

(2) *sa bhaginikanam*, if correct, would be very puzzling indeed, for the change of dental *n* to cerebral *ṇ*, though common enough in the literary Prākṛits, is unknown to epigraphical Pāli or Māgadhī. But, from an examination of the original urn, I can confidently assert that what has been taken for the upper cross-bar of *ṇi* (𑀭), is merely a small particle of stone peeled off when the writer engraved the *i-mātrā* of *ni*. Hardly any photograph or impression will show this clearly, but on the original urn there remains no doubt whatever.

(3) I am glad to confirm the correctness of the reading *saputa*, instead of Mr. Smith's *saputra*, pointed out by you in a foot-note. Mr. Smith probably has been misled by the fact that one stroke of *t* is prolonged a little down below the bottom line of the letter, thus . But, if this be *r*, it ought to be a serpentine line, and not a straight down-stroke, as, e.g., we have  $\left. \begin{array}{l} \{ \\ \{ \\ \{ \end{array} \right\}$  *dra* in one of the Bharhat Stupa inscriptions.

My reading of the inscription, from the original, accordingly stands thus:—

yanam

iyam salilanidhane budhasa bhagavate saki sukutibhatinam  
sabhaginikanam saputadalanam.

This inscription is in one line only, round the hemispherical lid of the urn, with the exception of the two syllables *yanam*, which stand above *suki*.—I have the honour to be, sir, your most obedient servant,

T. BLOCH,  
*Philol. Secr. A.S.B.*

*To the Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, London.*

## 6. THE GOSINGA KHAROṢṬHI MS.

As our readers are aware, fragments of an old birch bark MS. in Kharoṣṭhi characters found their way in 1896 to Paris and St. Petersburg. The MS. was found about

thirteen miles from Khotan, at or near the site of the ancient Gosinga Vihāra, and is the earliest known Indian MS. M. Senart has published in the *Journal Asiatique* facsimiles of the seven leaves which, together with numerous fragments, form the Paris portion of this important discovery; and has added to the great services he has rendered to the reconstruction of Indian history by a masterly decipherment of the contents of these leaves, with numerous valuable notes.

The little work is an anthology, a Dhammapada, a collection of religious verses. From what sources was the collection made? As is well known, there is a similar anthology included, under the name Dhammapada, in the Buddhist canon. M. Senart has shown that the majority of the verses included in this new collection are found also in the old one, but not in the same order, or in the same connection; and that a number of others in the new MS. are not in the older collection at all. This would seem to point to the supposition that the new anthology has not been compiled from the Pāli one; but rather from the sources from which the latter was itself compiled.

Besides M. Senart's references I have noted the following:<sup>1</sup>

- 11. 4 Sutta Nipāta, 333, and Thera Gāthā, 653, 1005.
- 11. 5 Milinda, 379.
- 15. 2 The MSS. of the Dhṛp. read often Hīna-Dhammaṃ.
- 16. 4 Saṃyutta, 1. 157; Divyāvādāna, 300; Milinda, 245; Nettī, p. 41 of my MS.
- 17. 5 Thera Gāthā, 257.
- 18. 7 Jātaka, 5. 72.
- 19. 1 Thera Gāthā, 676.
- 20. 2, 3 „ „ 677-8.
- 21. 6 Milinda, 213.
- 25. 12 Jātaka, 5. 99.
- 26. 14 Thera Gāthā, 883.

<sup>1</sup> The figures on the right give the page and verse of the *tirage à part* of M. Senart's paper.

40. 9 Saṃyutta, 1. 73; Milinda, 399.  
 41. 11 Thera Gāthā, 2 (for mantabhāṇī).  
 48. 23 Itivuttaka, p. 42; Thera Gāthā, 1032; Mahā-  
     vastu, iii, 422.  
 50. 26 Saṃyutta, 1. 182.  
 53. 32 Itivuttaka, 45.  
 54. 34 Jātaka, 5. 99.  
 56. 38 Sutta Nipāta, 950.  
 57. 39 Divyāvadāna, 339; Udānavarga, 185.  
 74. 6 Jātaka, 1. 314.  
 85. 33 Itivuttaka, 48; Vinaya, 3. 90.  
 89. 43 Thera Gāthā, 636.  
 90. 3 Saṃyutta, 1. 97; Netti, 95; Lalita Vistara, 328.  
 95. 16 Udāna, 1. 5; Divyāvadāna, 561.  
 102. 31, 32 Saṃyutta, 1. 77; Jātaka, 2. 140.  
 108. 43 Saṃyutta, 1. 83.  
 108. 44 M.P.S., vi, 16; Saṃyutta, 1. 193; Gāta, No. 95, etc.

Professor Oldenbourg, of St. Petersburg, is editing the other and larger portion of this Gosinga MS.; and when we have the whole text before us we may be able to draw some more certain conclusion as to the probable method of its compilation. At present it is uncertain whether the compiler translated into his native dialect from the Pītakas, or whether he drew from previous translations of the Pītaḥ books, or whether he translated from one or other of the other anthologies, different from the Pāli Dhammapada, which (from the lists of books extant in China or Tibet) we know must have existed in the centuries preceding the Christian era. As the MS. comes from a district afterwards predominantly Mahāyānist, it is interesting to note the fact that it contains no trace of Mahāyāna doctrine.

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS.