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A Version of the Śikhālakasūtra/Sīngālovādasutta

Jens-Uwe Hartmann and Klaus Wille

The sermon to the layman Śikhālaka—this is his name in the Sanskrit version—or to Sigālaka/Sīngāla, as he is called in the Pāli sources, ranks among the best-known discourses of the Buddha, since it is famous for containing all the fundamentals of the ethics of a Buddhist lay person. Consequently, every school we know of incorporated a version of this discourse in their collection of canonical scriptures. The Theravādins and, presumably, the Dharmaguptakas included it in their versions of the Collection of Long Sūtras (Dīghanikāya/Dīrghāgama), while the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins assigned it to the Discourses of Intermediate Length (Madhyamāgama). Only the Theravāda version has been entirely preserved in its original language, Pāli, while a number of fragments of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda version in Sanskrit were known from Central Asia. Now, with the appearance of the Indian fragments from Afghanistan, a third Indian version has come to light. Its language differs distinctively from the other two versions in that it still preserves a fairly large amount of Prakritic words and forms in an otherwise Sanskritized text. This specific mixture is so typical of many fragments of canonical texts among the manuscripts from Afghanistan that one feels tempted to consider it as the standard “church language” of the school which produced them, be it the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins or any other of the schools that once were present in the region of Gandhāra.¹

Regrettably, so far only two fragments of the text have been identified in the Schøyen Collection. They belong to the same leaf and can be joined. The material is palm leaf; the script is close to Gilgit/Bamiyan Type I, probably dating to the 5th century.² The left part of the folio is missing, and therefore no folio number is available which could tell us if the manuscript contained only the present sūtra or belonged to a larger collection. The folio preserves part of the account of the six places, or rather ways, in which one decreases one’s substance (ṣaḍ bhogānām apāyasthānāni according to Mahāvyutpatti 2504; cf. SHT IV 412 fragment 23v5 [p. 50]). Although similar in contents, the particular order of the six differs from version to version as the following table illustrates. Surprising are the different orders of the Chinese Madhyamāgama, the Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia (SHT 412) and the Mahāvyutpatti, since all three are supposed to belong to the same version, i.e., that of the (Mūla-)Sarvāstivādins.

---

¹ Cf. the remarks on the school affiliation of the Cān̄gisūtra in BMSC II, p. 2.
Schøyen fragment  DN  C-DÄ  C-MÄ  Skt.-MÄ=  Mvy  T. 17
1. surä°  1  1  3 ?  1  1  SHT IV 412
2. vikäla°  2  3  2 ?  3  2
3. päpamitra°  5  4  3  4  5  4  5
4. (dyüta)°  4  2  1  3  2  3
5. mahäsamäj(a)°  3  4  5  4  5  4
6. älasya°  6  6  6  6  6  6
Not only their order, but also the terms themselves differ in the various versions, as far as the original Indian words are preserved or are capable of being reconstructed.

1. MS surä-m(ai)r(e)ya-madyapäna-pramäda-sthänänuyoga : DN surä-meraya-majja-pamä-da-ṭṭhänänuyoga : Mvy madyapānam;
2. MS vikälavesi/// : DN vikäla-visikhä-carivänuyoga : Mvy vikālacaryā;
3. MS päpamitrajanasamsevä : DN päpamittänuyoga : Mvy päpamitratā;
4. MS (dyūta)° : DN jūtappamädaṭṭhänänuyoga : Mvy dyūtam;
5. MS mahäsamäj(a-)° : DN samajjäbhicarana : Mvy samājadarsanam : SHT 412 (24) r4 mahāsamājadarśana;

Naturally, the wording of each section differs from version to version. Although the Pāli text is mostly in close agreement with the Schøyen fragment and helps considerably in its reading and understanding, at least once it differs to such an extent that it is difficult even to assign the relevant line of the Schøyen fragment to a specific section (see line r5, probably belonging to section 4). There is another formal similarity which appears to link the Pāli and the text preserved in the Schøyen fragment more closely: the statement that when one follows the six ways of decreasing one’s substance, new riches will not be generated and the existing ones will be diminished, is repeated in SHT, C-DÄ (T. 1), C-MÄ (T. 26) and T. 17 at the end of each section, while in the Pāli and in the Schøyen fragment the full repetition of the formula occurs only once, after the sixth section. However, tasya evam ratikṛ[dyänuyoga/// in line verso 1 appears to point to a repetition at least here, and possibly in verso 3, too, but if so, it must have been abbreviated.

