

Pali Text Society

JOURNAL

OF THE

PALI TEXT SOCIETY

1908

EDITED BY

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, F.B.A., PH.D., LL.D.

OF THE MIDDLE TEMPLE, BARRISTER-AT-LAW

PROFESSOR OF COMPARATIVE RELIGION AT THE UNIVERSITY OF MANCHESTER

London

PUBLISHED FOR THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY

BY

HENRY FROWDE

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS WAREHOUSE, AMEN CORNER, E.C.

1908

Journal of the Pali Text Society.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
I. REPORT OF THE SOCIETY FOR THE YEAR 1907	vii
II. THE BUDDHIST COUNCILS AT RĀJAGAHA AND VESĀLĪ, BY PROFESSOR R. OTTO FRANKE	1
III. EARLY PALI GRAMMARIANS IN BURMA, BY DR. MABEL BODE	81
IV. INDEX TO TRENCKNER'S NOTES ON THE MILINDA AND MAJJHIMA-NIKĀYA, BY PROFESSOR DINES ANDERSEN	102
V. INDEX TO THE PAṬISAMBHIDĀMAGGA, BY MISS MABEL HUNT	152
VI. ADDENDA TO SIMILES IN THE NIKĀYAS, BY MRS. RHYS DAVIDS	180
MISPRINTS IN PROFESSOR FRANKE'S ARTICLE	189
ISSUES OF THE PĀLI TEXT SOCIETY	190
LIST OF DONORS TO THE SOCIETY	197
STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT FOR 1907	198

PALI TEXT SOCIETY.

COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT.

Managing Chairman.—T. W. RHYS DAVIDS.

PROFESSOR DINES ANDERSEN.

DR. J. ESTLIN CARPENTER.

M. ÉMILE SENART, de l'Institut.

ARNOLD C. TAYLOR.

Hon. Secretary.—Mrs. Rhys Davids, Harboro' Grange, Ashton-on-Mersey, Cheshire.

(With power to add workers to their number.)

Hon. Secretary and Treasurer for America.—Professor Charles R. Lanman, 9, Farrar Street, Cambridge, Mass.

Hon. Secretary and Treasurer for Ceylon.—E. R. Gooneratne, Esq, Gate Mudaliyar, Galle.

Hon. Secretary and Treasurer for Burma.—Professor Charles Duroiselle The College, Rangoon.

REPORT OF THE PALI TEXT SOCIETY FOR THE YEAR 1907

THE Society has maintained during the year the slow but steady progress experienced during the last few years. It may now be considered self-supporting. Though the number of regular subscribers is still very small, the subscriptions, together with the sales of back issues, prove sufficient year by year to pay for the next year's issues, and to leave a balance over. The gradual accumulation of these balances is now more than sufficient to pay for two years' issues. As there is no longer any serious probability of a change for the worse in the Society's finance, it is proposed, so long as the margin shall be enough for one year's issues in advance, to pay each collaborator in the Society's work a small honorarium of £1 per sheet.

In making this announcement, I may be allowed to express my poignant regret that the amount should be so small. It would be considered a disgrace to say to a tailor: 'You are well known in the town for the skill and accuracy of your work. Make me, therefore, a coat (or a suit) for nothing.' It is not yet considered a disgrace to say to a scholar: 'You are well known in the world for the skill and accuracy of your work. Write me, therefore, an article (or a book) for nothing.' Why this difference? Is it entirely a question of economics? Ruskin, with great earnestness and no little indignation, would have answered with an emphatic NO. There are questions of ethics, of intelligence, of social pride, of organization to be considered. And if one marks the studied contempt with

which successful men of the world often defend themselves against any possible imputation of belonging to the ranks of scholars (and this even happens when they are addressing learned men or writing semi-learned essays)—when one marks this careless air of self-complacency, one is inclined to think that *māna*, no less than *moha*, may also enter into the argument. In any case, the age of barbarism, the age which values wealth and birth above knowledge and insight, cannot last for ever. That, too, is *anicca*ṇ, though it be also *dukkha*ṇ. Signs of a gradual, continuing change are already clear to the discerning eye. Meanwhile let every scholar help those organizations which assist the change; and throw, whenever possible, his vote into the scale in favour of payment for all scholarly work. An established precedent counts much in such matters. And let us never forget the workers, willing to help in our new studies, who are now forced, by want of the miserable pence, to turn unwillingly to the more hackneyed fields.

The text issued this year is Professor Geiger's new critical edition of the *Mahāvamsa*. This is the only text issued by the Society which is not an *editio princeps*. It is, however, very much wanted, as the former edition of this important text is out of print and scarce, and contains many inaccuracies. We are glad to be able to issue to our subscribers so excellent a specimen of the method and manner in which, we trust, any other new edition we may find it necessary to publish will be carried out.

Difficulties had arisen, during my long illness, as to the method to be adopted in preparing the projected Pali Dictionary. It was found impossible to arrange these difficulties by correspondence, and I was too ill to travel. This month I was fortunately able, at the Congress of Orientalists at Copenhagen, to consult personally with the scholars interested in the project. A meeting was held at the University there, attended by Professors Andersen, Geiger, Kuhn, Lanman, Oldenberg, Pischel, and Windisch, with Mrs. Rhys Davids and myself. At that

meeting it was unanimously decided that the Dictionary should be carried out on the plan proposed by the Society, each collaborator writing the Dictionary articles for the words commencing with the letter or letters undertaken by him; and subsidiary details were discussed and settled. Professor Kuhn was kind enough to undertake the words beginning with vowels, Professor Hardy, who had undertaken these, having completed only a portion of the short a's at the time of his lamented death. There seems to be no reason why the work should not now go rapidly on, and this urgent want in our Indian studies be at last placed in the hands of scholars. Two years have been lost. But the indices, and other lexicographical material published during those years in the Journal, will help the work which will now be pushed on with renewed hope.

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS,
Chairman.

HARBORO' GRANGE,
ASHTON-ON-MERSEY.

THE BUDDHIST COUNCILS AT RĀJAGAHA AND VESĀLĪ, AS ALLEGED IN CULLAVAGGA XI., XII.

By R. OTTO FRANKE

INTRODUCTORY

THE authorities for establishing the historical truth of the three first Buddhist Councils are the xith and xiith Books of the Cullavagga, together with the Northern Buddhist derivatives of these two chapters; besides these the Dīpavaṇsa, the Mahāvaṇsa, and, among Buddhaghosa's Commentaries, chiefly the introduction to the Samantapāsādikā. Now the Dīpavaṇsa ought, through my inquiry into its origin, published in the Vienna *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, xxi, pp. 203 ff., to have suffered much in reputation. Besides this, I have there proved a certain assumption to be erroneous—the assumption, namely, that the authors of the Dīpavaṇsa, Mahāvaṇsa, and Samantapāsādikā had any chronicles contained in the old Sinhalese Commentary on the Canon (which would mean a chapter of ancient tradition) in their possession. I have tried to show that, on the contrary, the authors of the Mahāvaṇsa and of the Samantapāsādikā wrote out the Dīpavaṇsa, but that, in the absence of any sources, the last-named work must be considered as standing unsupported on its own tottering feet. If hereby—and there can be no reasonable doubt about it—

the credibility of the *Dīpavaṃsa* and that of the 'historical sources' derived from it, has been badly shaken, the further question obtrudes itself: Is the historical truth of the Buddhist Councils, as recorded in the above-named works, to stand as sufficiently attested?

This question calls the more impressively for a reply, in that the results of investigations into the Buddhist Canon show in themselves a discrepancy with the theory of the Councils.* It may now be considered as safely established, that the books of the Canon *as a whole* are not authentic; that the Canon was not composed and compiled in one and the same period of time, but that different books came into being at different periods covering a considerable time;† that the contents of each book were not collected, but were composed, each by a separate hand, with more or less reference to pre-existing traditional materials; and that even the first two *Pitakas* (to say nothing of the *Abhidhamma*) cannot possibly have been presented as finished before either the 'first' or the 'second' Council, even if these events took place at the intervals assigned to them.‡ But the records of the Councils affirm more or less the opposite on all these points.

I will here, to prove my verdict, add to the evidence brought forward by other investigators some illustrative matter from the Canon. In the *Majjhima Nikāya* i. 82 we read: 'Ahaṇ kho pana Sāriputta etarahi jīṇṇo vuddho mahallako addhagato vayo anuppatto, asītiko me vayo vattati.' ('I am now an old man, Sāriputta; of ripe years, and the path of my life lies behind me; my life is in its eightieth year.') Now, as the Buddha is said to have lived no more than eighty years, this Sutta, if it is to rank

* My conclusion is not based alone on Kern's 'Manual of Indian Buddhism'—*e.g.*, pp. 2 and 109. I propose to give my proofs in a book entitled 'A Critique of the Pali Canon.'

† Rhys Davids has done most to establish this point. See especially his 'Buddhist India,' London, 1903, pp. 176 ff.

‡ Else the Buddha must have lived considerably earlier than is supposed. I am bound to confess that, judging by the nature of the sources accessible to us at the present day, there seems to me to be nothing soundly established respecting the date of his death.

as authentic, must have dated from the very last stage of his life. There would certainly be some remark to this effect in the Sutta. There is, however, nothing of the sort. There is, in this connexion, nothing to distinguish it from any other Sutta. On the other hand, we should expect to find in the Gospel of the Decease—the Mahā-parinibbāna-suttanta—some comment on what is stated in Majjhima i. 82; but we do not find it. The sentence quoted, however, does appear in the Mahā-parinibbāna-suttanta (Dīgha xvi. 2, 25 [vol. ii. 100]), with one word altered—it is 'Ānanda' for 'Sāriputta.' Hence, on the face of it, either one text is inauthentic, or both are. Probably, as appears in other passages, the Majjhima has borrowed from the Dīgha.

But, again, the passage in both these Nikāyas is contradicted by Saṃyutta xlvii. 13 (vol. v., p. 161). According to *this* Sutta, Sāriputta died while the Buddha was at Sāvattihī. However shortly his death may have preceded that of the Buddha, it was before the latter's last tour, on which he did not revisit Sāvattihī: 'Ekaṇ samayaṇ Bhagavā Sāvattihīyaṇ viharati... tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Sāriputto Magadhesu viharati Nālagāmake ābādhiko dukkhito bāhagilāno... atha āyasmā Sāriputto tena ābādhena parinibbāyi...' Again, in Saṃy. xlvii. 14, 1 (vol. v. 163) we read: 'Ekaṇ samayaṇ Bhagavā Vajjīsu viharati... aciraparinibbutesu Sāriputta - Moggalānesu.' No significance attaches to the fact that, in later Suttas—e.g., xlviii. 44 (vol. v. 220)—Sāriputta is still alive, for the Nikāya is not ostensibly in chronological order. But there is no explaining away the contradiction that, in Majjhima i. 82, Sāriputta is alive in the Buddha's eightieth year, and that in Dīgha xvi. 1, 16 the Exalted One, on his last tour, under taken in the same year, discourses at Nālandā to Sāriputta: 'Atha kho āyasmā Sāriputto yena Bhagavā ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā Bhagavantaṇ abhivādetvā... Bhagavantaṇ etad avoca... "Uḷārā kho te ayaṇ Sāriputta āsabhī vācā bhāsita..."'

It is further worth noticing the relation of Dīgha xvi. 5, 7-18, to xvii. Both passages treat of King Mahā Sudassana; both are put into the mouth of the Exalted One on the identical occasion when he lay a-dying at Kusinārā beneath the twin sāla trees; both are in nearly identical words:

(a) Dīgha xvi. 5, 17 (vol. ii. 146): 'Evaṇ vutte āyasmā Ānando Bhagavantaṇ etad avoca: "Mā bhante Bhagavā imasmiṇ kuḍḍa-nagarake ujjangala-nagarake sākha-nagarake parinibbāyatu. Santi, etc., to karissantīti." "Mā h'evaṇ Ānanda avaca mā h'evaṇ Ānanda avaca kuḍḍa-nagarakaṇ ujjangala-nagarakaṇ

sākha-nagarakan ti. Bhūtapubbaṃ Ānanda rājā Mahā-Sudassano nāma ahosi cakkavattī dhammiko dhammarājā cāturato vijitāvī janapadatthāvariya-patto sattaratanasamannāgato. Rañño Ānanda Mahā-Sudassanassa ayaṃ Kusinārā Kusāvati nāma rājadhānī ahosi, puratthimena ca pacchimena ca dvādasa yojanāni āyāmena uttarena ca dakkhiṇena ca satta yojanāni vitthārena, *etc.*, to dasamena saddena. Gaccha tvaṃ Ānanda Kusinārāyaṃ pavasi tvā Kosinārakānaṃ Mallānaṃ ārocehi." . . .

(b) *Dīgha* xvii. 1, 1 (vol. ii. 169): 'Evaṃ me sutaṃ. Ekaṃ samayaṃ Bhagavā Kusinārāyaṃ viharatī Upavatane Mallānaṃ Sālavane antarena Yamakasālānaṃ parinibbānasamaye. Atha kho āyasmā Ānando yena Bhagavā ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā Bhagavantaṃ abhivādetvā ekamantaṃ nisīdi. Ekamantaṃ nisinno kho āyasmā Ānando Bhagavantam etad avoca: "Mā bhante Bhagavā . . . sākhanagarake parinibbāyi. Santi, *etc.*, to karissantīti." "Mā hevaṃ Ānanda avaca kuḍḍanagarakaṃ ujjangalanagarakaṃ sākhanagarakan ti. Bhūtapubbaṃ Ānanda rājā Mahā-Sudassano nāma ahosi khattiyo muddhāvasitto cāturato vijitāvī janapadatthāvariya-patto. Rañño Ānanda . . . rājadhānī ahosi. Sā kho Ānanda Kusāvati pacchimena ca puratthimena ca dvādasa yojanāni," *etc.*, to "dasamena saddena. Kusāvati Ānanda rājadhānī sattahi pākārehi parikkhittā ahosi," *etc.*'

It is striking that the same book, professing to give us the words of the Buddha, should twice give the same discourse delivered on a certain occasion; but it is still more striking that the discourse is of such different extent in each passage. In the former the allusion to King Mahā Sudassana is limited to the remark quoted. In the latter the whole Suttanta is occupied with the story of the King—*i.e.*, about thirty pages. One only of the two versions, if either, can be authentic, since truth can have but one shape. From the first our suspicions settle on *D. xvii.*, inasmuch as the thin, artificial, long-winded rigmarole of *D. xvii.* does not mate with the tone of the Buddha's converse in *xvi.* and elsewhere; and, further, because it is so highly improbable that the dying Buddha would have delivered a mythical discourse of that length. But our decision here must rest, not on what our feeling and our criticism pronounces to be not genuine, but on the fact that tradition covers both Suttantas with the shield of accepted authenticity. That tradition hereby forfeits for both of them its claim on our recognition.

Another analogous instance is the story of the conversion of

Sundarika-Bhāradvāja. It is related in three versions (three at least, so far as I know) : in M. vii. (vol. i. 39); S. vii. 1, 9 (vol. i. 167-170); and S. N. iii. 4 (pp. 79 ff.). The root idea in all three versions is that moral purity (in M. *suddha*, in S. *suddhi*) is to be won, not through ritual, but through inward cleansing. Cf., e.g., in M. :

Idh' eva sināhi brāhmaṇa,
Sabbabhūtesu karohi khemaṇṇ;
Sace musā na bhaṇasi, sace paṇaṇ na hiṇsasi,
Sace adinnaṇ n'ādiyasi, saddahāno amacchari,
Kiṇ kāhasi Gayaṇ gantvā, udapāno pi te Gajā ti.

And in S. :

Dhammo rahado brāhmaṇa sīlatittho
Anāvalo sabbhi sataṇ pasattho
Yattha have vedaguno sinātā
Anallīnagattā va taranti pāraṇ
Saccaṇ dhammo saṇyamo brahmacariyaṇ.

In all three versions the river Sundarikā is mentioned; all three conclude with Sundarika-Bhāradvāja announcing his conversion in the usual formula: 'Abhikkantaṇ bho Gotama!' etc.; and there are besides more detailed points of agreement in the Saṇyutta and Sutta Nipāta versions. All three accounts, however, reveal marked, in part radical, discrepancies. Now, the conversion can only have taken place in one way, hence two of the accounts must be false; probably all three are. But of such variations in one and the same narrative the Canon reveals quite a large number; such tokens of non-authenticity crop up everywhere.

I will only adduce further the beginning of Dīgha xvii. and that of some other Suttas. D. xvii. 1, 1 begins with the usual Evaṇ me sutaṇ, followed by the equally usual Ekaṇ samayaṇ . . . ; but this usual commencement is most unfitting for the ensuing narrative, if we make our point of view the mere peephole permitted by the Council-theory. If at the first Council, a few weeks after the Buddha's death, the Suttas were, according to this theory, edited or revised, then this Sutta must have been spoken by the Buddha but a little time previously, from the editors' point of view; but in that case the words ekaṇ samayaṇ ('once upon a time') do not fit the case; therefore, either the Council-theory, or the tradition of the compilation of the Suttas, or both, must be inaccurate.

