

A Gāndhārī Version of the Simile of the Turtle and the Hole in the Yoke*

I. Introduction

The simile of a blind (or one-eyed) turtle, which surfaces every hundred years, inserting its neck into a single hole in a (wooden) yoke that is floating on a vast ocean is well known in Buddhist, Jain, and even Brahmanical literature, where it is used to illustrate the rarity of something occurring, such as birth as a human being.

Among the numerous Gāndhārī texts preserved in the Senior collection of Kharoṣṭhī Buddhist manuscripts is a short sūtra for which this powerful image is central.¹ Appearing as the third of six texts written on scroll 22r (ll. 31–56), which is one of the longest scrolls in the collection, the sūtra represents a Gāndhārī version of the second of two Pāli suttas found in the Sacca-saṃyutta of the Saṃyutta-nikāya which utilise this simile (nos. 56.47–48; V 455–57). The uddāna entry for these two Pāli suttas is *chiggaḷena ca dve vuttā* (S V 459,11),² where *chiggaḷa-* “hole” is a reference to *ekacchiggaḷaṃ yugaṃ* “yoke with a single hole” of the simile. Based on this uddāna entry, the Burmese edition (B^c), for example, gives *Dutiyacchiggaḷayuga-suttam* as the title of the second sutta (S no. 56.48; V 456,18–457,16).³ Although the Gāndhārī sūtra lacks a title, the uddāna-like reference to it in the

*I would like to thank members of the Early Buddhist Manuscript Project (Seattle), including Richard Salomon, Collett Cox, Timothy Lenz, and Stefan Baums, for their comments on my reading of the Gāndhārī passage. I am also indebted to Richard Salomon, Stefan Baums, Arlo Griffiths, and Oskar von Hinüber for their remarks on several of my interpretations.

¹For the Senior collection, see Salomon 2003 and my introductory chapter to Glass 2007. I am currently writing a detailed catalogue of this collection (Allon [forthcoming]) with financial support from the Australian Research Council.

²E^c reads *chiggalena* against *chiggaḷa-* of the text (see below).

³A title for this sutta is not recorded in the Pāli commentaries.

“index” scrolls nos. 7+8 (l. 6) is *ekatarmao yuo* “yoke with a single hole” (see below for further discussion).⁴

There is apparently no Sanskrit parallel to this sūtra. Where the Pāli Saṃyutta-nikāya has two *chiggaḷa* suttas (nos. 56.47–48), the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama (SĀ), *Zá āhán jīng* 雜阿含經, has only one, no. 406 (T 2 no. 99 108c6–20).⁵ The Chinese sūtra is a closer parallel to the first of the two Pāli suttas (no. 56.47). However, as it shares many elements in common with our Gāndhārī sūtra and with the second Pāli *chiggaḷa* sutta, it will be utilized in the following study. Like the Pāli suttas, the Chinese sūtra forms part of the *saṃyukta* on the (four) truths, the Dixiāngyìng 諦相應 (= Pāli Sacca-saṃyutta).⁶

In the Gāndhārī sūtra and in the second Pāli *chiggaḷa* sutta, the simile illustrates the rarity of the occurrence of the optimal conditions under which one may attain enlightenment, those conditions being the presence of a Tathāgata, his teaching the Dharma, and one’s birth as a human being (according to the order of the Gāndhārī). Both sūtras advance the Four Noble Truths as the subject most worthy of attention when these conditions are in place (this being the factor that qualifies the Pāli sutta for inclusion in the Sacca-saṃyutta).

In the first Pāli *chiggaḷa* sutta and in the Chinese sūtra, the simile illustrates the rarity of human birth only, as it does in many of the occurrences discussed below. These two sūtras also refer to the Four Noble Truths.

In an interesting article entitled “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies IX: The Blind Turtle and the Hole in the Yoke” published in 1972, Mr Norman discussed occurrences of this simile in Pāli and Jain literature. Space does not permit me to publish the full Gāndhārī sūtra here, but as this Gāndhārī version of the simile contains several very

⁴For a brief discussion of the two “index” scrolls, see Salomon 2003, pp. 80–83, and § 5 of my introductory chapter to Glass 2007.

⁵In Yin Shún’s reordering of the SĀ this sūtra is no. 598 (1983, Vol. 2, p. 130), while according to the Fóguāng (1983, Vol. 1, p. 22) it is no. 405.

⁶There are no uddānas in this section of the SĀ.

interesting features, the most notable among them being the preservation of an archaic word for the hole in the yoke, I present here an edition, translation, and analysis of this section of the text in honour of Mr Norman's eightieth birthday and as a token of my admiration for his scholarship and in gratitude for all I have learnt from him.⁷

2. The Gāndhārī, Pāli, and Chinese versions of the simile

The edition of the Gāndhārī text (RS 22r, ll. 33–43) presented here is based on a reading of the digital colour and infrared images. Further work on the manuscript is unlikely to significantly improve the reading of this section of the text, unless some of the small, currently unplaced fragments are found to belong to this section of the manuscript. In order to save space, I have combined the edition and reconstruction. Text that is difficult to read is contained within square brackets []; akṣaras of uncertain reading are marked by a question mark ?; reconstructions are marked by an asterisk within parentheses (*).

The reading of the Pāli parallel (S V 456,18–457,5) is based on the four main published editions: European (E^c), Burmese (B^c), Sinhalese (C^c), and Thai (S^c).⁸ The reading of the Chinese version follows the Taishō edition (T 2 no. 99 p. 108c7–14).

The numbering of the major divisions of the text (§§ 1, 2, 3) follows that employed by the European edition (E^c) of the Pāli. To facilitate analysis of the text, I have subdivided § 3 into two subsections (§ 3a and § 3b) in the case of the Gāndhārī and Pāli, and into three (§§ 3a–c) in the case of the Chinese.

⁷The full text will be published in the near future along with the other texts on this scroll in the series Gandhāran Buddhist Texts, Seattle: University of Washington Press.

⁸The readings of B^c and C^c are based on the electronic versions as the printed editions were not available to me. See abbreviations for details.

§ 1.

Gāndhārī ⁹*bhayava*?¹⁰ *eḍa[ḍ aya]*: (l. 33)

The Bhagavat said this:

Pāli (*bhagavā etad avoca*):¹¹

The Bhagavat said this:

Chinese 爾時世尊告諸比丘。(p. 108c7)

Then the Bhagavat said to the monks:¹²

§ 2.

Gāndhārī *sayasavi bhikṣava aya mahapaḍavi* [34] [*eko*]ḍia *asa. tatra puruṣ[e] ekatarmao yuo pakṣivea*. [35] *tam eṇa purime vaḍo paḍimo saharea paḍimo vaḍa* ¹³*puri*¹⁴*me* [36] *saharea utare vaḍ[a] dakṣiṇo saharea dakṣiṇa* ¹⁵*va[ḍe* ¹⁶*u*¹⁷*t]*(**a*)¹⁸*[r]*(**o*)¹⁹ *s(*a)h(*a)re(*a)*. [37] ²⁰*atra hasa kaṇa kachavo vaṣaṣaḍa umi[jo] vaṣaṣaḍa[sa* ²¹*acaṇ]*(**a*) [38] ²²*saha samida umic[e]*.²³ (ll. 33–38)

“Monks, suppose that this great earth were one mass of water, and a man were to throw a yoke with a single hole into it. An easterly wind would carry it west; a westerly wind would carry it east; a northerly wind would carry it south; a southerly wind would carry it north. In it

⁹ Frag. A.

¹⁰ The reading could be *su*.

¹¹ Missing in E^c, B^c, C^c, and S^c (see commentary below).

¹² I am indebted to Lily Lee and Rod Bucknell for their comments on my translation of the Chinese text.

¹³ Frags. A+Bb-2.

¹⁴ Frag. A.

¹⁵ Frags. A+Am-5.

¹⁶ Frags. A+Am-2.

¹⁷ Frag. A.

¹⁸ Frag. Bc-2.

¹⁹ The original reading could have been *-ro* or *-ra*, but not *-re*.

²⁰ Frag. A.

²¹ Frags. A+B.

²² Frag. A.

²³ The scribe discontinued writing this line to avoid writing across the raised join between two sections of bark.

there were a blind turtle which, emerging after a hundred years, with the passing of a hundred years, would emerge over and over.

Pāli *seyyathāpi bhikkhave ayaṃ mahāpathavī²⁴ ekodakā²⁵ assa. tatra puriso ekacchiggaḷaṃ²⁶ yugaṃ pakkhipeyya. tam enaṃ puratthimo²⁷ vāto pacchimena saṃhareyya pacchimo vāto puratthimena saṃhareyya uttaro vāto dakkhiṇena saṃhareyya dakkhiṇo vāto uttarena²⁸ saṃhareyya. tatrassa kāṇo kacchapo so²⁹ vassasatassa vassasatassa accayena sakiṃ sakiṃ ummujjeyya* (p. 456,18–24).

“Monks, suppose that this great earth were one mass of water, and a man were to throw a yoke with a single hole into it. An easterly wind would carry it west; a westerly wind would carry it east; a northerly wind would carry it south; a southerly wind would carry it north. In it there were a blind turtle which would emerge once each time with the passing of each hundred years.

Chinese 譬如大地悉成大海。有一盲龜壽無量劫。百年一出其頭。海中有浮木。止有一孔。漂流海浪。隨風東西。(p. 108c7–9)

“Suppose the great earth were completely covered by a great ocean, and there were a blind turtle of long life, an immeasurable *kalpa* [in duration], which poked his head out every hundred years. In the ocean there was a floating piece of wood with only one hole, floating on the ocean waves to the east and west according to the wind.”

§ 3a

Gāndhārī³⁰ [39] *ta ki maṇasa avi ṇa 'ṣe kaṇo kachava vaṣi[ad](*)sa ajaeṇa saha ṣ(*am)[i][40]ḍa umi[jata] am[a]spi ekatarmao yuo grive pakṣivea.* (ll. 39–40)

What do you think, would this blind turtle, emerging over and over, with the passing of a hundred years, insert its neck into that yoke with the single hole?