In the fragment, the Buddha never addresses his interlocutor by his personal name, but always with the title “son of a householder” (grhapatiputra). The word grhapatiputra, appearing altogether seven times, is consistently spelled grhapatiputrā (once grahapatiputrā, in r2). This is evidently an example of the so-called Pluti, the use of which in the vocative is familiar in Middle Indian.5 Although no personal name occurs in the fragment, this particular group of six ways, and especially the summarizing verses at the end, appear to be rather characteristic of the discourse to Śikhālaka/Sigālaka,6 and there can hardly be any doubt that the fragment belongs to this sūtra. However, without any further indication in the fragment, the specific form of the name of the main figure, if it is Śikhālaka/Sigālaka/Siṅgāla, is open to conjecture, and therefore we have refrained from voicing an opinion and simply retain the combination of the Sanskrit and Pāli forms.

5 The term is not preserved.
6 Only the beginning of the term is preserved.
5 Hinüber 2001: § 311.
6 For a similar group of four apāyamukha (itthidhutta, surādhutta, akkhadhutta and pāpamitta) cf. AN IV 283.13–24 (= IV 287.20–288.17); the first three terms occur also in Sn 106.
Survey of the existing versions

1. Theravāda
   *Singālovāda-suttanta*, no. 31 of the *Dīghanikāya* (DN III 180–193 ~ DN(ChS) III 146–157) in Pāli;
2. (presumably) Dharmaguptaka
   *Shansheng jing*, no. 16 of the *Dirghāgama* in Chinese translation (T. 1, 70a19–72c7);
3. (Mūla-)Sarvāstivāda
   3.1. Sanskrit fragments from Central Asia, most likely belonging to mss. of the *Madhyamāgama*:
           - SHT IV 412, fragments 22–31 (pp. 47–64)
           - SHT VI 1244 (pp. 44f.)
           - SHT VIII 1914 (pp. 96f.) + X 3354 (forthcoming), same ms. as SHT 4195
           - SHT X 4195, same ms. as SHT VIII 1914 (cf. SHT IV 412, fragment 30)
           - SHT 4589 (not yet edited), from the beginning of the sūtra;
   3.2. one folio of a Sanskrit manuscript apparently of the *Madhyamāgama* containing the final part of the *Śikhālasūtra* and the beginning of the *Apramādasūtra*, preserved among the so-called Bendall Manuscripts in the National Archives of Nepal, Kathmandu, cf. Matsuda 1990 and 1996;
   3.3. *Shansheng jing*, no. 135 of the *Madhyamāgama* in Chinese translation (T. 26, 639c6–642a21);
4. Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravāda?
   two fragments of a folio from Afghanistan (see below);
5. Single translations of unknown school affiliation
   5.1. *Shijialuo yue liu fang li jing* (T. 16, 250c14–252b1), allegedly translated by An Shigao;
   5.2. *Shanshengzi jing* (T. 17, 252b9–255a7), translated by Shi Fadu.
6. Quotation

Transliteration

MS 2379/45 + 2376/36; recto

1 /// hapatiputrā ādinavā sur[ā]m. r. yamadyapānapramādasthānānuyog[o] v[e]dayitavyām katame śat* .. + + .. ..
2 /// dorbalyikaranāṃ ime grahapatiprutā śat* ādinavām || śa kho pun ime grahapatiprutā ādi-
   navā víkāl[aveši]
3 /// aguptām arakṣitaṃ svāpateyam se bhoti a[gu]ptaṃ arakṣitaṃ śamki atmānaṃ karoti abhūta se vacanapathā rohamti
4 /// |||| śa kho pun ime grahapatiprutā ādinavā[ ]pā]pamitrajanasamsevāye vedayitavyām katame

7 The folio represented by fragment 24 can hardly follow immediately after fragment 23, as claimed in note 3; the manuscript must have contained another folio in between.
8 This ascription is doubtful (and not accepted by Erik Zürcher), as Paul Harrison informs us, since the gāthās are translated as verses. However, on the basis of the vocabulary an early translation remains a possibility.
9 MS 2376/36 was first transliterated by Gudrun Melzer and then identified by her as belonging to the same folio as 2379/45.


