa
āpāthaṃ āgacchanti n'ev'assa
cittaṃ

pariyādiyanti amissikatam³ ev'assa
cittaṃ hoti [*thitaṃ ānejjappattaṃ*]
vayaṃ c'assānupassatiti "

³ *Āṅg. amissikatam.*

HOERNLE MSS.

MAHĀVAGGA.

5 *smād-bhavaṃ prajānāti • idam
avocad āyuṣmān Śroṇa idam
vadi^stvā a*

6 *dhimuktasya pravīvekaṃ tathā
āiva ca • avyāvadhy-ādhimuk-
tasya trṣṇā-kṣaya-rata^sya ca⁸*

7 *cetasah jñātvā āyatan-ōtpādam
tataś cittaṃ vimucyate • tato
vimukta-⁸*

8 *ya n'āstī karaṇīyaṃ na vīdyate •
śailī⁹ yathā eka-gghano vā-
yunā⁸*

nekkhammaṃ a-
dhimuttassa pavivekaṃ ca cetaso |
avyāpajjhādhimuttassa upādā-
nakkhayaṃ ca || taṇhakkhaya-
dhimuttassa asammoḥaṃ ca

cetaso | disvā āyatanuppādam sammā
cittaṃ vimuccati || tassa sammā-
vimuttassa santacittassa bhik-
khuno || katassa paṭica⁴

yo n'atthi karaṇīyaṃ ca na vijjati ||
selo yathā ekagghano vātena na
samīrati | evaṃ rūpā rasā saddā
gandhā phassā ca kevalā || iṭṭhā
dhammā aniṭṭhā ca na pavedhenti
tādino |

⁸ See footnotes 4-6, p. 172.

⁹ Read *śailo*. See footnote 2, p. 151.

⁴ *Ang. paṭica°*.

TRANSLATION.¹

(Obv.) [Just as if there be, O Lord, a rocky mountain without holes, not perforated, solid,] standing on even ground, and a swift rain-wind should come from the eastern quarter, [yet it would not make it quake, or shake,] or tremble, a swift rain-wind (should come) from the western quarter, yet it would not make it [quake, or shake,] or tremble, a swift rain-wind (should come) from the northern quarter, from the southern quarter, yet it would not make it [quake, or shake,] or tremble; just so, O Lord, though [shapes perceptible by the eye should frequently] come within reach of the eye of the Arhat, whose mind has thus become emancipated, whose [passions] are extinct, they do not [change] the emancipation of his mind, the emancipation of his intellect; [undefiled is his mind, and] he perceives [the passing away]; though sounds perceptible by the ear should frequently come

¹ Passages restored on the basis of the Pāli text are enclosed in square brackets.

within reach of his ear, [though smells perceptible by the nose should frequently] come [within reach of his nose], though tastes perceptible by the tongue should frequently come within reach of his tongue, [though touches perceptible by the body should frequently] come within reach [of his body], though thoughts perceptible by the intellect should frequently [come] within reach of his intellect, [they do not change the emancipation of his mind, the emancipation of his intellect]; (Rev.) undefiled is his mind, and he perceives the passing away,¹; he perceives the condition of the passing away of those (impressions), he perceives the condition of absence of desire, [he perceives annihilation], he perceives [renunciation]; perceiving the passing away, perceiving annihilation, perceiving renunciation, [he is not in fear];² not being in fear, he is individually extinguished; he recognizes that his rebirth is cut off his existence³ Thus spoke the venerable Śroṇa. Having thus spoken, [he said further:

‘He]⁴ who is set upon [renunciation]⁴ and solitude, who is set upon kindness and delights in the rooting-out of thirst,—

‘. [who has attained to the absence of delusions]⁵ from the mind, he recognizes the source of sensations and then his mind is set free.

‘Then, after [his mind]⁶ has been set free, there is no [gathering up of what is done];⁶ nothing to be done remains.

‘As a solid rock [is not shaken]⁷ by the wind, [just so shapes and tastes and sounds and smells and touches—the whole of them—things wished for and unwished, cannot make tremble such a one].’⁷

NOTES.

There can be no doubt, I think, that the language of the fragment is not the so-called mixed dialect, but Sanskrit. There are indeed a few mistakes, but

¹ See footnote 4, p. 170.

² As regards the gap at the end of rev. l. 3 and the beginning of rev. l. 4, only the words *pratiniḥsarg-ānudarśi* and *na paritrasyate* can be restored with certainty.

³ The general tenor of this passage may be inferred from the corresponding Pāli passage quoted on p. 174, but the restoring of the exact text is difficult. *Kṣīṇajāti* would seem to point to a bahuvrīhi compound *kṣīṇa-jātiḥ*. *Smād* in rev. l. 5 I am unable to complete.

⁴ Among the syllables missing at the end of rev. l. 5 the first was *tvā* (*vadītvā*), the last *a* (*adhimuktasya*); the rest is uncertain. For the general sense compare the passage quoted on p. 174.

⁵ Restore at the end of rev. l. 6: *tṛṣṇā-kṣaya-ratasya ca*. The rest is quite uncertain.