²⁴~*pathavī* in C^c and S^c.

²⁵*ekodikā* in S^c, C^c and in the two Sinhalese mss (S^{1,3}) used for E^c (S² was not used by the editor for this volume of S).

²⁶~*chiggaḷaṃ* throughout C^c.

²⁷*purimo* in the Sinhalese mss (S^{1,3}) used for E^c.

²⁸*uttare* in the Sinhalese mss (S^{1,3}) used for E^c.

²⁹*so* is missing in the Sinhalese ms S³ used for E^c.

³⁰Frag. B.

Pāli *taṃ kiṃ maññatha bhikkhave api nu so*³¹ *kāṇo kacchapo vassasatassa vassasatassa accayena sakiṃ sakiṃ ummujjanto*³² *amusmiṃ*³³ *ekacchiggale yuge gīvaṃ paveseyyā ti* (p. 456,25–457,2).

What do you think, monks, would that blind turtle, emerging once each time with the passing of each hundred years, insert its neck into that yoke with the single hole?

Chinese 盲龜百年一出其頭。當得遇此孔不。(p. 108c10)

Would the blind turtle, poking his head out every hundred years, meet this hole or not?

§ 3b

Gāndhārī *adīcam eḍa bhayava* [41] *suḍalavam eva ya eṣe kaṇo*³⁴ *kachavo vaṣihada omica vaṣihada*³⁵ *sa aca[e]*³⁶ [42] *ṇa saha samida*³⁷ [43] *umijata amaspi ekatarmao yuo grīve paḍi[mu](*)ce)a*³⁸ *ṇa* [va] *paḍimu[ce](*)a*. (ll. 40–43)

It would be by chance, Bhagavat, it is very rare indeed, that this blind turtle, emerging after a hundred years, with the passing of a hundred years, emerging over and over, would put that yoke with the single hole on his neck, or he may not put it on.

Pāli *adhiccam idaṃ bhante yaṃ so kāṇo kacchapo vassasatassa vassasatassa accayena sakiṃ sakiṃ ummujjanto amusmiṃ ekacchiggale yuge gīvaṃ paveseyyā ti* (p. 457,3–5).

It would be by chance, venerable sir, that that blind turtle, emerging once each time with the passing of each hundred years, would insert its neck in that yoke with the single hole.

³¹*kho* in S^c, B^c and in the two Burmese mss (B^{1,2}) used for E^c.

³²*ca* is added in the Sinhalese mss (S^{1,3}) used for E^c.

³³*amukasmiṃ* in the Burmese ms B² used for E^c.

³⁴The scribe has marked both the *e* and *o* mātrās on *ṇ*. He probably wrote the *o* mātrā second in accordance with the spelling elsewhere.

³⁵*ḍa* could also be read as *ha*.

³⁶The bottom of the *e* akṣara is preserved on frag. Bb-2.

³⁷The scribe has left the line short to avoid writing across the join between two sections of bark.

³⁸Frag. B+Bd-1.

Chinese 阿難白佛。不能。世尊。所以者何。此盲龜若至海東。浮木隨風。或至海西。南。北四維圍遶亦爾。不必相得。(p. 108c10–13)

Ānanda said to the Buddha: “It would not be able to, Bhagavat. Why is that? If this blind turtle should arrive in the eastern part of the ocean, the floating piece of wood might, according to the wind, arrive in the west, south, or north of the ocean. Going around the four directions in this way, they would certainly not meet each other.”

§ 3c

Chinese 佛告阿難。盲龜浮木。雖復差違。或復相得。(p. 108c13–14)

The Buddha said to Ānanda, “Although the blind turtle and the floating piece of wood may miss [each other], perhaps they may also meet each other.”

The wording of this section, which is missing in the Gāndhārī and Pāli, seems odd, unless the Buddha is merely confirming that they may or may not meet each other.

3. Commentary

§ 1. The Buddha addresses the monks

The Sāvattī–Jetavana nidāna and initial interchange between the Buddha and the monks are missing in the Pāli editions and in the manuscripts used for them. However, as this passage is given in full in the first sutta of the Mahāvagga of the Saṃyutta-nikāya in E^c (V 1), B^c, and C^c (and elsewhere throughout the Mahāvagga) and in the first sutta of the Sacca-saṃyutta in C^c and the Sinhalese manuscripts (S^{1, 3}) used for E^c, it has clearly been omitted through scribal abbreviation. Undoubtedly, this passage would have been included when this sutta was recited, as would the conclusion to this sutta which is also abbreviated in the Pāli editions and manuscripts (see Allon 2001, pp. 253–55).

The nidāna of this Gāndhārī sūtra is repeated in the next sūtra on this scroll (RS 22r, ll. 57–59). It also occurs twice in a collection of three Ekottarikāgama-type sūtras (EĀ-G) preserved in the British Library Kharoṣṭhī collection (Allon 2001, pp. 225–32, 253–55).

bhayava? eḍa[ḍ aya] (l. 33): The reading in the line 57–59 example of this phrase is *bhayava [ṣu] eḍaḍ aya*. The akṣara of uncertain reading

(?) in line 33 could be read as [ṣu], as in this second example. The corresponding Pāli expression is *bhagavā etad avoca*. The nominative singular corresponding to Pāli *bhagavā*/Skt *bhagavān* is *bhayava* or *bhagava* throughout the Senior manuscripts and *bhayavadu* in the EĀ-G (Allon 2001, pp. 113–14). However, in the one complete example of the equivalent of Pāli *bhagavā etad avoca* in EĀ-G (l. 28) the reading is *bha[ya]va[ṣu]* rather than *bhayavadu* as expected. In my edition of that text I took this to be a scribal error and amended it to *bhayava*<*du> (Allon 2001, pp. 225–26, 232), but these two examples in the Senior manuscripts suggest that this amendment may not have been justified. Given that *bhayava/bhagava* is the nominative singular in all other contexts in the Senior manuscripts, it is possible that we should take *ṣu*³⁹ as a separate word rather than as the termination of *bhayava*. The most likely explanation is that *ṣu* is the equivalent of the Sanskrit particle *sma* (or possibly *su*), which is attested elsewhere in Gāndhārī as *sa*, *ṣa*, *su*, and possibly *ṣu*,⁴⁰ although the usage of this particle in such a context (e.g. Pāli *bhagavā (s)su etad avoca* or the like) is not attested in Buddhist literature to my knowledge.

Brough (1962, pp. 228–29) noted that *hi ṣa* in the Khotan Dharma-pada (160d) corresponds to Ṛgvedic *hi sma*, in contrast to *ha ve* of the Pāli version, which corresponds to *ha vai* of the Brāhmaṇas, and concluded that “[w]e have thus the interesting situation that the Prakrit, from the North-west, appears to represent the survival of a common Ṛgvedic usage, while the Pali, from a more central region, has instead a group which is most familiar from the Brāhmaṇas”. If *ṣu* in *bhayava ṣu* in the Gāndhārī manuscripts discussed here does correspond to Skt *sma*, then this would represent another instance of the archaic usage of this

³⁹Although *ṣ* and *k* are indistinguishable in the Senior manuscripts, in EĀ-G they are not. The reading is therefore unlikely to be *ku* in the Senior examples.

⁴⁰See Norman (2004, p. 128) for the Pāli, BHS, and Gāndhārī forms, and for references to previous discussions. For the Gāndhārī spelling *ṣu*, see Norman 1971B, p. 218 = *Collected Papers*, Vol. 1, p. 118.

particle being attested in Gāndhārī (for which compare the appearance of the archaic *tardman-* in this text discussed below).

For *eḍaḍ aya*, which corresponds to the Pāli expression *etad avoca*, see Allon 2001, pp. 163–65 where it was transcribed as *eḍāḍ aya*.

§§ 2–3. The simile of the blind (or one-eyed) turtle

As noted by Mr Norman (1972) in his article on this topic, the simile of the blind turtle inserting its neck into a single hole in a yoke floating in the ocean is referred to in Therīgāthā 500 as illustration of the rarity of being born a human being:

*sara kāṇakacchapaṃ pubbasamudde, aparato ca yugachiddaṃ
sirā⁴¹ tassa ca paṭimukkaṃ, manussalābhamhi opammaṃ.*

In his translation of the Therīgāthā, Mr Norman (1971A, p. 49) translated this verse as “Remember the blind turtle in the sea in former times, and the hole in the yoke floating [there]; remember the putting on of it (= the yoke) as a comparison with the obtaining of human birth.” But in view of his later comments (Norman 1972, pp. 157–58), the first line would be better translated “remember the blind turtle in the eastern ocean, and the hole in the yoke [floating] from the western [ocean]”.⁴² In his 1972 article, Mr Norman also quotes several other Pāli references for this simile (M III 169,9–16; S V 455,24–29 [the first of the two *chiggaḷa* suttas currently under view]; Mil 204,11–13; As 60,17–18) and examples from Jain literature.

In a much earlier article on this topic, Harināth De (1906–1907, pp. 173–75) refers to two similar passages in Sanskrit Buddhist literature. The first appears in Śāntideva’s *Bodhicaryāvatāra* (4.20):

⁴¹The reading *sirā* (= *sira[m]*) was proposed by Alsdorf in the European edition of the *Thī* (p. 248). C^o has *sara* (cf. Mr Norman’s translation).

⁴²Winternitz (1913, p. 44 = *Kleine Schriften*, 1991, p. 547) translates the verse as “Denke an das Gleichnis für die Erlangung einer Wiedergeburt als Mensch: an die einäugige Schildkröte und das im Ozean nach Osten und Westen herumgetriebene Loch des Joches und daran, ob der Kopf dieser (Schildkröte in jenem Loch) stecken bleibe.”

*ata evāha bhagavān, mānuṣyam atidurlabham
mahārṇavayugacchidrakūrmagrīvārpaṇopamam*

translated by Crosby and Skilton (1995, p. 26) as “That is why the Fortunate One declared that the human state is so hard to attain; as likely as the turtle poking its neck through the hole of a yoke floating on the mighty ocean.”