\[ sat^* asamto na \]

5 /// dgachati sahadgatsasya vā pariṣagatasya vā jñātikulamadhyagatamsya vā rājakulamadhyagatsasya vā vacanā<<[ni]>> [kkra]

6 /// .. hapatiputrā [ā]dinavā mahāsama[j].\(^{10}\)
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3. (r4 ...) || ša kho pun’ ime grhapatiputrá ādīnavā pāpamitrānasamsevāye⁸ vedayitavyam. katame śat? asaṃto na ////

⁸samsevāye loc.sg.; rare in Pāli, contamination of (f.) -āya(m) and (m.) –e; cf. Oberlies 2003: 187; cf. also BHSG § 9.41 (all examples from Mv).


4. (r5 ...) dgachati sahadgatasya vā pariṣagatasya vā jñātikulamadhyagatam{m}syā vā rājaka-ladhyagatasya vā vacanānī kkrā(ma) ////

This line must preserve part of the section corresponding to dyūta, or jūta in Pāli, but here the overall correspondence between the wording of the Pāli and that of the Schøyen fragments becomes very loose. Apparently there is only one point of contact, and that is the word sahadgatasya which is likely to correspond to sabhāgatassa; for the development sabhāgata > sahāgata > sahāmata > sahāgata cf. sabhāpāti (Przyłęski 1924 and Bongard-Levin et alii 1996: 98, note 26). If so, ///dgachati should correspond to Pāli rūhati and is possibly to be restored to (u)dgachati or (samud)gachati. For ’gachati here and in v4 cf. the same phenomenon in a Central Asian manuscript: SHT I 399 fol. 196v1 ichamti (MPS-S 31.10); fol. 200r4 ichāma (MPS-S 31.19); fol. 201v1 ichatha (MPS-S 31.36); 204v3 ichasi (MPS-S 31.59).

The reading of kkrā at the end of the line is somewhat uncertain, and below nākra there seem to be traces of the āksara nī. However, we do not really understand vacanānī kra(ma)///, and therefore a reconstruction appears impossible.

Cf. DN 183.16–21 (DN(ChS) 149.2–6): 11. Cha kho ’me gahapati-putta ādīnavā jūtapamāda-tthānānyuge: jayam veram pasavati, jino vittam¹⁷ anusocati, sandittihā dhanahjàni,¹⁸ sabhā-gatassa vacanam na rūhati, mitāmaccānam paribhūto hoti, āvāv-vivāhākānam apathito hoti. akkha-dhutto purisa-puggalo¹⁹ nālam dārā-bharānyayà.²⁰

The Turfan fragment SHT 412 (24) r1 possibly also belongs here: /// m parā + + maddhyagatasya ca yukta .r. ///.

5. (r6 ... ša kho pun’ ime gr)hapatiputra ādīnavā mahāsāmāj(a) (v1 ... kahi) gitam, kahi vāditam, kahi kumbhamṭuna, kahi pānisvarā, kahi śobhikānagarānib, tasya evam ratikṛdyānuyoga(ṃc anuyuktasya?) ///

³⁸For kumbhatuna and pānisvara cf. BHSD s.vv. kumbhatūna and pānisvāra; cf. also SBV II 235.17–18 and Abhidh-k-vy 420.30–421.1 pānisvare kumbhatūnāre.