Equally unsuitable, on the supposition that the Sutta Piṭaka was compiled immediately after the Buddha's parinirvana, is the same opening phrase in S. vi. 2, 5 (vol. i. 157), borrowed entirely from D. xvi. 6, 7 ff. (vol. ii. 155)—'Ekaṇ samayaṇ Bhagavā Kusi-

nārāyaṇ viharati Upavattane Mallānaṇ . . . parinibbāna-samaye'—as well as the same commencement in *Anguttara* iv. 76, 1 (vol. ii. 79), borrowed from D. xvi. 6, 5, and 6 (vol. ii. 154), and in the *Sutta* quoted above, S. xlvii. 9 (vol. v. 152), borrowed from D. xvi. 2, 21 ff. (vol. ii.): 'Ekaṇ samayaṇ Bhagavā Vesāliyaṇ viharati Beluvagāmake. . . .'

There are even *Suttas*, describing matters that took place after the Buddha's death, and which on that account cannot have been collected at the Rājagaha Council, which open in the same way with *ekaṇ samayaṇ*, a phrase which sets the editing of them back no brief interval after this post-parinirvāna period—*e.g.*, D. x. 1, 1 (vol i. 204).

But all this is merely provisional and far from adequate evidence for my argument. I need not have adduced any of it, had there been sufficient space to bring forward my more genuine proofs.

The northern Buddhists' records concerning Councils cannot, as I shall point out later on, be taken into account.

The question which we have undertaken to discuss is, therefore, to be thus put: 'What judgment can we arrive at concerning the Councils reported in *Culla-vagga*, xi. and xii.? Are these reports, at least, historically sound?'

There is some temerity involved in expressing an individual judgment as to the Councils, in view of the inquiries already published by not a few eminent scholars; the more so if the judgment be based exclusively on materials already known and used, and on the excellent work of certain among those scholars, against whose conclusions the said judgment takes its stand. No discussion of the Councils, for example, can ignore Oldenberg's fine edition of the *Vinaya Piṭaka* and his treatment of its literary position and of the Councils, or put on one side Rhys Davids's and Oldenberg's joint translation and treatment of the *Vinaya*. Oldenberg, too, was the first to point out the close connexion between the *Mahā Parinibbāna-Suttanta* and *Culla-vagga* xi., which is the base and corner-stone of investigations into the account of the Councils. To Kern also and to De la Vallée Poussin I owe gratitude, both for incitement and sustained interest. Vincent A. Smith's

views deserve considerable attention.* I shall do my utmost, in the course of my inquiry, to make scrupulous acknowledgment wherever I have adopted from their writings, or have found myself in line with them. Such courage as I feel moving me to take a view divergent from theirs I derive from the consideration, that this problem of the Councils is one of sufficient complexity to leave scope for luck in hitting on some conclusion, and to make it explicable why the cogitations of distinguished scholars should not have chanced upon that direction which seems to me to be correct.

By far the most important fact, I repeat, for the understanding of Culla-vagga xi., xii. is the connexion between these chapters and the Mahā Parinibbāna-Suttanta (D. xvi.). This fact has hitherto only so far been dealt with, that it was held not entirely to upset the question of the Councils as a historical problem. It is this view of the matter—as a historical problem—which has been the connecting principle in all explanations hitherto given of C.V. xi., xii., however widely some of these explanations may seem at first sight to differ. At bottom they only differ in what they suffer to stand as historically true. For even the more sceptical deny the historical truth of these chronicles either in part only, or only in the sense that they represent some latent historical fact. Curiously enough, no one seems to have lit on the explanation (or at least on the thoroughgoing explanation) that one of the two texts might be, as literature, dependent on the other, and concocted out of it.† This explanation is, after all, in such cases of textual agreement, the first

* I could find but little to help me in Minayeff's 'Recherches sur le Bouddhisme' (*Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études*, iv.).

† Oldenberg, in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 52, p. 623, does account for the coincidences between C.V. xi. and the M. Parinibbāna S. by the influence of the latter; but he merely believes that the narrative of the Councils has taken a few data from the M. Pari. S. and grouped these data, or the constructions based upon them, round the principal facts.

to suggest itself. And anyway it is the view put forward in the following inquiry, as that which alone commends itself to me.

I shall first quote the equivalent passages in the two works, which Oldenberg and other scholars have already dealt with. It is essential to the clearness of my argument that this evidence should plainly and fully meet the eye.

I. PUBLISHED DISCUSSION ON THE PARALLEL PASSAGES IN DĪGHA-NIKĀYA XVI. AND CULLA-VAGGA XI.

The whole of the first two sections of C.V. xi. is derived from D. xvi. 6, 19, 20 (ii. 162).^{*} There are a few changes in the derived text; some of them not without significance for the critic. The sentence, 'Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo bhikkhū āmantesi,' occurs, in the Dīgha, almost at the end of section 20. The Culla-v. has transferred it to the beginning, making the entire borrowed portion into the speech of M. Kassapa. The second alteration follows from the first. The opening words of the Dīgha section (19): *Tena kho pana samayena āyasmā M. Kassapo Pāvāya Kusināraṇ . . .* become, in the C.V., 'Ekaṇ idāhaṇ āvuso samayaṇ Pāvāya Kusināraṇ . . .,' with the further use of the first instead of the third person—*ahaṇ*, etc. Thirdly, the compiler of the Culla-vagga has substituted for *Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo bhikkhū āmantesi*, the words: 'Atha khv āhaṇ āvuso te bhikkhū etad avocaṇ . . .' Besides this, he has inverted the order of Subhadda's and M. Kassapa's speeches. Fourthly, his insertion, as often as possible, of the vocative *āvuso* is one of the many peculiar characteristics of C.V. xi., xii., which will be further dealt with in my second section.

I now give the whole of the borrowed passage as it stands, to aid our criticism.

Dīgha xvi. 6, 19: *Tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo Pāvāya Kusināraṇ add-*

^{*} See Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, S.B.E. xx., p. 370, n. 1.

hāna-magga-paṭipanno hoti mahatā bhikkhu-sanghena saddhiṃ pañcamattehi bhikkhu-satehi. Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo maggā okkamma aññatarasmiṃ rukkhamūle nisīdi.

Tena kho pana samayena aññataro ājivako Kusinārāya mandārava-pupphaṃ gahetvā Pāvaṃ addhāna-magga-paṭipanno hoti.

Addasā kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo ājivakaṃ dūrato 'va āgacchantaṃ. Disvā tam ājivakaṃ etad avoca: 'Ap' āvuso amhākaṃ Satthāraṃ jānāsīti.'

'Āma āvuso jānāmi. Ajja sattāha-parinibbuto samaṇo Gotamo. Tato me idaṃ mandārava-pupphaṃ gahitaṃ' ti.

Tattha ye te bhikkhū avīta-rāgā appekacce bāhā paggayha kandanti, chinna-papātaṃ papatanti āvaṭṭanti vivaṭṭanti: 'Atikhippaṃ Bhagavā parinibbuto, atikhippaṃ Sugato parinibbuto, atikhippaṃ cakkhuṃ loke antarahitaṃ' ti.

Ye pana te bhikkhū vītarāgā, te satā sampa-jānā adhiyāsentī: 'Aniccā saṃkhārā, taṃ kut' ettha labbhā?' ti.

20. Tena kho pana samayena Subhaddo nāma buddhapabbajito tassaṃ paṇḍitaṃ nisinno hoti. Atha kho Subhaddo buddha-pabbajito te bhikkhū etad avoca:

'Alaṃ āvuso mā socittha mā paridevittha. Sumuttā mayaṃ tena mahā-samaṇena. Upaddutā ca homa "Idaṃ vo kappati, idaṃ vo na kappatīti," idāni pana mayaṃ yaṃ icchissāma taṃ karissāma, yaṃ na icchissāma taṃ na karissāmāti.'

Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo bhikkhū āmantesi:

'Alaṃ āvuso mā socittha mā paridevittha. Nanu etaṃ āvuso Bhagavatā paṭigacceva akkhātaṃ: "Sabbeheva piyehi manāpehi nānābhāvo vinābhāvo aññathābhāvo, taṃ kut' ettha āvuso labbhā? Yaṃ taṃ jātaṃ bhūtaṃ saṃkhataṃ

paloka-dhammaṃ taṃ vata mā palujjīti n'etaṃ
t'hānaṃ vijjatīti.”'

Now at that time the venerable Mahā Kassapa was journeying along the high road from Pāvā to Kusinārā with a great company of the brethren, with about 500 of the brethren. And the ven. M. Kassapa left the high road, and sat himself down at the foot of a certain tree. Just at that time a certain naked ascetic, who had picked up a Mandārava flower * in Kusinārā, was coming along the high road to Pāvā. And the ven. M. Kassapa saw the naked ascetic coming in the distance, and asked him : ‘O friend ! surely thou knowest our Master ?’ ‘Yea, friend ! I know him. This day a week ago the Samaṇa Gotama attained Parinirvana. That is how I obtained this Mandārava flower.’