The second is found in a prose passage in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra (463.4–5):

*durlabho hy amba tāta buddhotpāda udumbarapuṣpasadṛśo mahārṇavayugacchidrakūrmagrīvāpraveśavat. durlabhaprādurbhāvā amba tāta buddhā bhagavantaḥ.*⁴³

For, father and mother, the appearance of a Buddha is rare as a flower on a fig tree, as the likelihood of the turtle inserting its neck into the hole of the yoke floating on the great ocean. Father and mother, Buddhas, Bhagavats are ones whose appearance is rare.

Kumārajīva’s Chinese translation has 又如一眼之龜, 值浮木孔 “and as the one-eyed turtle meeting the hole in the floating log” (T 9 no. 262 p. 60a29–b1).

In an article on the same topic, A.N. Upadhye (1972) quotes many examples from Jain literature and the following Buddhist verse from Mātṛceṭa’s Adhyardha-śataka (5):⁴⁴

*so ’haṃ prāpya manuṣyatvaṃ, sasaddharmamahotsavaṃ,
mahārṇavayugacchidrakūrmagrīvārpaṇopamam*

I, attaining the human state, accompanied by the good Dharma which is the great festival, which is as likely as the turtle poking its neck through the hole of a yoke floating on the mighty ocean ...

Not surprisingly, the image is also found in Brahmanical texts. An example is the Laghu-Yogavāsiṣṭha 6.15.14 (= YV 6a.126.4), which is

⁴³Ed. Kern and Nanjio. One of the Central Asian manuscripts refers to the single hole: (**udum*)*barapuṣpasadṛśa(s) tāta tathāgata yugamitaikacchi /// (437a6) (ed. Toda 1983, p. 214).

⁴⁴Cf. Winternitz (1913, pp. 46–47 = *Kleine Schriften*, 1991, pp. 549–50) for the Chinese version.

quoted verbatim in the eighteenth century Bodhasāra by Narahari (I4.2.17):⁴⁵

*calārṇavayugacchidrakūrmagrīvāpraveśavat
anekajanmanām ante, vivekī jāyate pumān*

Like the turtle inserting its neck into the hole in the yoke floating on the agitated ocean, a person becomes discerning at the end of many births.

There are numerous examples in Chinese and Tibetan Buddhist texts, but my primary concern here is with the wording of the Indian versions.⁴⁶

sayaṣavi bhikṣava aya mahapaḍavi [eko]ḍia asa (ll. 33–34): Pāli *seyyathāpi bhikkhave ayaṃ mahāpathavi ekodakā assa*.

For *sayaṣavi* = Pāli *seyyathāpi*, see Allon 2001, p. 209.

The spelling of *paḍavi* in *maha-paḍavi*, which corresponds to Skt *pr̥thivī*/Pāli *paṭhavi*, *paṭhavi*,⁴⁷ is a further example of “[s]poradic non-etymological alternations between unaspirated and aspirated consonants” in the Senior manuscripts noted by Salomon (2003, p. 86), for which cf. also *adica* = Pāli *adhiccaṃ* in § 3b (l. 40) below and *paḍama* = Skt *prathamam* / Pāli *paṭhamaṃ* in another Senior manuscript (I2.31). Previously attested spellings of this word in Gāndhārī are *praṭhavi* and *paḍhavi* found in inscriptions.⁴⁸

[*eko*]ḍia: The reading is *ekodakā* in E^c and B^c of the Pāli parallel, but *ekodikā* in S^c and C^c, and in the two Sinhalese manuscripts (S¹, 3)

⁴⁵For the commentary on the Bodhasāra verse, see Jacob 1909. I would like to thank Jenni Cover for bringing the Bodhasāra reference to my attention and for providing the context to it and Walter Slaje for drawing my attention to the Jacob article and for verifying the details of the Yogavāsiṣṭha reference.

⁴⁶The occurrences of the simile in the Chinese translation of the Sūtrālamkāra are discussed by Winternitz (1913, pp. 45–46 = *Kleine Schriften*, 1991, pp. 548–49), who quotes Huber’s French translation of these. The Central Asian manuscript of this text (*Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā*) edited by Lüders (1926, p. 156; frag. 123 R2) preserves the words *tadyugacchidram*.

⁴⁷See *PED* s.v. *paṭhavi*. For references to *ṭh* < *th* when preceded by *r* or *r* in Pāli, see Oberlies 2001, p. 80.

⁴⁸*praṭhavi*: Mānsehrā inscription of the year 68, line 9 (Konow 1929, p. 20); *paḍhavi*: Ajitasena inscription, line 5 (Fussman 1986).

used for E^c (S² was not used by the editor for this volume of S). The *CPD* (s.v. *ekodaka*) questions the variant reading *ekodikā* as a possible feminine form. However, the *SWTF* (s.v. *ekodaka*) accepts Sanskrit *ekodikā* on the basis of its occurrence in the similar phrase *ekodikāyāṃ mahāpṛthivyāṃ ekārṇavāyāṃ* found in a fragment of the Sanskrit version of the Aggañña-sutta from Central Asia;⁴⁹ for which also cf. *tadyatheyaṃ mahāpṛthivy ekodakajātā bhavet* in the Larger Sukhāvativyūha (56.4).⁵⁰ Gāndhārī *ekoḍia* could go back to a form such as *ekodikā* in the MIA version from which this text was translated or have resulted from palatalisation of *a* under the influence of secondary *-y-* (*ekodakā* > **ekodayā* > *ekoḍia*), which is common in Gāndhārī. It is, of course, possible that an MIA palatalised form lay behind *ekodikā* in a Central Asian Sanskrit manuscript.

ekatarmao yuo (l. 34) “a yoke with a single hole”: Pāli *ekacchiggaḷa- yuga-*. This occurs three times in this sūtra: once in the accusative singular *tatra puruṣ[e] ekatarmao yuo pakṣivea* (l. 34) “a man were to throw a yoke with a single hole into it [the ocean]”, where the Pāli has *tatra puriso ekacchiggaḷaṃ yugaṃ pakkhipeyya*, and twice in the locative singular *am[a]spi ekatarmao yuo grive pakṣivea* (l. 40) “would insert its neck into that yoke with the single hole” and *amaspi ekatarmao yuo grive paḍi[mu>(*ce)a* (l. 43) “would put that yoke with the single hole on his neck” (see below), where the Pāli has *amusmiṃ ekacchiggaḷe yuge gīvaṃ paveseyya*. As stated above, the words *ekatarmao yuo* also occur on scrolls 7+8 (l. 6) as the uddāna-like reference to this sūtra.

An etymology for Pāli *chiggaḷa*, *chiggala* “hole”, which is recorded in the Pāli canon in *eka-cchiggaḷa-yuga-* “a yoke with one hole” of the current context and in *tāḷa-cchiggaḷa*, *tāḷa-* “key hole”, is not given by the dictionaries and grammars (e.g. *PED* s.v.),⁵¹ where it is often

⁴⁹See *SWTF* s.v. *ekodaka* for references. The Mahāvastu version (I 339.7, ed. Senart) has *ayam api mahāpṛthivi udakahradaṃ viya samudāgacchet*.

⁵⁰Ed. Ashikaga 1965.

⁵¹For *tāḷa-cchiggaḷa*, *~chidda*, see von Hinüber 1992, pp. 17, 31.

compared with Pāli *chidda-*/Skt *chidra-* “hole”.⁵² Nor is it listed in the *CDIAL*. As noted by O. von Hinüber (1992, pp. 17, 31) the word is certainly non-Aryan in origin,⁵³ although a comparable word (Pāli *chiggaḷa-*) is not listed in *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary* (Burrow and Emeneau 1961 and 1968).⁵⁴

The Gāndhārī word *ekatarmao* is to be taken as a compound of *eka-* and *-tarmao*,⁵⁵ where *tarmao* must be the equivalent of Skt *tardman-*⁵⁶ n. “hole” (< √*tṛd* “to cleave, pierce”; MW and *CDIAL* s.v.), with *-ka* suffix. The word has not been recorded previously in Gāndhārī and there appears to be no Pāli or other MIA equivalent.⁵⁷ Based on the model of the development of Skt *vartman-* “road” to *vaṭṭa-* in Prakrit or *vaṭuma-* (cf. *vattantī*) in Pāli, *vaṭṭamaya-*, *vaḍḍumaga-* in Prakrit (*CDIAL* s.v. *tārdman-*), the expected MIA forms for Skt *tardman-* would be **taḍḍa-* with *-rd-* > *-ḍḍ-* or possibly **tadda-* with *rd* > *dd*,⁵⁸ both involving the last member of the cluster *-rdm-* not being taken into consideration in the assimilation of the cluster,⁵⁹ or **taḍuma-* or

⁵²The *Abhidhānappadīpikā-tīkā* (Nandawansa 2001, p. 239) gives *chinditvā gacchatī ti chiggalaṃ; yadādi*.

⁵³The similarity between Pkt *gaḍa-* “hole” (*CDIAL* s.v. *gaḍa-*¹), corresponding to Skt *garta-* “hole” (cf. *śamyā-garta-* “hole (*garta*) for the yoke pin (*śamyā*)”, *CDIAL* s.v.), and the latter part of *chiggaḷa-* is therefore merely coincidental.

⁵⁴If the word does have a Dravidian origin, then the latter part of the word may be connected with Malayalam *aḷa* “hole” listed in this dictionary (1961, § 261).

⁵⁵In this scribe’s hand *t* and *d* are indistinguishable. However, in view of the interpretation given below, the reading *-darmao* and a connection with *dāra-* “hole” (MW s.v.; see also *CDIAL* s.v. *dāra-*¹) is unlikely.

⁵⁶Although *tardman-* is only found in the Vedic corpus, most Sanskrit words quoted in this paper are not (e.g. *kha-*, *chidra-*). For the sake of consistency, I have therefore omitted the accent from all Sanskrit words in my discussion, including *tardman-*.

⁵⁷None are listed in *CDIAL* s.v. I am indebted to Mr Norman for verifying this absence.