³⁹For the difficult śobhikānagarāni cf. Lāduges 1940: 423 ff. and BHSD s.v. śobhika; the situation is additionally complicated by the fact that the word (or its equivalent) appears to have been transferred from a list of sounds and other amusements into a closely related list of fights, military operations and similar diversions, cf. DN I 6.11–13 and 65.12–15: naccaṃ gitam vāditam pekkham akkhānam pāniśaram vetālaṃ kumbha-thūnam Sobha-nagarakam candālam vansam dhopanam (immediately followed by hathi-yuddham and the list of fights etc.), while in SBV II 235.9–10 dārīkayuddhe, attalavamśe, śobhītāgamare, uṣantikāyām, dhvajagre, balagre, yvūdhe senikadarsane (followed in the next paragraph by the list of sounds etc.). In the Pāli both lists are united under the rubric of viṣukadassanam (first sadda, then yuddha), while in SBV II they are divided into vividhadarsanasamārmbhānyuyogam (i.e., yuddha) and vividhasabdasravanasamārmbhānyuyogam (śabdā). In SBV II the term Śobhitānagarā appears within the list of yuddhas in both the Skt. text and the Tibetan translation (translated as bro gar gyi tshogs, cf. Samghābhavedavastu, Q 1030, vol. 42, p. 128.3.2 = bka’ gyur ’dul ba, vol. Ce, fol. 250b2; TibT 1, vol. 1, p. 342.544.2 = vol. na, fol. 272b2; Bhaisajyavastu; Q 1030, vol. 41, p. 146.5.2 = bka’ gyur ’dul ba, vol. ge, fol. 66b2; TibT 1, vol. 1, p. 110.142.1 = vol. kha, fol. 71b1). The quotation of the same two lists in the Abhidharmakosavākyā (Abhidh-k-vy 420.18–421.4), apparently drawn from the Tridandisūtra of the Dīrghāgama, does not contain the word. The Tridandisūtra, however, has it (śobhanagarāke) on fol. 363r³

¹⁷DN cittam, DN(ChS) vittam; vittam was already suggested by T.W. Rhys Davids, cf. Dialogues of the Buddha, London 1921 (Sacred Books of the Buddhists, 4), vol. 3, p. 175, note 4. Cf. also SN I 123.2.

¹⁸DN(ChS) dhanajānī.

¹⁹DN(ChS) ayam puriaspuggalo.

²⁰DN(ChS) dāra-.
6. (v2 ... śa) kho pun’ ime grhapatiputrā ādināvā ālasyakosidye vedayitavyam. katame śat? iha grha(papitrā) (v3 ...) ti atiusṇam ti karmām na karoti, bubhūkṣito° 'smīti karmām na karoti, atyasīto ti karmām na karoti; tasye(vām ālasyakosidyānuvogam anuyuktasya?) (v4 ...) pratayevekṣīta kṣipram evam bhogā kṣayavyaṃtaṁb gacha<m>tic. ime grhapatiputrā śa ādināvā ālasyakosidye (dye) ///

°Read bubhuṣkita, but cf. SHT VIII 1914+3354 r3(below).

bksayavyayam probably stands either for kṣayavyayāntam or for svayatām.

For the spelling gachati cf. also line recto 5.

Cf. also the Turfan fragments SHT IV 412 (24) v4: // + (sa)\[d\] ime grhapatiputra ādināvā āla(sva) /// and v5: // + a[t]\[i\]sāyam karma na karoti \| atyusne [ka]rmna na karoti ///; SHT VIII 1914+3354 r2: /// (vedi)avyah kate śat° ati + + [k]\[a\]rma na [karoti] a[t]\[i\] /// and r3: /// (a)tyāśīth硼 karma na karoti - a[t] (bubh) [ti] kṣitah karma \[n\]\[a\] + ///.

(v5 ... d)ivā ca svapnaṁ paricāryaṁ kāle°
pāpāni mitraṇī kadaryatā ca{m}
ete pi śhāṇa puruṣa dhvasamyamī°

°kāle appears opposed to Pāli akāle, but apparently must be understood along the same lines: read paricāryākāle?

°Read dhvamsayamī, cf. Pāli dhamsayanti.

This is also the first verse in T. 17.

Cf. DN 184.27ff. (DN(ChS) 150.9–12):

Akkh-iththiyā vārūni nacca-gitam
divā-sappam° pāricariyā akāle.25
Pāpā ca mittā su-kadaryatā ca,
ete ca śhāṇa puruṣām dhvamsayantī.

Cf. also SHT VIII 1914+3354 v3 /// + + [da]ryatā ca sthānāḥ nyetāni (puru)\[s\]\[a\]m dhvams\[a\]ya\[n\]ti · 3 .. /// and v4: /// [sthā]nāy [etā]ni purūṣaṁ ...m + + + 4 samsa + + + ///.

---

21 DN(ChS) Kva.
22 DN(ChS) kumbhathunan.
23 DN(ChS) ālasyānuvoge.
24 DN(ChS) divāsoppam.
25 DN akāle (v.l. akāle).