And forthwith of those of the brethren who were not yet free from the passions, some stretched out their arms and wept, and some fell headlong on the ground, and some reeled to and fro [in anguish at the thought] : ‘Too soon has the Exalted One died ! Too soon has the Blessed One attained Parinirvāna ! Too soon has the Eye of the world vanished !’

But those of the brethren who were free from the passions, acquiesced, mindful and self-possessed, saying : ‘Impermanent are all component things ; What else were here possible ?’

Now at that time a brother named Subhadda, who had been received into the order in his old age, was seated in that company. And Subhadda, the aged recluse, spoke to the brethren, saying : ‘Enough, friends, weep not, lament not ! We are well rid of the great Samaṇa. It was harassing to us to be told : “This beseems you, this beseems you not.” But now we shall be able to do whatever we like ; and what we do not like, that we shall not have to do !’

But the ven. M. Kassapa addressed the brethren and said : ‘Enough, friends, weep not, lament not ! Has not the Exalted One, friends, declared to us from the first : “From all things near and dear to us we must sever, . . . we must change. How can it be possible that, whereas anything whatever born, brought into being, compounded, perishable, should not perish ! It cannot be.”’

Culla-vagga xi. 1: Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo bhikkhū āmantesi : ‘Ekaṃ idāhaṃ āvuso samayaṃ Pāvāya Kusināraṃ addhānamaggapaṭipanno mahatā. . . . Atha khv āhaṃ āvuso maggā okkamma aññatarasmiṃ rukkhamūle nisidiṃ.

* The Buddha's funeral couch and all Kusinārā was covered with the blossoms (D. xvi. 5, 2 ; 6, 16).

Tena kho . . . Addasaṇ khv ahaṇ āvuso taṇ
 ājivakaṇ . . . disvāna taṇ ājivakaṇ etad avocaṇ
 . . . Tatrāvuso ye te bhikkhū avitarāgā . . .
 taṇ kut' ettha labbhā 'ti. Atha khv āhaṇ āvuso
 te bhikkhū etad avocaṇ: Alaṇ āvuso mā socittha
 . . . n'etaṇ ṭhānaṇ vijjatīti. Tena kho pana
 samayena āvuso Subhaddo nāma vuḍḍhapab-
 bajito . . . Atha kho āvuso Subhaddo . . . upad-
 dutā ca mayaṇ homa . . . na taṇ karissāmā 'ti.

There then follows immediately M. Kassapa's proposal to hold a Council.*

Here I will only draw such conclusions as are suggested by the text of these two passages and by the variations in C.V.

In the Dīgha everything narrated here is happening between Pāvā and Kusinārā, and is timed eight days after the Parinirvāṇa. (In the next section but one (22) we first hear of M. Kassapa's arrival at the funeral pyre at Kusinārā.)† The characters mentioned are M. Kassapa, a passing Ājivaka, Kassapa's bhikkhus, and, among these, Subhadda. In Culla-vagga M. Kassapa reports this occurrence as a past event, rendered less recent by the phrase 'ekaṇ idāhaṇ āvuso samayaṇ . . .'.‡ We cannot tell in the least, from the text, where and when the compiler of C.V. xi. intended this account to have been spoken. We have no ground for assuming that it was at Kusinārā, for even in the original account, in the Dīgha, it was not at Kusinārā that the conversation took place.§ Just as little may we infer, from C.V., that his telling took place

* By an error Minayeff ('Recherches,' p. 25) makes this proposal form part of the narrative of what happened between Pāvā and Kusinārā.

† Atha kho āy. M. K. yena Kusinārā-Makuṭa-bandhanaṇ Mallānaṇ cetiyaṇ yena Bhagavato citako ten' upasankami.

‡ Rightly pointed out by Oldenberg against Minayeff.

§ Here I differ from Oldenberg's view (*loc. cit.* 615; cf. Vin. I. xxvi.), and share that of De la V. Poussin (*Muséon*, 1905, p. 3). The accounts, given in derived compilations—as, e.g., the Dīpavaṇsa (see Oldenberg, *loc. cit.*)—are of no importance.

shortly after the Buddha's death. The only inference that can be drawn from the two texts is that the account in C.V. xi. has a literary connexion with the account of the Parinibbāna and the circumstances connected with it, and that the former has made use of the latter, though not in a skilful manner. But because the C.V. xi. derives from a historical (or quasi-historical) account, we are not, therefore, to conclude that the C.V. itself is history, or that there is any connexion between the events chronicled in both. The apparent reason for deriving C.V. xi. from the Dīgha account was the anarchical sentiment expressed by Subhadda. It was to contravene such rebellious tendencies against both Dhamma and Vinaya that, according to C.V. xi., the work of the Council, described in that chapter, was undertaken. Herein lies the explanation of the changed order in the speeches of Subhadda and M. Kassapa made between Pāvā and Kusinārā.* Subhadda's speech had, in C.V., to come last, since it was to form the bridge to what followed. This consideration is sufficient to lay any doubt whether it were not D. xvi. that had been affected by C.V. xi.

C.V. xi. 9: *Atha kho āyasmā Ānando there bhikkhū etad avoca: Bhagavā maṇ bhante parinibbānakāle evaṃ āha: Ākankhamāno Ānanda sangho mam' accayena khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni samūhaneyya.* 'Then said the venerable Ānanda to the therā-bhikkhus: Sirs, the Exalted One told me at the time of his Parinibbāna: "Ānanda, after I have passed away the Order may, if it will, suspend the rules relating to minor and supplementary matters."' This refers to Dīgha xvi. 6, 3: 'Ākankhamāno Ānanda sangho mam' . . . samūhantu.'†

In the C.V. the brethren reproach Ānanda for not having

* So, too, Oldenberg, *Vin. I.* xxviii, n. 1. Cf. also Oldenberg, *Z.D.M.G.*, 52, 628.

† This has been already pointed out by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (*S.B.E.* xx. 377). Minayeff's historical conclusions (*op. cit.* 32) completely misunderstand the situation.

asked the Buddha which rules he had in mind. Now, in D.xvi.6 there is no statement of Ānanda's asking the Buddha. But there is something in which the reproof may have taken root, and that is (D. xvi. 6, 5): *Atha Bhagavā bhikkhū āmantesi: 'Siyā kho pana bhikkhave ekabhikkhussa pi kankhā vā vimati vā Buddhē vā Dhamme vā Sanghe vā Magge vā Paṭipadāya vā: pucchatha, bhikkhave! Mā pacchā vippaṭṭi-sārino ahuvattha: 'Sammukhībhūto no Satthā ahosi, na mayaṃ sakkhimha Bhagavantaṃ sammukhā paṭipucchitun ti.' Evaṃ vutte te bhikkhū tuṇhī ahesuṃ.*

Then spake the Exalted One to the brethren: * 'It may be, brethren, that there is doubt or misgiving in the mind of some brother as to the Buddha, or the Truth, or the Order, or the Path, or the Way: ask ye, brethren! Do not have to reproach yourselves afterwards with the thought: "Our Teacher was face to face with us, and we could not bring ourselves to inquire of the Exalted One when we were face to face with him." And when he had thus spoken the brethren were silent.

Note this, too, in C.V. xi. 10: *Idam pi te āvuso Ānanda dukkaṭaṃ yaṃ tvaṃ mātugāmehi Bhagavato sarīraṃ paṭhamaṃ vandāpesi, tāsāṃ rodantīnaṃ Bhagavato sarīraṃ assukena makkhitaṃ. Desehi taṃ dukkaṭaṃ ti. Ahaṃ kho bhante mā yimā vikāle ahesun ti mātugāmehi Bhagavato sarīraṃ paṭhamaṃ vandāpesiṃ. . . .*

'This also, friend Ānanda, was ill done by thee, in that thou causedst the body of the Blessed One to be saluted by women first, so that by their weeping the body of the Blessed One was defiled by tears. Confess that fault.' 'I did so, Sirs, with the intention that they should not be kept beyond due time. I see no fault therein. Nevertheless, out of my faith in you, I confess that as a fault.' †

* Ānanda being one of them.

† I think that 'first' must mean 'too soon'—i.e., before he was dead, or perhaps 'in the first watch of the night.' But it is not easy to see this meaning in 'paṭhamaṃ,' and it is, perhaps, better to impute a lack of 'correctitude' to the compiler.

This paragraph clearly refers to D. xvi. 5, 20 ff.* ‘And the ven. Ānanda went to the . . . Mallas of Kusinārā . . . saying: This day, O Vāsetṭhas, in the last watch of the night, the Parinibbāna of the Tathāgata will take place. Be favourable herein, O Vāsetṭhas, be favourable. Give no occasion to reproach yourselves hereafter, saying: “In our own village did the Parinibbāna of the Tathāgata take place, and we took not the opportunity of visiting the Tathāgata (once more) in his last hours.”’