⁵⁸Pischel 1965, §§ 288–91; von Hinüber 2001, § 256.

⁵⁹Pischel 1965, § 334; von Hinüber 2001, § 260; Oberlies 2001, § 17.

**taḍḍuma-* with the cluster split by epenthesis.⁶⁰ The Gāndhārī form, with its apparent omission of the dental stop, is unexpected. As the cluster *rd* is regularly retained in Gāndhārī, we would have expected **tardao* or **tardumao* for this word. Alternatively, the development could have been *-rdm-* > **-rmm-* > *-rm-* following von Hinüber 2001, § 261. Noteworthy is the spelling *tarman-* throughout Kaul's edition of the Laugākṣiḡhyasūtra mentioned below, which is transmitted only in Kashmiri manuscripts.

In the Therīgāthā verse (500) quoted above, the word for hole is *chidda-* (*yuga-[c]chiddaṃ*) = Skt *chidra-* in contrast to *chiggaḷa-* of the Saṃyutta-nikāya sutta under discussion, for which compare the example of the older *tāḷa-cchiggaḷa* of the Saṃyutta-nikāya being replaced by *tāḷa-cchidda* in the Vinaya discussed by von Hinüber (1992, pp. 17, 31). The interchangeability of *chiggaḷa-* and *chidda-* in the context of a yoke in Pāli texts is also seen in the various commentaries on *sammā-* (Skt *śamyā*) “yoke pin” of the Brahmanical sacrifice *sammāpāsa-* (Skt *śamyāpāsa-*) mentioned in a verse found in several places in the Pāli canon (e.g. Sn 303; S I 76,20; A II 43,30): *samman ti yugacchidde pakkhipitabbadaṇḍakaṃ* (e.g. Spk-ṭ I 180 B^c; Mp-ṭ II 299) and ... *sammāpāso, yugacchiggaḷe pavesanaḍḍakasaṅkhātāṃ sammaṃ khipivā* ... (It-a I 94,20–21; Mp IV 70,11–13).⁶¹

In the Buddhist Sanskrit examples mentioned above, the word is *yuga-cchidra-*, as it is in the Jain examples quoted by Norman (1972) and Upadhye (1972): Skt *yuga-cchidra-* or Pkt *juga-chiḍḍa-*.

As already noted, the equivalent of Skt *tardman-* is not found in Pāli texts. The word does not appear, for example, in any commentarial gloss or in the list of words for hole in the Abhidhānappadīpikā, namely, *randhaṃ tu vivaraṃ chiddaṃ kuharaṃ susiraṃ bilaṃ susi 'uthī chiggaḷaṃ sobbhaṃ* (649–50),⁶² which is clearly based on the Amara-

⁶⁰Pischel 1965, § 139; von Hinüber 2001, §§ 152–56.

⁶¹Cf. also those reported in Mr Norman's notes on Thī 500 (Norman 1971A, pp. 174f.).

⁶²Nandawansa 2001, p. 239.

kośa,⁶³ where the word is similarly absent: ... *kuharam suṣiram vivaram bilam | chidram nirvyathanam rokam randhram śvabhram vapā suṣiḥ* ... (I.8.486–89).⁶⁴ Again, the word does not appear to be recorded in Buddhist literature in Sanskrit (e.g. the word is not listed in *SWTF*).

Although apparently not found in Buddhist literature, *tardman-* in conjunction with *yuga-*, meaning hole in the yoke, does occur in early Brahmanical literature.⁶⁵ The earliest attested example is the Atharva-veda (Śaunaka) I4.I.40 (= AVP I8.4.9):⁶⁶

*śām te hiraṇyaṃ śām u santv lāpaḥ śām methīr bhavatu śām yugāsya
tārdma
śām ta āpaḥ śatāpavitrā bhavantu śām u pātyā tanvā Iṃ śām spṛśasva*

translated by Whitney (1905, p. 747) as

Weal be to thee gold, and weal be waters ; weal be the post (*methī*), **weal the perforation (*tārdman*) of the yoke** ; weal be for thee the waters having a hundred cleaners (*-pavitra*) ; for weal, too, mingle thyself with thy husband.

The following verse (AVŚ I4.I.41 = AVP 4.26.7), which also refers to the hole in the yoke, is of some interest since it is taken from the Ṛgveda (8.91.7):

*khé ráthasya khé 'nasaḥ khé yugāsya śatakrato
apālām indra trīṣ pūtvākṛṇoḥ sūryatvacam*

⁶³For the relationship between the Abhidhānappadīpikā and the Amarakośa, see Nandawansa 2001, pp. xxvii–xxxii.

⁶⁴Ed. Ramanathan n.d., Vol. 1, p. 146. The word does not appear in the commentaries on the Amarakośa edited by Ramanathan (pp. 146–47) or in the Abhidhānacintāmaṇināmamāla (1363–64), a similar lexicographical work by Hemacandra (eleventh–twelfth centuries), or its commentaries (ed. 2003, pp. 624–25).

⁶⁵Several of the following references are mentioned in Winternitz (1913, pp. 43–44 = *Kleine Schriften*, 1991, pp. 546–47). I would like to thank Arlo Griffiths for his responses to my questions on this Brahmanical material.

⁶⁶Ed. Roth and Whitney 1856.

In the hole of the chariot, in the hole of the cart, **in the hole of the yoke**,
O thou of a hundred activities, having thrice purified Apālā, O Indra, thou
didst make her sun-skinned (tr. Whitney 1905, p. 748).

In this Ṛgveda verse the word for hole is *kha-* (*khé yugásya* “in the hole of the yoke”) rather than *tardman-*, which does not occur in the Ṛgveda, or *chidra-*, which occurs only once in the Ṛgveda (1.162.20) as an adjective meaning “pierced”, “torn asunder” (MW s.v. *chidrá*). These two verses of the Atharvaveda are not commented on by Sāyaṇa,⁶⁷ but in his commentary on the second verse as it occurs in the Ṛgveda, *kha-* is glossed with *chidra-*.⁶⁸

The compound *yuga-tardman* occurs several times in the Kauśikasūtra of the Atharvaveda, which the commentaries consistently gloss with *yuga-cchidra-*.⁶⁹ The three occurrences of *tardman-* in the Śrautasūtra of Kātyāyana (6.1.30; 7.3.20; 15.5.27), which do not occur in conjunction with *yuga-*, are similarly all glossed with *chidra-* by the commentators (Karka and Yājñikadeva).⁷⁰ The Kāṭhakaḡrhyasūtra of the Black Yajurveda (ed. Caland 1925), also known as the Laugākṣi-ḡrhyasūtra, contains two relevant sūtras. The first (25.9) quotes the Ṛgveda verse (8.91.7) referred to above, which is also found in the Atharvaveda (14.1.41), glossing *khé yugásya* with *yugatardmani*,⁷¹ then

⁶⁷Ed. Viśva Bandhu et al. 1961, part 3, p. 1542.

⁶⁸Ed. Rajwade et al., 1978, Vol. 3, p. 906.

⁶⁹Extracts from the commentaries are given by Bloomfield (1890) in footnotes to his edition of the Kauśikasūtra and in an appendix (Paddhati of Keśava). The references are 35.6 (p. 94; see also p. 336); 50.18 (p. 146; see also p. 355); 76.12 (p. 203); cf. 76.13. For Dārila’s commentary, see the edition by Diwekar et al. 1972, which only covers the first occurrence. Cf. also Caland’s notes to his translation of the Kauśikasūtra (1900, pp. 31, n. 5; 115, n. 5; 175, n. 10).

⁷⁰Ed. Weber 1972. Ranade ([1978]) translates *tardman* in these three occurrences as “cavity”, “holes”, and “perforations”, respectively (his numbering is 6.1.28; 7.3.17; 15.5.25).

⁷¹*hiraṇyam ništarkyam baddhvādhy adhi mūrdhani dakṣiṇasmin yugatardmany adbhīr avakṣārayate śaṃ te hiraṇyam iti.*

quotes the preceding Atharvaveda verse (14.1.40), also quoted above.⁷² The second sūtra (26.3) is of similar wording, mixing *kha-* and *tardman-*.⁷³ The commentaries of Devapāla, Brāhmaṇabala, and Ādityadarśana presented in Caland's edition of the Kāṭhakaḡḡyasūtra all gloss *khe* and *yugasya tardma* of these two sūtras with *yugacchidra-* (Devapāla gives *randhra-* for *kha-* of the first sūtra). Finally, *tardman-* also occurs in the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa (Mādhyandina 3.2.1.2), but the commentaries of Sāyaṇa and Harisvāmin (published Delhi 1987) lack such a gloss.

There are, no doubt, other instances of *tardman-* and *yuga-tardman-* in Brahmanical literature, but the above will suffice for the current purposes.⁷⁴

Apart from *yuga-tarṃao* of the Gāndhārī text under review, there is only one other instance of a word meaning hole recorded in Gāndhārī to my knowledge. This is *chidra-*, which appears in the Senior manuscripts in the expression *paṣaṇaṣa chid<*r>a*⁷⁵ (20.6) “a hole in the stone (of the city wall)” (Gāndhārī *paṣaṇa-* = Skt *pāṣāṇa-* “stone”). The Pāli parallel has *pākāra-sandhiṃ* “a hole in the [city] wall” (e.g. S V 160,22–23; A V 195,2) with v.l. *pākāra-cchiddaṃ* recorded in the European edition of the Aṅguttara-nikāya occurrence.⁷⁶

⁷²The reading throughout M. Kaul's edition of the Laugākṣiḡḡyasūtra is *tarman-*.

⁷³*khe rathasya khe 'nasaḡ khe yugasya ca tardmasu khe akṣasya khe avadadhāmiti yugataromasu śamīśākhām avadadhāti.*

⁷⁴The *Āpastambagḡḡyasūtra* (4.2.8, ed. U.C. Pandey) uses the word *yugacchidraṃ*.

⁷⁵The reading appears to be *chidva*, but the context demands *chidra*. It appears that the scribe accidentally overwrote the upward stroke of the post-consonantal *r* making it appear like a post-consonantal *v*.