⁶ The exact words at the end of rev. l. 7 cannot be restored. The *ya* at the beginning of rev. l. 8 suggests *paricayo* or *samcayo*.

⁷ These words rest entirely on the Pāli text.

they are for the most part only due to the scribe. Thus *mano-vijñāyā* (obv. l. 8) stands for *mano-vijñeyā*, *taś-cittam* (rev. l. 1) for *ta-cittam*, *aparitasyamānaḥ* (rev. l. 4) for *aparitrasyamānaḥ*, *ya* (rev. l. 8), which seems to be the rest of *paricaya* or *samcaya*, for [*parica*]yo or [*samca*]yo,¹ *śailī* (rev. l. 8) for *śailo*. There occur, as far as I see, only two genuine irregularities. In rev. l. 5 we have *vadi*, which undoubtedly is the rest of *vaditvā*, while the correct form would be *uditvā* (Pāṇ. I, 2, 7). In rev. l. 4 we find twice Ātmanepada forms of *tras*, viz. [*paritra*]syate and *aparit[r]a-syamānaḥ*, mentioned already above. According to Pāṇini (I, 3, 78 and III, 1, 70) the verb is conjugated only in Parasmaipada, but Ātmanepada forms are found also in the epic language.² In a few cases the rules of sandhi are not observed. In *āyusmān Śroṇa* (rev. l. 5) the *n* ought to have been changed into *ñ* before the *śa*, but this rule is often neglected in manuscripts. In *jñātvā āyatan-ōtpādam* (rev. l. 7) and *yathā eka-ghano* (rev. l. 8) the vowel combination has not taken place on account of the metre. In *pratiṣṭhitaḥ athā°* (obv. l. 1), *bhadamta arhataḥ* (obv. l. 4), *°haramti amīśrīkṛtam* (rev. l. 1), [*paritra*]syate *apari°* (rev. l. 4), *cetasaḥ jñātvā* (rev. l. 7), the suppression of the sandhi, of course, is perfectly justified, as in all these cases the first word is either the concluding word of a sentence or a verse, or a vocative which, in the spoken language at any rate, cannot enter into sandhi with the following word. From the absence of sandhi between *diśaḥ* and *dakṣiṇasyā* in obv. l. 3 we may infer that the words *śighrā pravepayet* were meant to be repeated after *diśaḥ*. Before *p* the upadhmāniya appears in *aparitrasyamānaḥ pratiy°* (rev. l. 4), but before *kṣ* we find not the jihvāmūliya, but the visarga in *arhataḥ kṣiṇā°* (obv. l. 4).³

From an examination of the Idyikutṣari fragments Pischel had come to the conclusion that the Sanskrit Canon was perfectly independent from the Pāli Canon and composed in a much more condensed language. In the present fragment also there is nothing to show that the Sanskrit text is a translation from the Pāli. In this respect it is remarkable that several times the Sanskrit text has not the exact equivalents of words used in the Pāli, but different terms. Instances are *śighrā* (obv. ll. 1, 2, 3) instead of *bhusā*, *sampravepayet* (obv. ll. 2, 3, 4) instead of *sampavedheyya*, *arhataḥ* (obv. l. 4) instead of *bhikkhuno*, *ābhāsam* (obv. ll. 5, 6, 7, 8) instead of *āpāthum*. In the Gāthās (rev. ll. 6 ff.) the divergences from the Pāli version are even greater. The Sanskrit text has *tath-āṅva ca* for *ca cetaso*, *trṣṇā-*

¹ It is not impossible that the *o*-sign was originally written and has only become rubbed off.

² See the St. Petersburg Dictionary.

³ This difference is strictly in accordance with the rules of the phonologists of the Taittiriya school (Taitt. Pr. IX, 3; Vyāsaśikṣā 158), but the scantiness of the materials makes it impossible to decide whether it is so by accident or intentionally.