‘And when they had heard this saying of the venerable Ānanda, the Mallas, their sons, their daughters-in-law and wives, were grieved and sad, and afflicted at heart. And some of them wept, dishevelled their hair, and stretched forth their arms and wept. . . . Then the Mallas, with their sons, daughters-in-law, and wives, being grieved . . . at heart, went to the Sāla Grove . . . to Ānanda.’

‘Then the ven. Ā. thought: If I allow the Mallas of Kusinārā, one by one, to pay their respects to the Exalted One, the whole of the Mallas of Kusinārā will not have been presented to the Exalted One until this night brightens up into the dawn. Let me now cause the Mallas of Kusinārā to stand in groups, each family in a group, and so present them to the Exalted One, saying: “Lord, a Malla of such-and-such a name, with his children, his wife (or wives), his retinue, and his friends, humbly bows down at the feet of the Exalted One.”’

‘And . . . after this manner the ven. Ānanda presented all the Mallas of Kusinārā to the Exalted One in the first watch of the night.’†

* I cannot understand why Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (S. B. E., xx. 379, n. 2; and, again, Oldenberg, Z.D.M.G., 52, p. 618, n. 8) doubt this.

† Cf. with this the Buddha’s words (D. xvi. 5, 5 [vol. ii. 144]): Paṇḍito kho bhikkhave Ānando; jānāti: ‘Ayaṃ kālo Tathāgataṃ dassanāya upasankamituṃ bhikkhūnaṃ, ayaṃ kālo bhikkhunīnaṃ, ayaṃ kālo upāsakānaṃ, ayaṃ kālo upāsikānaṃ . . .’ (‘He is a wise man, is Ānanda. He knows when it is the right time for . . . the brethren . . . and the laity to come and visit the Tathāgata.’)

The fact that, in the more original document, those who came are not exclusively 'women' will hardly be considered an objection against the connexion between the two narratives. But in view of the admonitions concerning the female sex, which tradition has ascribed to the Buddha (see D. xvi. 5, 9 [ii. 141]; C.V. x. 1; A. iv. 80 (ii. 82 *f.*), it is only natural that the inclusion of women in the reception of laymen by the Buddha during his last hours must have been very annoying to the brethren.

C.V. xi. 10 continues: *Idam pi te āvuso Ānanda dukkaṭaṇ yaṇ tvaṇ bhagavatā oḷārike nimitte kayiramāne oḷārike obhāse kayiramāne na bhagavantaṇ yāci: tiṭṭhatu bhagavā kappay tiṭṭhatu sugato kappay bahujaṇahitāya bahujaṇasukhāya lokānukampāya atthāya hitāya sukhāya devamanussānaṇ ti. Desehi taṇ dukkaṭaṇ ti. Ahaṇ kho bhante Mārena pariyuṭṭhitacitto na bhagavantaṇ yāciṇ: tiṭṭhatu bhagavā. . . .*

'This, too, friend Ānanda, was ill done by thee, in that even when a suggestion so evident and a hint so broad were given thee by the Exalted One, thou didst not beseech him, saying, "Let the Exalted One remain on for a kalpa! Let the Blessed One remain on for a kalpa, for the good and happiness of great multitudes, out of pity for the world, for the good and the gain and the weal of gods and men!" Confess that fault.'

'I was possessed by Māra, friends, when I refrained from so beseeching him. . . .'

This passage is based upon D. xvi. 3, 3, 7, 40 (ii. 103 *f.*, 115):* 3. . . So ākaṅkhamāno Ānanda Tathāgato kappay vā tiṭṭheyya kappāvasesaṇ vā ti. 4. *Evam pi kho āyasmā Ānando Bhagavatā oḷārike nimitte kayiramāne oḷārike obhāse kayiramāne nāsakkhi paṭivijjhitaṇ, na Bhagavantaṇ yāci: Tiṭṭhatu bhante Bhagavā kappay, tiṭṭhatu Sugato kappay bahujaṇahitāya bahujaṇasukhāya lokānukampāya atthāya hitāya*

* Pointed out by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (S.B.E., xx. 380, n. 1).

sukhāya devamanussānan ti, yathātaṇ Mārena pariyaṭṭhitacitto.

'The Tathāgata could therefore, Ānanda, should he desire it, live on yet for a kalpa, or for that portion of the kalpa which has yet to run. But even though a suggestion so evident and a hint so broad were thus given by the Exalted One, the ven. Ānanda was incapable of comprehending them; and he besought not the Exalted One, saying, Vouchsafe, Lord, to remain during the kalpa! Live on through the kalpa, O Blessed One, for the good . . . so far was his heart possessed by the Evil One.'

The Māra theme is taken up again in § 7: *Atha kho Māro pāpimā acira-pakkante āyasmante Ānande yena Bhagavā ten' upasankami . . .* Hence in the *Dīgha*, the narrative occurs in a broader connexion. Moreover, we must also, as I have said, read, with the foregoing, D. xvi. 3, 40 (ii. 115), wherein the Buddha himself reproves Ānanda: *Tasmāt ih' Ānanda tuyh' ev' etaṇ dukkaṭaṇ, tuyh' ev' etaṇ aparaddhaṇ, yaṇ tvaṇ Tathāgatenā evaṇ oḷārike nimitte kayira-māne . . . na Tathāgataṇ yāci . . .* Here, then, we find this text ascribing to the Buddha himself those words of upbraiding which find an echo in C.V. xi., and a yet stronger echo in the North-Buddhist report of the Council, which is derived from the C.V. In no case has the compiler of C.V. xi. recorded anything at first hand.*

C.V. xi. 12: *Atha kho āyasmā Ānando there bhikkhū etad avoca: bhagavā maṇ bhante parinibbānakāle evam āha: tena h' Ānanda saṅgho mam' accayena Channassa bhikkhuno brahmadandaṇ āṇāpetū 'ti. Pucchi pana tvaṇ āvuso Ānanda bhagavantaṇ: katamo pana bhante brahmadando 'ti. Pucchiṇ kho 'haṇ*

* Had Minayeff and Oldenberg adopted a literary, instead of a historical, method, of explanation (*vide* Z.D.M.G., 52, pp. 620 ff.), they would have spared themselves all trouble and difficulty. Oldenberg's accurate apprehension on p. 621, therefore, does not, unfortunately, fit the case.

bhante bhagavantay: katamo pana bhante brahmadāṇo 'ti.... Channo Ānanda bhikkhū yaṇ iccheyya taṇ vadeyya, bhikkhūhi Channo bhikkhu n'eva vattabbo na ovaditabbo nānusa-sitabbo 'ti.*

Now the ven. Ānanda said to the Thera Bhikkhus: 'The Blessed One, Sirs, said to me at the time of his Parinirvana: "Let then the Order, Ānanda, when I am passed away, impose the higher penalty on Channa Bhikkhu." 'Didst thou then, friend Ānanda, ask the Blessed One what was that higher penalty?' 'I did, Sirs: "Ānanda, let Channa Bhikkhu say whatever he may wish, but the Bhikkhus shall neither answer him, nor counsel him, nor exhort him." '†

This section and the following account of the Buddha's command being carried out is based on Dīgha xvi. 6, 4 (ii. 154)‡: Channassa Ānanda bhikkhuno mam' accayena brahma-daṇḍo katabbo 'ti.

Katamo pana bhante brahma-daṇḍo 'ti?

Channo Ānanda bhikkhu yaṇ iccheyya taṇ vadeyya, so bhikkhūhi n'eva vattabbo na ovaditabbo na anusāsitabbo 'ti.§

The story of Channa is in a way connected with Majjhima xv. (i. 95): Āyasmā Mahāmoggallāno etad avoca: Pavāreti ce pi āvuso bhikkhu: Vadantu maṇ āyasmanto, vacanīyo 'mhi āyasmantehīti, so ca hoti dubbaco dovaccassakaraṇehi dham-mehi samannāgato akkhamo appadakkhiṇag-gāhī anusāsaniṇ, atha kho naṇ sabrahmacārī na c'eva vattabbaṇ maññanti na ca anusāsi-tabbaṇ maññanti na ca tasmiṇ puggale vissā-saṇ āpajjitabbaṇ maññanti.

* See also C.V. xi. 15.

† This Channa was a mutinous fellow, very difficult to manage. Cf. C.V. i. 25; iv. 14, 1. Pācittiya xii. 1; liv. 1; lxxi. 1. Sanghā-disesa xii. 1.

‡ Already pointed out by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (S.B.E. xx., p. 381, n. 2).

§ Certain details in the carrying out may be related to previous passages in the Cullavagga. More on this later.