⁷⁶*chidra-* also appears in the unrelated expression *achidra-vuti* in the Khotan Dharmapada, where the corresponding Pāli Dhammapada verse has the equivalent *acchidda-vutti-* (= Skt *acchidra-vṛtti-*) “impeccable conduct” (Dhp-G^K 241c; cf. *achidra-vurti* in Khvs-G 23a).

The occurrence of *yuga-tarmao* in our Gāndhārī text suggests that the equivalent of Skt *tardman-* was the word current in Gandhāra for the hole in a yoke, in contrast to *chidra-* (or *chiggaḷa-* in the case of some Pāli texts), which is the term found in Buddhist literature from other regions and in Jain and later Brahmanical Sanskrit literature. Given that *tardman-* is found in some early Brahmanical Sanskrit texts, but is commonly replaced by *chidra-* in later texts, particularly commentaries, it would appear that an old lexical item was preserved in usage in Gandhāra. Of course, although the Senior manuscripts date to the second or third century A.D. (Salomon 2003, pp. 74–78; Allon et al. 2007) and *yuga-tarmao* may therefore have been the expression for the hole in the yoke current in Gandhāra at that time, its usage cannot be fixed more accurately in time and space. For instance, it remains possible that this term was not current when these manuscripts were written, but is rather a vestige of a much earlier period when this sūtra was first translated (or transposed) into Gāndhārī from another MIA dialect.

Finally, it is impossible to tell what word for hole the translators of the Chinese texts had before them in their Indian originals. For example, throughout the Saṃyuktāgama parallel and in Kumārajīva's translation of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra simile, the term is *kōng* 孔, "hole".⁷⁷ But what is interesting is that these two Chinese translations refer to a piece of wood with (one) hole, rather than a yoke: the Saṃyuktāgama parallel has 浮木止有一孔 "a floating piece of wood with only one hole" (p. 108c8–9), while Kumārajīva has 浮木孔 "hole in the floating log" (T 9 no. 262 p. 60b1).

tam eṇa purime vaḍo paḍimo saharea (l. 35): Pāli *tam eṇaṃ puratthimo vāto pacchīmena saṃhareyya*. The propensity for *purima-* to replace *puratthima-* is witnessed in the Sinhalese manuscripts used for E^c of the Pāli, which read *purimo* for *puratthimo*, and in the B^c reading

⁷⁷Surprising is Wogihara's (1979) actual listing of *tardman* in his Sanskrit–Chinese–Japanese dictionary (s.v. *tardman*); the first of the two entries, *xuè* 穴, is also listed under *chidra*.

of the commentary on this word in another text: *puratthimaṃ disaṃ dhāvati ti purimaṃ* (E^c *puratthimaṃ*) *disaṃ gacchati* (Nidd-a II 432,5–6). For *purima-* as “eastern” in Pāli, see *BHSD* s.v. *purima*.

The grammatical case of *pačimo* “western” in *pačimo saharea*, and of the word which replaces it in each of the following parallel clauses (*purime*, *dakṣiṇo*, and *ut(*a)r(*o)*), must be accusative, in contrast to the instrumental of the Pāli *pacchimena saṃhareyya*, etc.

atra hasa (l. 37): The Pāli has *tatrassa = tatra assa* “in it there would be”. The Senior manuscripts contain several further examples of the occasional writing of *h* plus vowel mātṛā where a word-initial vowel is expected: *hiḍam e[yi]* (5.27) besides *iḍam eyi* (5.21) = Pāli *idam avoca*; *himaspi* (15.7) = Pāli *imasmiṃ*; *hidriaṇa* (5.34) besides *idriaṇa* (5.39) = Pāli *indriyānaṃ*; and *hirdhaiṇapaḍaṇa* (5.34,38) = Pāli *iddhi-pādānaṃ* (see Glass 2007: §5.1.1.). The expected initial vowel in each of these latter Senior examples is the palatal vowel *i*. Several interpretations of this phenomenon were presented in my discussion of the word *hasavaro* = Skt/Pāli *athāparaṃ* (which is preceded by *sughadu* = Pāli *sugato*) found in the EĀ-G (l. 16), including that it represents sandhi *h-*, an “easternism”, or “emphatic” *h-*.⁷⁸ Although I considered sandhi *h-* to be the most likely of these interpretations, the rarity of the phenomenon led me to dismiss it. Rather, I concluded that *h-* in these words represented the “sporadic, and as yet to be fully understood, appearance of prothetic *h-* in Gāndhārī” (Allon 2001: 181).⁷⁹

It is interesting that the majority of examples of prothetic *h-* in the Senior manuscripts appear in palatal environment. This parallels the occasional appearance of glide *h* in internal position, most examples of

⁷⁸Allon 2001, pp. 180–81; cf. 102; add Oberlies 2001, p. 75; Norman 2002, p. 227.

⁷⁹It is tempting to see this phenomenon as purely graphic, since the only difference between a word-initial vowel (e.g. *i-*) and *h* plus that vowel (e.g. *hi-*) in Kharoṣṭhī is that the latter has a short horizontal stroke to the right at the bottom of the akṣara.

which also appear in palatal environment.⁸⁰ Examples from the Senior manuscripts are *uḍahivadre* (2.65[v29]), besides *uḍāivadra* (2.9) = Skt *udāyibhadra*-/Pāli *udāyibhadda*- “[prince] Udāyibhadra”; *bramahia* (19.13,30), besides *bhamaṃ* (17.10) = Pāli *brahmacariya*- “the holy life”; *sahiṇa*- (12.10) = Pāli *sāyaṇha*- “evening”. For examples in the Khotan Dharmapada, see Brough 1962: § 39. In other words, when they do occur there is a marked tendency for prothetic *h*- and glide *-h*- to appear in the neighbourhood of palatal vowels, which may be due to the palatal character of *h* (Wackernagel 1957: §§ 213–16; Burrow 1973: 77ff.; von Hinüber 2001: § 223).

kaṇa kachavo (l. 37), *kaṇo kachava* (l. 39), *kaṇo kachavo* (l. 41): Pāli *kāṇo kacchapo*. Mr Norman (1971A: 49) and Bhikkhu Bodhi (2000: 1871–72) translate the Pāli as “blind turtle”, while Winternitz (1913: 44 = *Kleine Schriften* 1991: 547) gives “one-eyed turtle (*einäugige Schildkröte*)”. The Chinese Saṃyuktāgama parallel has “blind turtle”, *máng guī* 盲龜, while Kumārajīva’s translation of the Saddharmapūṇḍarikasūtra simile quoted above has “one-eyed turtle” *yīyǎn zhī guī* 一眼之龜. These translations reflect the dual meanings of one-eyed and blind (in both eyes) for *kāṇa*-, which are attested in the Pāli commentarial glosses (see *DOP* and *CPD* s.v. *kāṇa*-), such as *kāṇo ti ekakkhikāṇo vā ubhayakkhikāṇo vā* (Ps IV 231,21).⁸¹

The phrases expressing the number of years after which the turtle would surface in §§ 2, 3a, and 3b and their Pāli counterparts are best discussed together. They are

§ 2

Gāndhārī *vaṣaśaḍa umi[jo] vaṣaśaḍa[sa acaṇ](*) saha samiḍa umic[e]a*
(ll. 37–38)

Pāli *vassasatassa vassasatassa accayena sakim sakim ummujjeyya*

⁸⁰For *h* as glide, see Brough 1962, § 39; Norman 1979, pp. 323–24 (= *Collected Papers*, Vol. 2, pp. 75–76); von Hinüber 2001, § 274; Allon 2001, p. 102.

⁸¹The B^c of the commentary on the Dutiyacchiggaḷasutta (Spk III 302,17) and a Burmese and a Sinhalese manuscript used for E^c read *andha-kacchapassa* against *kāṇa-kacchapassa* of E^c.

§ 3a

Gāndhārī *vaṣi[ad̄](*)sa ajaeṇa saha s[*am][i]ḍa umi[jata]* (ll. 39–40)

Pāli *vassasatassa vassasatassa accayena sakim sakim ummujjanto*

§ 3b

Gāndhārī *vaṣihaḍa omica vaṣihaḍasa aca[e]ṇa saha samida umijata* (ll. 41–43)

Pāli *vassasatassa vassasatassa accayena sakim sakim ummujjanto*

The Gāndhārī and Pāli differ in several ways. Where the Pāli has *vassasatassa vassasatassa accayena* “with the passing of each hundred years” in each section (§§ 2, 3a, 3b),⁸² the Gāndhārī has *vaṣaśaḍa* (*vaṣihaḍa*) *umi[jo]* (*omica*) *vaṣaśaḍasa* (*vaṣihaḍasa*) *acaṇa saha*⁸³ “emerging after a hundred years, with the passing of a hundred years” in § 2 and § 3b, but *vaṣi[ad̄](*)sa ajaeṇa saha* “with the passing of a hundred years” in § 3a. I take *saha* of the Gāndhārī to be the equivalent of Pāli/Skt *saha* “with”, rather than *sakim* of the Pāli parallel, although the expression *accayena saha* is not attested in Pāli. The Chinese parallels the Pāli with *bǎi nián yī* 百年一 “every hundred years”.

The interpretation of *umi[jo]*, *omica* in *vaṣaśaḍa umi[jo]* (l. 37), *vaṣihaḍa omica* (l. 41) is problematic. Although faint, the final *o* vowel in *umi[jo]* is certain. This spelling suggests that *umi[jo]*, *omica* is the present participle nominative singular masculine of the verb corresponding to Skt *ut-√majj* construed with the ablative (or accusative?), the phrase meaning “emerging after a hundred years”. The Pāli equivalent would be *vassasatā ummujjaṇ*, which is not recorded. However, the nominative singular of this participle appears as *umijata* in the following lines (ll. 40, 43), where the Pāli has *ummujjanto*. It may therefore represent the gerund of this verb, which appears in Sanskrit as

⁸²The reading in E^c of the Majjhima-nikāya occurrence (M III 169,13–14) is *vassasatassa accayena sakim ummujjeyya*, with the v.l. in two Sinhalese manuscripts of *vassasatassa vassasahassassa vassasatasahassassa accayena* ..., which is also recorded in B^c as the Sinhalese reading.