ksaya-rata[sya ca] for *upādānakkhaya* *ca* or rather *tanhakkhaya* *ādhimuttassa*, as the two *pādas* seem to have changed their places in the Sanskrit version, *jñātvā* for *disvā*, *tataḥ* for *sammā* and *tassa*, *vāyunā* for *vātena*. But it cannot be maintained that the Sanskrit text of our fragment is shorter than the Pāli text. The only Pāli words omitted¹ in the fragment are *sammā*^o (obv. l. 4) and *thilam ānejjappattain* (obv. l. 5, rev. l. 1). But these omissions are more than counterbalanced by a number of additions. The epithets of the mountain (obv. l. 1) are here augmented by the addition of *same bhūmi-bhāge pratiṣṭhitāḥ*, those of the Arhat (obv. l. 4) by the addition of *kṣiṇ-āśra[vasya]*. Instead of *cittān pariyaḍiyanti* we find here *ceto-vimuktīm prajñā-vimuktīm pa[ryū]harānti* (obv. l. 5, rev. l. 1). The largest addition is the passage from *ta*^o to *vadī*^o (rev. ll. 2-5). There is nothing corresponding to it in the Pāli text, nor have I found its exact counterpart anywhere else in the Canon, though it contains nothing but familiar thoughts, and single portions of it are met with frequently. With *vyay-ānudarśi nirodh-ānudarśi pratinihsarg-ānuda[rśi]* in rev. l. 3 compare, e. g., Saṃyutta-nikāya XXXVI, 7, 6. 7. 8. 8, 6: *aniccānupassī viharati | vāyānupassī viharati | virāgānupassī viharati | nirodhānupassī viharati | paṇinissaggānupassī viharati* |. To the words: [*na paritra*] *syate aparit[r]asyamānaḥ pratyātman eva nirvāti kṣiṇajāti[h]* *smād-bhavaṃ prajānāti* in rev. ll. 4 and 5 corresponds, e. g., Saṃyutta-nikāya XXII, 53, 11; 54, 18; 55, 30; XXXV, 90, 11; 193, 11: *na paritassati | aparitassam paccattaññeva parinibbāyati | kkhīṇā jāti vusitaṃ brahmacariyaṃ kataṃ karaṇiyaṃ nāparam itthātāyāti pajānāti*. And the last phrase: *idam avocad āyuṣmān Śroṇa idam vadī[tvā]* . . . is well known from the Pāli Canon, where it forms the transition from the prose to the Gāthās just as in our passage; compare, e. g., Majjhima-nikāya 82: *idam avoc' āyasmā Raṭṭhapālo | idam vatvā athāparam etad avoca*, and Dīgha-nikāya XVI, 3, 51; XVII, 2, 17; &c.

As the leaf itself bears no mark indicating its origin, and as the corresponding Pāli text is practically identical in the Vinaya-piṭaka and the Aṅguttara-nikāya, it is at present impossible to decide whether the fragment belongs to the Vinaya or to the Ekōttarāgama of the Sanskrit Canon. And even a third possibility must be taken into consideration. It is a well-known fact that later Buddhist Sanskrit works have frequently taken over long passages from the older canonical scriptures. I need refer only to the Divyāvadāna, where we find many quotations from the Canon, especially from the Vinaya, embodied in the legends. It is therefore *a priori* not impossible that our leaf belonged to a later work, in which the passage preserved to us was only a quotation. However, there is nothing to prove this hypothesis; and even if it should be correct, this would detract but little from the value of the fragment, as, considering the archaic style and the

¹ Shown in small italics within square brackets in the transcript.

close agreement with the Pāli text, we might rest assured, I think, that the passage was taken literally from the Canon. Perhaps a comparison with the corresponding passages in the Chinese and Tibetan Canons will enable us to assign a definite place to this fragment, which testifies again to the original unity of the Buddhist doctrine in spirit and letter in the North as well as in the South.¹

¹ This question has been treated at length and with thoroughly convincing results by Professor Oldenberg in ZDMG., vol. lii, pp. 613 ff.

ADDITIONAL NOTE TO P. 144.

[AMONG the Stein MSS., recovered by him from the old Buddhist site at Farhad Beg (about eight miles north of Khadalik, Anc. Khot., II, 413-14; also *ante*, p. 2), there is a rather extensive fragment of a pothī of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, consisting of thirty-four folios, a specimen of which has been published by Prof. de la Vallée Poussin in the Journal RAS., 1911, pp. 1069-77. This specimen comprises the ending of the eleventh (fols. 7 b^{vii}-10 a^{vi}), and the beginning and ending of the twelfth chapter (fols. 10 a^{vi}-11 b^{viii} and fols. 13 bⁱⁱ-14 b^v), corresponding to the Kern edition, pp. 250^x-256^{vi}; also pp. 267ⁱ-269ⁱⁱⁱ and pp. 271^{vi}-274^{xi}. The middle portion of the twelfth chapter which is contained in fols. 12 aⁱⁱ-13 a^{viii}, and which corresponds to the text of fols. 259 and 260, on pp. 149-52 of the present volume, is omitted in Prof. de la Vallée Poussin's publication. A collation of this portion, made by me (August 1915), shows that the text of the Stein MS. completely agrees with the text edited by Professor Lüders, the agreement including even the curious reading *kulaputrāho* in fol. 260 b^{iv} (Stein MS. fol. 13 a^v). There are only two small differences: for *prativitarkam* 259 aⁱ the Stein MS. has *parivitarkam*, fol. 12 aⁱⁱⁱ, and for *strībhāvam* 259 aⁱⁱ it has *strībhāve*, fol. 12 a^{iv}. Moreover before *itaś cavitvā* 259 aⁱⁱ the Stein MS. inserts *prativedha* [*sic*] *yāmi · tvam api Yaśodhare*, fol. 12 a^{iv}; before *pratīlabdhānām* 260 a^v it inserts *dhāraṇi*, fol. 13 aⁱ; and after *te* 260 b^v it omits *sarve*, fol. 13 a^{vi}.

As regards the first excerpt, in fols. 253 and 254 on pp. 144-49 of the present volume, printed in the Kern ed., pp. 261^{xiv}-265ⁱⁱⁱ, its equivalent is entirely missing in the Stein MS. In fact, the whole of the text, printed in the Kern ed. on pp. 256^{vii}-266ⁱⁱⁱ, is missing in that MS., apparently due to some inadvertence by its scribe.—R.H.]