The foregoing are the passages in C.V. xi. more obviously inspired by the Mahā-Parinibbāna-suttanta, and which, in consequence, have long ago been indicated (as stated in my footnotes). Now in my judgment there are certain others to be pointed out, which are of at least no smaller significance.

II.-III. PASSAGES NOT YET COMPARED IN DĪGHA-NIKĀYA XVI.
AND CULLAVAGGA XI., XII.

II. THE APPELLATIONS ĀVUSO AND BHANTE.

The first passage which I shall produce, and which, so far as I can see, has hitherto passed unnoticed in this connexion, does not properly belong to this chapter, but to the next. I bring it forward here, however, because it is useful to the present argument.

In C.V. xi. 2, the bhikkhus, in deciding who is to be chosen as the last of the 500 representatives to hold the Council, say to Mahā Kassapa: 'Ayaṇ bhante āyasmā Ānando kiñcāpi sekho, abhabbo,' etc. 'Lord, this ven. Ānanda, although he have not yet attained [to Arahatsip], yet is he incapable of falling into error. . . .' In § 6 Ānanda himself says: 'Sve sannipāto, na kho me taṇ paṭirūpaṇ yo' haṇ sekho samāno sannipātaṇ gaccheyyan 'ti.

'To-morrow is the assembly. Now it beseems me not to go into the assembly while I am still only on the way (towards Arahatsip).'

In the night he is set free from earthly weaknesses: Etasmiṇ antare anupādāya āsavehi cittaṇ vimucci. The original passage which reverberates here is Dīgha xvi. 5, 13, and 14 (ii. 143, 144). Ānanda is here lamenting over the Buddha's announcement of his impending death: 'Ahaṇ ca vat' amhi sekho sakaraṇīyo, Satthu ca me parinibbānaṇ bhavissati. . . .' 'Alas! I remain still but a learner; one who has yet to work out his own perfection. And the Master is about to pass away from me. . . .' The Buddha then speaks

words of consolation to him, ending with: *khippaṇ hohisi anāsavo* — ‘quickly shalt thou be free from earthly weaknesses.’

Ānanda’s immaturity in saintship is shown, in C.V. xi., xii., to have induced another very interesting result, which, among others, we will now consider.

In *Dīgha* xvi. 6, 2 (ii. 154), the Buddha decides as follows: *Yathā kho paṇ’ Ānanda etarahi bhikkhū aññamaññaṇ āvuso-vādena samudācaranti, na vo mam’ accayena evaṇ samudācaritabbaṇ. Theratarena Ānanda bhikkhunā navakataro bhikkhu nāmena vā gottena vā āvuso-vādena vā samudācaritabbo, navakatarena bhikkhunā therataro bhikkhu bhante ti vā āyasmā ti vā samudācaritabbo.*

Ānanda! when I am gone address not one another in the way in which the brethren have heretofore addressed each other—with the epithet, that is, of (*āvuso*) ‘friend.’ A younger brother may be addressed by a senior superior brother by his name, or by his family name, or by the title ‘friend.’* But an elder brother should be addressed by a younger brother as ‘lord’ or as ‘venerable sir.’

With this somewhat surprising injunction from the lips of the dying Buddha compare the preceding section (xvi. 6, 1): ‘It may be, Ānanda, that in some of you the thought may arise, “The word (*pāvacaṇa*) has lost its Teacher; we have no more a Teacher!” But it is not thus, Ānanda, that you should regard it. The truths and the rules of the Order which I have set forth and laid down for you all, let them, after I am gone, be the Teacher to you.’ The connecting-link between this and the passage previously quoted is the idea of authority,

* That by the title ‘Thera’ (elder) more was conveyed than mere seniority in years, see A. ii. 22, iii. 195, according to which one of the characters of a Thera is that he *āsavaṇaṇ khayā anāsavaṇ cetovimuttiṇ . . . upasampajja viharati*. In C.V. ix. 3, 1, the Theras are called *paracittaviduno*—‘knowers of the thoughts of others.’ This may not mean for us what it did then, but it shows sufficiently that Thera was not simply ‘elder.’

and this gives consecutiveness to the two paragraphs. A certain guarantee for the genuineness of the former (not, of course, as a logion of the Buddha, but as an integral part of the Suttanta) is conferred by the inner agreement in this pronouncement (D. xvi. 1, 6): *Yāvakiṇvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū ye te bhikkhū therā rattaññū cirapabbajitā saṅgha-pitaro saṅgha-parināyakā te sakkarissanti garukarissanti mānessanti pūjessanti tesañ ca sotabbaṃ maññissanti, vuddhi yeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnaṃ pāṭikañkhā no parihāni.*

‘So long, O bhikkhus, as the brethren honour and esteem and revere and support the elders of experience and long standing, the fathers and leaders of the Order, and hold it a point of duty to hearken to their words, so long may the brethren be expected, not to decline, but to prosper.’

What is to be said as to the justification and the consequences of that utterance ascribed to the dying Buddha regarding forms of mutual address? Did the usage indeed prevail for the brethren to address each other indiscriminately as *āvuso*? Do we find in C.V. xi., xii., where we naturally look first to watch the effect of the Buddha’s depositions, that that usage was replaced by a more conventional observance?

We can reply ‘Yes’ to both questions.

As to the former question, the inquiry most obviously suggesting itself on reading the injunction only is: Was there any such indiscriminate use of *āvuso* as a vocative during the Buddha’s lifetime? But this cannot well be put. Our knowledge of the age and the genuineness of the different Buddhist documents is only at its rudimentary stage. It is given as yet to no mortal man to demonstrate that any one Buddhist sentence was spoken during the lifetime of the Founder. All that we can, therefore, decide on is the reply to a question framed thus: ‘Does the Canon supply instances where on any one occasion the bhikkhus addressed each other, irrespective of age or dignity, as *āvuso*?’ And we shall naturally consult for instances

those prose books, which in all probability are the oldest. But one thing must be noted. The more formal, hierarchical term, *bhante*, was not initiated in connexion with the Buddha's decree. It was already current, side by side with *āvuso*, when the oldest Pali literature was compiled, and was the mode in which highly respected men, both religious and sometimes lay, were addressed. The Buddha is always addressed by disciples and by the believing laity as *bhante*.* Sakka, even, and Māra, as well as a Yakkha and a Gandhabba, follow their example on certain occasions. Any Buddhist *bhikkhu* is also so addressed by the believing laity, and even by a god (D. xxiii. 33 [ii. 356]). Even were we able to distinguish, with apodeictic certainty, between the oldest and the youngest texts, we should feel no surprise at finding one *bhikkhu* addressing a superior *bhikkhu* as '*bhante*,' from the very natural desire of airing his sincerely deep respect; how much less should it surprise us in any text which we have good ground for believing to be younger than the Mahā Parinibbāna-suttanta, as, *e.g.*, the Saṅyutta-Nikāya.

Notwithstanding such possible cases, the results of trying to establish anything respecting the use of *āvuso* are satisfactory and positive. In the Dīgha, no doubt, the speaker is nearly always the Buddha, and such instances as we seek are hence not numerous. (I speak only of the first two volumes, which I have searched carefully.) Where *bhikkhus* of equal standing converse together—to mention briefly at the outset this somewhat self-evident fact—the invariable mode of address in the Dīgha and other ancient works is *āvuso*.† Those *bhikkhus* are always treated as equals who are referred to, without naming or other charac-

* The adherents of other religious orders—*e.g.*, the Paribbājakas—permit themselves now and again to address the Buddha and his *bhikkhus* as *āvuso*. The Brahmins are still less ceremonious.

† Cases where a *bhikkhu* of higher standing addresses one of lower degree as *āvuso*, as in D. xvi. 5, 13 (vol. ii. 143), when Ānanda addresses an ordinary brother, need not be exemplified, since in such relations the Buddha introduced no innovation.

terization, as 'bhikkhus' (mendicants). The few instances of this otherwise abundant use of āvuso occurring in the two first volumes of the Dīgha are as follows (i. 1, 3 [i. 2]): Atha kho sambahulānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ . . . ayaṃ sankhiyā-dhammo udapādi: Acchariyaṃ āvuso abbhutaṃ āvuso. . . . xiv. 1, 13 (ii. 8): Atha kho tesāṃ bhikkhūnaṃ acirapakkantassa Bhagavato ayaṃ antarākathā udapādi: Acchariyaṃ āvuso abbhutaṃ āvuso. . . .^{*} With these we may compare, e.g., Anguttara x. 115, 2 (v. 225): Atha kho tesāṃ bhikkhūnaṃ acirapakkantassa Bhagavato etad ahoṣi: Idaṃ kho no āvuso Bhagavā . . . vihāraṃ pavitṭho. . . . Further citations are superfluous.