⁸³I have removed the square brackets where the reading is verified by the repetitions.

unmajya or *unmajjya* (MW s.v. *un-majj*), but in Pāli as *ummujjitvā*. However, the final *o* in *umi[jo]* is unexpected in a gerund. Both interpretations would give more or less the same meaning. I translate this phrase as “emerging after a hundred years”, which covers both possibilities.⁸⁴

The optative third singular of the same verb appears as *umic[e]a* in line 38, where the Pāli has *ummujjeyya*. In contrast to the Pāli verb, which shows labialisation of the root vowel *a* under the influence of the preceding labial consonant cluster *mm*,⁸⁵ the Gāndhārī shows palatalisation of the vowel under the influence of the following palatal consonant cluster (original *jj*).⁸⁶

The alternation between *j* and *c*, as witnessed in the Gāndhārī spellings of these words, is common in the Senior manuscripts. The reflexes of original intervocalic *-jj-*, *-cc-*, *-j-* and *-c-*, and of initial *j-* and *c-* may appear as *j* or *c* in this scribe’s orthography. As noted by Salomon (2003: 87), this suggests “that this scribe, and presumably at least some other contemporary speakers of Gāndhārī as well, did not distinguish between *c* and *j* in their dialect”.

The Gāndhārī equivalent of Skt *varṣasāta*-/Pāli *vassasata*- “hundred years” shows three spellings: (i) *vaṣaśada-* (l. 37 [× 2]), which could be read as *vaṣayaḍa-* since *ś* and *y* are indistinguishable in this scribe’s hand; (ii) *vaṣi[ad.]* (l. 39); and (iii) *vaṣihaḍa-* (l. 41 [× 2]). I transcribe the two line 37 examples as *vaṣaśada-* rather than *vaṣayaḍa-* on the basis of the spelling of this word in Gāndhārī inscriptions and in the Khotan Dharmapada. Examples from the latter document are *varṣaśada-* (141a) and *vaṣaśada-* (316a). The above spellings *vaṣi[ad.]* and *vaṣihaḍa-* show the palatalisation of final *a* of Skt *varṣa-* under the

⁸⁴A neuter noun *ummuja-* “emerging” is recorded in Pāli (*CPD* s.v.). But this is not likely here.

⁸⁵Berger 1955, p. 60; Norman 1976B, p. 45 (= *Collected Papers*, Vol. 1, p. 250); cf. *CDIAL* s.v. *ūnmajjati*.

⁸⁶Cf. Norman 1976a and 1983.

influence of the following initial *ś* of *śata-*,⁸⁷ with the development *-ś-* > *-h-* in the case of *vaṣihada-* and further weakening (*-ś-* > *-h-* > \emptyset) in the case of *vaṣi[ad.]*. The same sound changes (*-ś-* > *-h-* and *-ś-* > *-h-* > \emptyset),⁸⁸ but this time in the context of a preceding or following original palatal vowel, are seen in *yoṇiho* = BHS *yonīśaḥ* “thoroughly” (l. 36) and *baiḥodu* (l. 82), *baiḥoda* (l. 110) = Skt *vaśībhūtaḥ* found in the Gāndhārī Anavatapta-gāthā currently being edited by Richard Salomon. A further example is the Gāndhārī spelling for the place name *takṣaśīla-*, which appears as *takṣaīla-* besides *takṣaśīla-*.⁸⁹ The above can be compared with the development of original *-h-* > *-ś-* = [ʃ] and *-h-* > \emptyset in palatal environment. Examples of the former are (i) *īśa* = Skt *iha* “here” found in the Niya documents, inscriptions, and in some of the British Library manuscripts⁹⁰ and *īśe* found throughout the Senior manuscripts (e.g. 2.37) and in some inscriptions, which shows palatalisation of final *a*; and (ii) the Gāndhārī version of the epithet of king Ajātaśatru found in the Senior manuscripts: *vediśaputra-* (2.21, 31, 44, etc.), *vediśaputra-* (2.13, 18, etc.) = Skt *vaidehīputra-/Pāli vedehiputta-*.⁹¹ Examples of the latter development (*-h-* > \emptyset in palatal

⁸⁷Cf. Gāndhārī *aviśīśadi*, which probably = Skt *avaśīṣyate* (Dhp-G^K 200; see Brough 1962, p. 243; Norman 1976A, p. 334 [= *Collected Papers*, Vol. 1, p. 227]). For an example in Pāli, see Norman 1983, p. 277 (= *Collected Papers*, Vol. 3, p. 15).

⁸⁸Cf. the examples of *ś* > *h* in Gray 1965, §401, and *-ś-* > *-h-* > \emptyset in the Gāndhārī Dharmapadas discussed in Lenz 2003, p. 43 (see also von Hinüber 2001, §221).

⁸⁹Examples of *takṣaīla-* are found in the British Library manuscripts (e.g. BL16+25, ll. 45–46 [see Lenz 2003, pp. 182–83]; and BL2, l. 7); for references to examples of *takṣaśīla-* in the inscriptions, see Konow 1929 index.

⁹⁰E.g. BL 16+25, ll. 21, 29, 32, 43 where the spelling alternates between *īśa* and *īśā* (see Lenz 2003, pp. 155–56). For comments on this word, see Burrow 1937, §§17, 91.

⁹¹Note that the original final palatal vowel in *vaidehī-* is not marked.

environment) are Aśokan *ia* = *iha* found at Shāhbāzgarhī⁹²; *sabaraka-idaī* = Skt *samparāya-hitāya* “for the benefit of the next life” and *vayari-* = Skt *vihārin-* in the Khotan Dharmapada (Brough 1962: § 39); and in the Senior manuscripts *amatrei* (17.15) = Pāli *āmantehi*, *paḍigaesu* (12.19) = Pāli *paṭiggahesum*, and *priao* (5.3) = BHS *plīhak-/Pāli pihaka-* “spleen”.⁹³ This indicates that both *-h-* (< *-ś-*) and *-ś-* (< *-h-*) in the above examples are an approximation at representing [ʒ], which tends to undergo further weakening (> Ø).

The palatalisation of a neighbouring vowel by *ś* and the weakening of original *-ś-* and *-h-* in palatal environment as witnessed in the examples listed here are, however, uncommon. The spellings for the equivalent of Skt *varṣaśata-* in Gāndhārī are more regularly *vaṣaśada-/vaṣaśada-/varṣaśada-*. Similarly, original *-ś-* and *-h-* in palatal environment normally remain, as they do in other contexts generally.⁹⁴ Examples from the Senior manuscripts are *kaśia-cadaṇa* (13.9) = Skt *kāśika-candanam* “sandal from Kāśī”; *deśīsama* (13.12) = Skt *deśīṣyāmi* “I will teach”; and *suha-vihara* (12.42) = Pāli *sukha-vihāri* “living at ease”.

samiḍa umic[e]a (l. 38), *samiḍa umijata* (ll. 39–40, 42–43): The two Saṃyutta-nikāya occurrences of the simile read *sakiṃ sakiṃ ummuḷḷeyya* “would emerge once each time” and *sakiṃ sakiṃ ummuḷḷanto* “emerging once each time”, while the European and Burmese editions of the Majjhima-nikāya (M III 169,14) occurrence of the simile do not repeat *sakiṃ*.⁹⁵ G *samiḍa* must be the equivalent of Pāli/Skt *samitaṃ* “continuously”, “over and over” (see *PED* s.v. *samita*¹). This appears in Pāli texts in the expression *satataṃ samitaṃ* “constantly and continuously”, an example being *māro pāpimā satataṃ*

⁹²Cf. Norman 1962, p. 326 (= *Collected Papers*, Vol. 1, pp. 34–35) and von Hinüber 2001, § 223.

⁹³For *priao*, see Glass 2007, § 5.2.1.7.

⁹⁴See Allon 2001, pp. 86–87 for references.

⁹⁵Cf. *tam enaṃ puriso vassasatassa vassasatassa accayena kāsikena vatthena sakiṃ sakiṃ parimajḷḷeyya* (S II 181,27–28).

samitaṃ paccupaṭṭhito (S IV 178,13–14) “Māra the Evil One is constantly and continuously waiting by”, which occurs in conjunction with a simile involving a jackal waiting for a turtle to extend its limbs.

avi na 'ṣe (l. 39) [§ 3a]: The Pāli parallel has *api nu so*. The Pāli equivalent of the Gāndhārī would be *api nu eso*. Cf. *ya eṣe* (= Pāli *yam eso*) in line 41, where the Pāli parallel has *yam so*.

The phrase used to express the idea of the turtle inserting its neck into the hole in the yoke is *am[a]spi ekatarmao yuo grive pakṣivea* in § 3a (l. 40) and *amaspi ekatarmao yuo grive paḍi[mu](*ce)a na* [va] *paḍimu[ce](*a)* in § 3b, where the Pāli parallel has *amusmiṃ ekacchiggaḷe yuge gīvaṃ paveseyyā ti* in both sections.