The Vinaya Piṭaka also affords innumerable instances—e.g., M.V. ii. 12, 3: . . . bhikkhū duccolā honti lūkhacīvarā. Bhikkhū evaṃ āhaṃsu: kissa tumhe āvuso duccolā lūkhacīvarā ti? etc. And among the many examples in the C.V. take i. 6, 1: Atha kho sangho Paṇḍukalohitakānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ tajjaniya-kammaṃ akāsi. te . . . bhikkhū upasaṅkamitvā evaṃ vadenti: mayaṃ āvuso sanghena tajjaniya-kammakataṃ sammāvattāma . . . iv. 14, 18: tehi . . . bhikkhūhi taṃ āvāsaṃ gantvā āvāsikā bhikkhū evaṃ assu vacanīyā: idaṃ kho āvuso adhikaraṇaṃ evaṃ jātaṃ. . . . v. 2, 4: tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno mukhe vaṇo hoti. so bhikkhū pucchi: kīdiso me āvuso vaṇo 'ti. bhikkhū evaṃ āhaṃsu: īdiso te āvuso vaṇo 'ti. vi. 3, 4: bhikkhū upadhāvitvā taṃ bhikkhuṃ etad avocuṃ: kissa tvaṃ āvuso vissaram akāsīti.

But a quite peculiar interest attaches to those properly evidential passages, in which a bhikkhu of lower standing addresses a brother possessing notoriously greater prestige than himself (theratara), and they must, therefore, be

^{*} In xv. 28, 30, and 31 (vol. ii. 66, 67) the phraseology is too general to determine whether a bhikkhu only or a layman also may be included under āvuso.

treated of more in detail. The texts allow us in many ways to infer whenever they deem any bhikkhu especially worthy. They give, for instance, repeatedly a list of notable 'thera's.' In C.V. i. 18, 1: Tena kho pana samayena sambahulā therā bhikkhū āyasmā ca Sāriputto āyasmā ca Mahāmoggallāno āyasmā ca Mahākaccāno āyasmā ca Mahākoṭṭhito āyasmā ca Mahākappino āyasmā ca Mahācundo āyasmā ca Anuruddho āyasmā ca Revato āyasmā ca Upāli āyasmā ca Ānando āyasmā ca Rāhulo. . . .

Again, in M. 32 (i. 212): Ekaṃ samayaṃ Bhagavā Gosīṅgasālavanadāye viharati sambahulehi abhiññātehi abhiññātehi therehi sāvakehi sadhiṇ, āyasmatā ca Sāriputtena āyasmatā ca Mahāmoggallānena āyasmatā ca Mahākassapena āyasmatā ca Anuruddhena āyasmatā ca Revatena āyasmatā ca Ānandena. . . .

M. 118 (iii. 78) gives the same list, but inserts between Mahākassapa and Anuruddha āyasmatā ca Mahākaccāyanena āyasmatā ca Mahākoṭṭhitena āyasmatā ca Mahākappinena āyasmatā ca Mahācundena.

A. ii. 17, 2 (iii. 299), has: Kahan nu kho bhikkhave Sāriputto, kahaṃ Mahāmoggallāno, kahaṃ Mahākassapo, kahaṃ Mahākaccāno, kahaṃ Mahākoṭṭhito, kahaṃ Mahācundo, kahaṃ Mahākappino, kahaṃ Anuruddho, kahaṃ Revato, kahaṃ Ānando, kahan nu kho te bhikkhave therā sāvakā gatā ti? Compare also with these Udāna i. 5.

The last place I give to M.V. x. 5, 3, and 6, because the appellation of therā is omitted: 3. Assosi kho āyasmā Sāriputto. . . . 6. Assosi kho āyasmā Mahāmoggallāno . . . Mahākassapo . . . Mahākaccāno . . . Mahākoṭṭhito . . . Mahākappino . . . Mahācundo . . . Anuruddho . . . Revato . . . Upāli . . . Ānando . . . Rāhulo. . . . Ānanda is ranked in the

list of Sākya nobles who had renounced the world, C.V. vii. 1, 4, after Anuruddha, and is also so placed in the scale of religious graduates, inasmuch as Anuruddha, immediately after entering the Order, won the 'heavenly eye,' while Ānanda won only the 'fruit of conversion.'

This list of Theras has a significance also for the modes of address in C.V. xi. xii. Just here I will only bring forward this much: Ānanda, although he plays a great part in the life-history of the Buddha, and in the canonical literature, remains at the bottom of the list, Mahā-Kassapa among the first. And we learn, from detached passages, that this estimate of, and by, himself found general acceptance. Take, *e.g.*, S. xvi. 11, 7, and 8 (ii. 218). In § 7 Mahā-Kassapa rebukes Ānanda for consorting so much with novices (*navēhi bhikkhūhi*),* and concludes his admonition with the words: 'This youth does not know his place'—*navāyaṇ kumāro mattam aññāsi*. In § 8 Ānanda replies: 'There are grey hairs on my head, and still I am exposed to being called "youth" by the venerable Mahā-Kassapa!†

Again, in M.V. i. 74, 1: *Tena kho pana samayena āyasmato Mahākassapassa upasampadāpekkho hoti. Atha kho āyasmā Mahākassapo āyasmato Ānandassa santike dūtaṇ pāhesi: āgacchatu Ānando imaṇ anussāvessatīti. Āyasmā Ānando evaṇ āha: nāhaṇ ussahāmi therassa nāmaṇ gahetun garu me thero ti.*

At that time some one requested to be ordained at the hand of Mahākassapa. Then the ven. M. Kassapa sent a messenger to the ven. Ānanda, saying: 'Ānanda is to come and declare this (person to be a bhikkhu).' The ven. Ānanda replied: 'I should not dare to make

* Cf. S. xvi. 11, 3 (vol. ii. 217): *Tena kho pana samayena āyasmato Ānandassa tiṇsamattā saddhivihārino . . . yebhuyyena kumārabhūtā.*

† In S. xxii. 83, 3 (vol. iii. 105), however, Ānanda counts himself among the novices: *Āyasmā Ānando etad avoca: Puṇṇo nāma āvuso āyasmā Mantāniputto amhākaṇ navakānaṇ sataṇ bahūpakāro hoti.*

use of the Thera's name.* I have too high a respect for the Thera.' (This, be it said in passing, comes very nearly into our forthcoming discussion, in chap. v., on C.V. xi. and xii., but this, in the M.V., need not seem strange.)

To the best of my belief, therefore, the two extremes of the quoted list of Theras, naming Mahā-Kassapa and Ānanda respectively, represent the greatest difference in importance and estimation of the Theras in that list. Imagine a Thera at the head of the list,† perhaps the admired Great Kassapa himself, conversing with another figuring at the bottom of it, perhaps with the modest Ānanda, or even with a bhikkhu who was not a Thera. Now, if any such latter interlocutor could call any of the former interlocutors āvuso (friend), then we have the best proof which the literary documents available can afford, that, during a certain period, and previous to an impending change, the usage indicated by the Buddha in D. xvi. 6, 2, was actually current. That change we shall presently discuss.

In D. xvi. 5, 13 (ii. 143), an anonymous bhikkhu dispatched to Ānanda, addresses that Thera as āvuso: *Atha kho Bhagavā aññataro bhikkhu āmantesi: 'Ehi tvaṃ bhikkhu, mama vacanena Ānandam āmantehi: "Satthā taṃ āvuso Ānanda āmantetiti."'* 'Evaṃ bhante' ti kho so bhikkhu Bhagavato paṭissutvā yen' āyasmā Ānando ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā āyasmantaṃ Ānandaṃ etad avoca: 'Satthā taṃ āvuso Ānanda āmantetiti.'

From D. xvi. 5, 23 ff (ii. 148 ff), we learn that, shortly before the Buddha's death, a wandering recluse named Subhadda‡ was by the Master admitted into the Order. In xvi. 5, 29 (ii. 152), the Exalted One commissions Ānanda

* For the procedure held requisite at such a declaration, cf. M.V. i. 76, 8, and 11.

† To realize the pre-eminence of such a Thera—*e.g.*, of Sāriputta—cf. M. (xxiv.) i. 150.

‡ Not to be confounded with the Subhadda whom we have to discuss later, and who, as we have seen, was travelling with M. Kassapa (D. xvi. 6, 20).

as follows: 'Tena h'Ānanda Subhaddaṃ pabbā-jethāti.' 'Evaṃ bhante' ti kho āyasmā Ānando Bhagavato paccassosi.

30. Atha kho Subhaddo paribbājako āyasman-taṃ Ānandaṃ etad avoca: 'Lābhā vo āvuso Ananda, suladdhaṃ vo āvuso Ānanda. . . .' There can be no question as to the difference in position between these two at the time, and yet Subhadda addresses Ānanda confidentially as āvuso. However, it is possible that Subhadda was on that occasion, prior to his ordination, merely using the familiar address in vogue among the Paribbājaka's.