The verb in the Pāli is *paveseyya* “would insert”. In contrast, the verb in § 3a of the Gāndhārī is *pakṣivea* = Pāli *pakkhipeyya*/Skt *prāvṣip*, which can also mean “would insert”. This is the verb used to express the idea of the man casting or throwing the yoke into the ocean in § 2: Gāndhārī *tatra puruṣ[e] ekatarmao yuo pakṣivea*, Pāli *tatra puriso ekacchiggaḷaṃ yugaṃ pakkhipeyya*. The verb in Gāndhārī § 3b is *paḍi[mu](*ce)a*, which is repeated in the negative *na* [va] *paḍimu[ce](*a)*, where *na va* = Skt *na vā* “or not”. The Pāli form of this verb is *paṭimuñcati* (see *PED* s.v.), which, interestingly, occurs in the Pāli Jātakas and commentaries in conjunction with *gīvā* “neck” in the sense of “put on”, “attach”. A particularly good example for our purpose is *pāsaṃ gīvāya paṭimuñcati* “he puts the snare on his neck” (Ja IV 405,10), where the commentary (line 15) glosses *paṭimuñcati* with *paveseti*, the verb found in the Pāli sutta under discussion.⁹⁶ Also of interest is *paṭimukkaṃ* in the Therīgāthā verse discussed above, a derivative of *paṭimuñcati*.⁹⁷ The active form of the verb (“would put that yoke with the single hole on his neck”) does seem a little strange

⁹⁶Other examples are (passive) *kāssa gīvāya paṭimucci* (v.l. *paṭimuñci*; As 272,32–33) and *kacchaṃ nāgānaṃ bandhatha, gīveyyaṃ paṭimuñcatha* (Ja IV 395,17).

⁹⁷For Pāli *paṭimukka-*, see Geiger 1994, § 197; Pischel 1965, § 566; von Hinüber 2001, § 493; Norman 2002, p. 241.

here, and it is possible that we are dealing with a passive (Pāli *~muccati*). If so, the translation would be “this blind turtle ... would be caught (or fastened) at the neck in that yoke”.

Finally, the Gāndhārī expression *amaspi ekatarmao yuo grive paḍi[mu](*ce)a ṇa [va] paḍimu[ce](*a)* “would put that yoke with the single hole on his neck, or he may not put it on” is reminiscent of the Buddha’s statement in §3c of the Chinese: “Although the blind turtle and the floating piece of wood may miss [each other], perhaps they may also meet each other” (盲龜浮木。雖復差違。或復相得).

aḍicam eḍa bhayava suḍalavam eva (ll. 40–41): Pāli *adhiccam idaṃ bhante*. For the non-aspirate consonant in *aḍicam* = Pāli *adhiccam*, see the discussion of *-paḍavi* = Skt *pṛthivī* above.

suḍalavam = Skt *sudurlabham*. The Senior manuscripts contain many examples of medial vowels not being marked, including *u/o*, as here, and *i/e*. Further examples of *u* not being marked are *caḍamaṣia* (2.11,14,16) = Pāli *cātumāsini-* “of four months” and *veḍadal[e]a* (13.5) besides *v[e]ḍudalae* (13.2) = Pāli *veḷudvāreyya(ka)-* “belonging to Veḷudvāra”.

Summary

This Gāndhārī sūtra, for which the simile of the blind turtle and the hole in the yoke is central, is as a whole quite close to the second of the two Pāli *chiggaḷa* suttas preserved in the Saṃyutta-nikāya (no. 56.48), while the one similar sūtra found in the Chinese Saṃyuktāgama is closer to the first of these two Pāli Saṃyutta-nikāya suttas (no. 56.47).

With regard to the portion of these suttas/sūtras analysed in detail here, the prose simile, the Gāndhārī and Pāli versions exhibit only minor differences in terms of structure and wording. Both differ in several important ways from the Chinese version.

The main differences between the Gāndhārī and Pāli versions are

- (i) different synonyms or near synonyms used: e.g. Gāndhārī *-tarmao* (= Skt *tardman* + *ka*), Pāli *-chiggaḷa-* “hole”; Gāndhārī *paḍi[mu]*, Pāli *paveseyya* “would insert” (§3a) and *paḍimucea*

“would put on” (§ 3b); cf. also Gāndhārī *bhayava*, Pāli *bhante* (§ 3b);

- (ii) different pronouns or indeclinable used: Gāndhārī *eṣe* “this”, Pāli *so* “that” (§§ 3a, 3b); Gāndhārī *atra* “here”, Pāli *tatra* “there” (§ 2);
- (iii) differences in syntax: the accusative case of Gāndhārī *paṭṭimo saharea* in contrast to the instrumental of the Pāli *puratthimena saṃhareyya*;
- (iv) a near synonym added: Gāndhārī *aḍicam ... suḍalavam*, Pāli *adhiccam* (§ 3b).

Although still relatively minor, the greatest point of difference between the Gāndhārī and Pāli versions of the simile is in the phrase used to express the period of time after which the turtle surfaces (§§ 2, 3a, 3b).

Greater differences are, however, evident in the sections of the sutta/sūtra not discussed in this article (§§ 4–7). This includes the order in which factors are listed (e.g. the three conditions that are most conducive to attaining enlightenment) and in the wording used to describe these, although much of the wording of the Gāndhārī text that differs from the Pāli parallel is in fact found elsewhere in the Pāli canon, a phenomenon already noted for this genre of text (see Allon 2001, e.g. pp. 178, 184, 256, 279).

The differences noted for this sutta/sūtra are of the same type as those identified in a comparison of three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-type sūtras with their Pāli and Sanskrit parallels, for which the reader is referred to Allon 2001: 30–38.

Mark Allon
University of Sydney

ABBREVIATIONS

The abbreviations used in this article are those of the *CPD*. Those not listed in the *CPD* are

AVP	Atharvaveda, Paippalāda recension
AVŚ	Atharvaveda, Śaunaka recension
B ^c	Burmese (Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana) edition(s) of Pāli texts (= VRI-CD unless otherwise stated; page references are to the printed edition as given by the VRI-CD)
CDIAL	R.L. Turner, <i>A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages</i> (London, 1966)
C ^c	Sri Lankan edition(s) of Pāli texts (= electronic version of Sri Lanka Buddha Jāyanti Tripiṭaka Series)
Dhp-G ^K	Gāndhārī Khotan Dharmapada (= “Gāndhārī Dharmapada”, ed. Brough 1962)
DOP	Margaret Cone, <i>A Dictionary of Pāli</i> , 1 vol. to date (Oxford, 2001)
EĀ-G	Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama (ed. Allon 2001)
E ^c	European (Pali Text Society) edition(s) of Pāli texts
frag(s).	fragment(s)
l. / ll.	line(s)
ms / mss	manuscript(s)
RS	The Robert Senior collection of Kharoṣṭhī manuscripts
SĀ	Saṃyuktāgama
S ^c	Thai (King of Siam) edition(s) of Pāli texts (= Mahidol University’s <i>Budsir on CD-ROM: A Digital Edition of Buddhist Scriptures</i> [Bangkok: Mahidol University Computing Center, 1994])
SWTF	Heinz Bechert, ed., <i>Sanskrit-Wörterbuch der buddhistischen Texte aus den Turfan-Funden</i> , 2 vols. to date (Göttingen, 1994–)
T	<i>Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō</i> , eds. J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe. 100 vols. (Tokyo, 1924–34)
YV	Yogavāsiṣṭha of Vālmīki

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

The Pāli texts quoted are the editions of the PTS unless otherwise stated. Non-Pāli texts quoted in this paper are the following:

- Abhidhānacintāmaṇināmamālā* by Hemacandrācārya; Devasāgaragaṇīkṛta-vyutpattiratnākarakalitā; samśodhakaḥ sampādakaśca Gaṇī Śrīcandra-vijayah, Surata: Śrī Rāndera Roḍa Jaina Saṅgha: Prāptisthāna Śrī Nemi-Vijnāna-Kastūrasūrisvaraḥ Jaina Jñānamandira, 2003
- Amarakośa, with the Unpublished South Indian Commentaries Amarapadavivṛti of Liṅgayasūrin, Amarapadapārijāta of Mallinātha and the Amarapada-vivarāna of Appayārya*, 3 vols., ed. A.A. Ramanathan, Adyar Library Series 101. [Madras]: Adyar Library and Research Centre, n.d. [c.1971–c.1983].
- Āpastamba-grhya-sūtra, with the “Anākula” Commentary of Śrī Hardatta Miśra, The “Tāparyadarśana” Commentary of Śrī Sudarśanācārya and Notes in Sanskrit by Mahāmahopādhyāya A. Chinnasvāmī*, ed., Umesh Chandra Pandey, Kashi Sanskrit Series 59, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1971
- Atharvaveda (Śaunaka), with the Pada-pāṭha and Sāyaṇācārya’s Commentary, Part III (Kāṇḍas XI–XVIII)*, ed., Viśva Bandhu et al., Hoshairpur: Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Insitute, 1961
- [*Atharvavedasaṃhitā*] = *Atharva Veda Sanhita*. 3., unveränderte Auflage (nach der von Max Lindennau besorgten zweiten Auflage), ed. R. Roth and W.D. Whitney, Bonn: Ferd. Dümmler’s Verlag, 1856
- Bodhasāra, with a Commentary by Divākara*, ed. Swami Dayānanda, Benares Sanskrit Series, Benares: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Book Depot, 1905
- Bodhicaryāvatāra of Śāntideva, with the Commentary Pañjikā of Prajñā-karamati*, ed. P.L. Vaidya, Buddhist Sanskrit Texts 12, Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute, 1960
- Fóguāng Dàzàngjīng* 佛光大藏經 [Fóguāng Tripiṭaka], Gāoxióng: Fóguāng Chūbānshè, 1983
- Kāṭhakaḡrhyasūtra, with Extracts from Three Commentaries, Appendix and Indexes*, ed. Willem Caland, Lahore: D.A.V. College, 1925
- The Kauśika Sūtra of Atharva Veda, with Extracts from the Commentaries of Dārila and Keśava*, ed. Maurice Bloomfield, New Haven, Conn.: *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 14, 1890 (reprinted Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1972)

- Kauśikasūtra-Dārilabhāṣya*, ed. H.R. Diwekar et al., Pune: Tilak Maharashtra Vidyapitha, 1972
- Laghuyogavāsiṣṭha*, ed. Vāsudeva Śarman, Bombay: Nirṇaya Sagar Press, 1937
- The Laugākṣhi-grhya-sūtras, with Bhāṣyam of Devapāla*, Vol. 1, ed. M.K. Kaul Shastri, Kashmir Series of Texts and Studies 49, Srinagar: Research Department, Jammu and Kashmir Government, 1928
- Mahāvastu avadānaḥ: Le Mahāvastu*, 3 vols., ed. Émile Senart, Paris: Société Asiatique, 1882–1897
- Ṛgveda-Saṃhitā, with the Commentary of Sāyaṇāchārya*, ed. V.K. Rajwade et al., Vol. 3, 6–8 Maṇḍalas, Pune: Tilak Mahārāshtra University, Vaidika Saṃshodhana Maṇḍala, 1978
- Saddharmapuṇḍarīka*, eds. H. Kern and Bunyiu Nanjio, Bibliotheca Buddhica 10, St. Petersburg: Académie impériale des sciences, 1908–1912
- Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra: Central Asian Manuscripts. Romanized Text*, ed. Hirofumi Toda, 2nd ed., Tokushima: Kyoiku Shuppan Center, 1983
- The Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, According to the Mādhyandina Recension with the Vedārthaparakāśabhāṣya of Sāyaṇācārya, supplemented by the Commentary of Harisvāmin*, 5 vols., Delhi: Gain Publishing House, 1987
- [Śikṣāsamuccaya] *Çikṣāsamuccaya: A Compendium of Buddhist Teaching Compiled by Çāntideva Chiefly from Earlier Mahāyāna-sūtras*, 4 vols, ed. Cecil Bendall, Bibliotheca Buddhica 1, St. Petersburg: Académie impériale des sciences, 1897–1902
- The Śrautasūtra of Kātyāyana, with Extracts from the Commentaries of Karka and Yājñikadeva*, ed. Albrecht Weber, 2nd ed. Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series 104, Varanasi: Chowkhamba Sanskrit Series Office, 1972
- Sukhāvātīvyūha*, ed. Atsuji Ashikaga, Kyoto: Libraire Hōzōkan, 1965
- Taishō Shinshū Daizōkyō*, 100 vols., ed. J. Takakusu and K. Watanabe, Tokyo, 1924–1934
- The Yogavāsiṣṭha of Vālmiki, with the Commentary Vāsiṣṭhamahārāmayāna-tātparyaprakāśa*, ed. Wāsudeva Laxmaṇa Śāstrī Paṇṣīkar, 3rd ed., Bombay, 1937

SECONDARY SOURCES

- Allon, Mark, 2001. (With a contribution by Andrew Glass) *Three Gāndhārī Ekottarikāgama-Type Sūtras: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 12 and 14*. Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 2, Seattle: University of Washington Press

- . forthcoming. *Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra II: The Senior Kharoṣṭhī Fragments*. Gandhāran Buddhist Texts, Seattle: University of Washington Press
- Allon, Mark and Richard Salomon, 2000. “Kharoṣṭhī Fragments of a Gāndhārī Version of the Mahāparinirvāṇa-sūtra”. In Jens Braarvig, ed., *Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection I*. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 1, pp. 243–73, Oslo: Hermes Publishing
- Allon, Mark, Richard Salomon, Geraldine Jacobsen, Ugo Zoppi, 2007. “Radio-carbon Dating of Kharoṣṭhī Fragments from the Schøyen and Senior Manuscript Collections”. In Jens Braarvig, ed., *Buddhist Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection III*. Manuscripts in the Schøyen Collection 4, pp. 279–91, Oslo: Hermes Publishing
- Berger, Hermann, 1955. *Zwei Probleme der mittelindischen Lautlehre*. Münchener Indologische Studien 1, Munich: J. Kitzinger
- Bodhi, Bhikkhu, tr., 2000. *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha: A New Translation of the Saṃyutta Nikāya*. 2 vols. Pali Text Society Translation Series 47, 48, Oxford: Pali Text Society
- Brough, John, ed., 1962. *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, London Oriental Series 7. London: Oxford University Press
- Burrow, T., 1937. *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- . 1973. *The Sanskrit Language*, 3rd edition. London: Faber
- Burrow, T., and M.B. Emeneau, 1961. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- . 1968. *A Dravidian Etymological Dictionary: Supplement*, Oxford: Clarendon Press
- Caland, W., tr., 1900. *Altindisches Zauberritual: Probe einer Uebersetzung der wichtigsten Theile des Kauśika Sūtra*. Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afdeeling Letterkunde, Nieuwe reeks, deel 3, no. 2. Amsterdam: J. Müller
- Crosby, Kate, and Andrew Skilton, tr., 1995. *Śāntideva: The Bodhicaryāvatāra*. Oxford World’s Classics, Oxford: Oxford University Press
- De, Harināth. 1906–1907. “Notes by Harināth De, M.A.”, *JPTS* V: 172–75
- Fussman, Gérard, 1986. “Documents épigraphiques Kouchans IV: Ajitasena, Père de Senavarma”, *BEFEO* 75, pp. 1–14
- Geiger, Wilhelm, 1994. *A Pāli Grammar*. Tr. Batakrishna Ghosh, rev. 2nd ed. K. R. Norman, Oxford: Pali Text Society

- Glass, Andrew, 2007. *Four Gāndhārī Saṃyuktāgama-Type Sūtras: Senior Kharoṣṭhī Fragment 5*. Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 4, Seattle: University of Washington Press
- Gray, Louis H., 1965. *Indo-Iranian Phonology, with Special Reference to the Middle and New Indo-Iranian Languages*, Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series 2. New York: AMS Press
- von Hinüber, Oskar, 1992. *Sprachentwicklung und Kulturgeschichte: Ein Beitrag zur materiellen Kultur des buddhistischen Klosterlebens*. Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur; Mainz, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1992, 6. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag
- 2001. *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick*. 2nd ed. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Sitzungsberichte 467, Vienna: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
- Jacob, G.A., 1909. “A Sanskrit Simile”, *JRAS* 4, pp. 1120–21
- Konow, Sten, ed., 1929. *Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions with the Exception of Those of Aśoka*. Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum 2.1, Calcutta: Government of India
- Lenz, Timothy, 2003. (With a contribution by Andrew Glass and Bhikshu Dharmamitra.) *A New Version of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada and a Collection of Previous-Birth Stories: British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragments 16 + 25*. Gandhāran Buddhist Texts 3, Seattle: University of Washington Press
- Lüders, Heinrich, ed., 1926. *Bruchstücke der Kalpanāmaṇḍitikā des Kumāralāta*. Kleinere Sanskrittexte 2, Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft
- Nandawansa, Bhikkhu Medagama, 2001. *Abhidhānappadīpikā: A Study of the Text and Its Commentary*, Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute
- Norman, K.R., tr., 1971A. *The Elders’ Verses*, Vol. II, *Therīgāthā*. Pali Text Society Translation Series 40, London: Pali Text Society
- 1971B. “Notes on the Gāndhārī Dharmapada”, *Indian Linguistics* 32, pp. 213–20
- 1972. “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies IX: The Blind Turtle and the Hole in the Yoke”, *JOI(B)* 21: 331–35 (= *Collected Papers*, Vol. 1, 1990, pp. 156–60)

- 1976A. “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XIII: The Palatalisation of Vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan”, *JOI(B)* 25, pp. 328–42 (= *Collected Papers*, Vol. 1, 1990, pp. 220–37)
- 1976B. “Labialisation of Vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan”, *Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik* 2, pp. 41–58 (= *Collected Papers*, Vol. 1, 1990, pp. 247–61)
- 1979. “Two Pali Etymologies”, *BSOAS* 42, pp. 321–28 (= *Collected Papers*, Vol. 2, 1991, pp. 71–83)
- 1962. “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies III”, *JOI(B)* 11, pp. 322–27 (= *Collected Papers*, Vol. 1, 1990, pp. 30–35)
- 1983. “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies XVI: The Palatalisation and Labialisation of Vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan”, *JOI(B)* 32, pp. 275–79 (= *Collected Papers*, Vol. 3, 1992, pp. 12–18)
- 1990–2001. *Collected Papers*. 7 vols., Oxford: Pali Text Society
- 2002. “A Survey of the Grammar of Early Middle Indo-Aryan”, *AO* 63, pp. 221–48
- 2004. “A New Version of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada?”, *AO* 65, pp. 113–33
- Oberlies, Thomas. 2001. *Pāli. A Grammar of the Language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka: With a Concordance to Pischel’s Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen*. Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 3, Berlin: Walter de Gruyter
- Pischel, R., 1965. *Comparative Grammar of the Prākṛit Languages*. 2nd ed., tr. Subhadra Jhā, Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass
- Ranade, H.G., tr., [1978]. *Kāṭyāyana Śrauta Sūtra: Rules for the Vedic Sacrifices*, Ranade Publication Series 1, Pune: R.H. Ranade
- Salomon, Richard, 2001. “‘Gāndhārī Hybrid Sanskrit’: New Sources for the Study of the Sanskritization of Buddhist Literature”, *IJ* 44, pp. 241–52
- 2003. “The Senior Manuscripts: Another Collection of Gandhāran Buddhist Scrolls”, *JAOS* 123.1, pp. 73–92
- Turner, R.L., 1966. *A Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London: Oxford University Press
- Upadhye, A.N., 1972. “The Turtle and the Yoke-hole”, *JOI(B)* 22, pp. 323–26
- Wackernagel, Jakob, 1957. *Altindische Grammatik* Vol. 1: *Lautlehre*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

- Whitney, William Dwight, tr., 1905. *Atharva-Veda Samhitā*, revised and brought nearer to completion and edited by Charles Rockwell Lanman, 2 vols., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University
- Winternitz, Moriz, 1913. “Beiträge zur buddhistischen Sanskritliteratur”, (Part 2) *WZKM* 27, pp. 33–47 (= *Moriz Winternitz: Kleine Schriften*. 2 vols., pp. 536–50, ed. Horst Brinkhaus, Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1991)
- Wogiwara, Unrai (萩原雲來), 1979. *Bonwa daijiten* (梵和大辞典), 2 vols. [Sanskrit–Chinese–Japanese dictionary], Tokyo: Kodansha International Ltd
- Yin Shún (印順) (Bhikkhu), 1983. *Zá āhan jīnglùn huìbiān* 雜阿含經論會編, 3 vols., Taipei: Zhèngwén Chūbǎnshè