In D. xvi. 6, 20 (ii. 162) we hear the other Subhadda speaking to the brethren attending the great Kassapa, and to the latter. This Subhadda was also a new recruit, since he is described as having left the world in his old age (buddhapabbajito).^{*} Even if his speech was not intended to include the apostle, there must have been among the 500 several of senior standing to himself. And yet he calls them all simply āvuso: 'Ahaṃ āvuso mā socittha. . . .'

It is in this very Suttanta itself that the important change in address takes place just after the Buddha's decease. Of this later. I will first give other examples of āvuso from other older Nikāya texts.

In M. xv. (i. 95) the bhikkhus call Mahā-Moggallāna āvuso, even though he was one of the first of the Buddha's disciples: 'Āvuso ti kho te bhikkhū āyasmato Mahāmoggallānassa paccassosun'. So in M. xviii. (i. 110), the bhikkhus address Mahākaccāna: 'Ekaman-taṃ nisinnā kho te bhikkhū āyasmantaṃ Mahākaccānaṃ etad avocun': 'Idaṃ kho no āvuso Kaccāna Bhagavā sankhittena uddesaṃ uddi-sitvā . . . vihāraṃ pavitt'ho, etc. In M. xxviii. (i. p. 184)

* It is conceivable that, in some more original form of traditional narrative, the two Subhaddas were one and the same. That two of the same name should have entered the Order so nearly at the same time is a little curious; but the matter is not worth discussing.

the bhikkhus address Sāriputta: *Āvuso ti kho te bhikkhū āyasmato Sāriputtassa paccassosun.*

In M. xxxii. (i. 212) the two senior Theras, M. Moggallāna and M. Kassapa, address each other as *āvuso*: '*Āyāma' āvuso Kassapa . . . Evaṃ āvuso ti. . .*' So also, in the same words, do Revata and Ānanda. Again, on p. 213, Ānanda, whose rank we have seen, addresses in the same way the leading Thera Sāriputta: '*Evarūpena kho āvuso Sāriputta bhikkhunā Gosingasālavanāṃ sobheyya.*'

In Ang. iv. 174, 4 (ii. 161), Ānanda to Mahākotṭhito: '*Channaṃ āvuso phassaṃyatanānaṃ asesavirāganīrodhā atth' aññaṃ kiñcīti.*'

In Ang. iv. 179 (ii. 167), Ānanda to Sāriputta: '*Ko nu kho āvuso Sāriputta hetu . . .*'; and v. 169, 2 (iii. 201): '*Kittāvata nu kho āvuso Sāriputta bhikkhu . . .*' and also vi. 51 (iii. 361). In Ang. ix. 11, 2 (iv. 374), an anonymous bhikkhu to Sāriputta: '*Satthā taṃ āvuso Sāriputta āmanteti.*' In A. x. 86, 1 (v. 162), the bhikkhus to M. Kassapa: '*Āvuso ti kho te bhikkhū āyasmato M. Kassapassa paccassosun.*' So in A. iv. 170 (ii. 156) the bhikkhus to Ānanda; also in S. xxi. 2 (ii. 274) the bhikkhus to Sāriputta, and (§ 4 *ibid.*) Ānanda to Sāriputta: '*Satthu pi te āvuso Sāriputta . . .*' So again in xxviii. 1, 6 (iii. 235), Ānanda to Sāriputta: '*Vipprasannāni kho te āvuso Sāriputta indriyāni . . .*' and again in lv. 4 and 13 (v. 346, 362).

Again in Udāna iii. 3, a company of bhikkhus address Yasoja their leader as *āvuso*: '*Evaṃ āvuso ti kho bhikkhū āyasmato paccassosun*' (p. 25).

I will pass over the many other instances that might be quoted, and bring forward only one more. A fortunate accident has reserved it for us, as if to make the antithesis in C.V. xi. all the more tangible. In S. xxii. 90, 8, and 18 (iii. 133, 135), Channa, too, addresses Ānanda with the familiar *āvuso*: 8. *Ekam antaṃ nisinna kho āyasmā Channo āyasmantam Ānandam etad*

avoca: Ekam idāhaṇ āvuso Ānanda samayaṇ Bārāṇasiyaṇ viharāmi. 18. Evam etaṇ āvuso Ānanda hoti. And in M. iii. 264=S. xxxv. 87 (iv. 56), Channa addresses the greater apostle, Sāriputta himself, in the same way: 'Na me āvuso Sāriputta khama-nīyaṇ. . . .'

The Vinaya-Piṭaka offers also equivalent examples;* and this, as we should expect, since the greater part of it deals with the lifetime of the Buddha. In M.V. ii. 12, 1: Bhikkhū āyasmantaṇ Mahākassapaṇ etad avocuṇ: kissa te āvuso cīvarāni allānīti. In C.V. iv. 4, 5: Te (*i.e.*, Mettiyabhummajakā bhikkhū) pacchābhattaṇ piṇḍapātapaṭikkantā there bikkhū pucchanti: tumhākaṇ āvuso bhattagge kiṇ ahoṣi. . . . In C.V. v. 8, 1: Atha kho āyasmā Piṇḍolabhāradvājo āyasmantaṇ Mahāmoggallānaṇ etad avoca: . . . gacchāvuso Moggallāna. . . . In C.V. vii. 3, 10: Evaṇ āvuso 'ti kho te bhikkhū āyasmato Ānandassa paṭissutvā. . . . In C.V. vii. 4, 2, Devadatta addresses Sāriputta as āvuso, but this instance cannot be relied on, as Devadatta had left the Order, and would consequently be at no pains to follow its usages.

The point, then, is well established, and in the older Nikāyas I have found no contradictory instance. Superficially considered, D. vi. 4 (i. 151) might seem to form one: Atha kho Sīho samaṇuddeso yen' āyasmā Nāgito ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā āyasmantaṇ Nāgitaṇ abhivādetvā ekamantaṇ aṭṭhāsi. Ekamantaṇ ṭhito kho Sīho samaṇuddeso āyasmantaṇ Nāgitaṇ etad avoca: 'Ete bhante Kassapa sambahulā . . . brāhmaṇa-dūtā . . . idh' upasankantā. . . . A samaṇuddesa is not yet a bhikkhū, but is a candidate for the position (see Childers's Dicty., s. v. uddeso; S.B.E. xiii. 48, n. 4; S.B.B. ii. 198). Hence he ranks very near to the pious laity. The

* Together with discrepant instances, which will be explained later.

respectful term *bhante*, used invariably by the latter, is, therefore, quite fitting on his tongue. In the next section Siha conveys the same announcement to the Buddha, and in that case, of course, cannot but use the same appellative *bhante*. It may be that the message as delivered to Nāgita-Kassapa is a mere duplication of the announcement to the Buddha, or has been assimilated to it in the course of handing down the narrative.

There is a quite analogous case of a *samaṇuddesa* using *bhante* in addressing a Thera in S. xlvii. 13 (v. 161): 2. Tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Sāriputto Magadhesu viharati Nālagāmake ābādhiko dukkhito bālāhagilāno, Cundo ca samaṇuddeso āyasmato Sāriputtassa upaṭṭhāko hoti. 3. Atha āyasmā Sāriputto tena ābādhena parinibbāyi. 4. Atha kho Cundo samaṇuddeso . . . yenāyasmā Ānando tenupasankami, upasankamitvā . . . āyasmantaṃ Ānandaṃ etad avoca: Āyasmā bhante Sāriputto parinibbuto. . . .

Worthy of special notice, on the other hand, is S. xvi. 10, 2 f., and 11, 4 f. (ii. 214 f., 217 f.). In both passages Ānanda addresses Mahā-Kassapa as *bhante*, which is in harmony with the Buddha's injunction: Atha kho āyasmā Ānando . . . yenāyasmā Mahākassapo tenupasankami. 3. Upasankamitvā āyasmantaṃ Mahākassapaṃ etad avoca: Āyāma bhante Kassapa . . . xvi. 11, 6: Tayo kho bhante Kassapa atthavase paṭicca Bhagavatā kulesu tikabhajanam paññattaṃ. As, however, the Saṃyutta-nikāya unquestionably uses portions of the Dīgha-nikāya, and in particular the M. Parinibbāna-Suttanta, it is really a much more impressive fact that it should not more thoroughly adapt itself to the arrangements made by the Buddha, but should contain so much important evidence for the previously current usage of *āvuso*.

The case of the Vinaya-piṭaka is quite similar. As it is a later compilation than the M. Parinibbāna-Suttanta (v. below, ch. v.), but at the same time purports to be a

testimony of the Buddha's lifetime, we find, as we should expect, instances both of the older form of address and also of the newer. And to the thoroughgoing adoption of the latter, it devotes two entire chapters. I have given instances of the older form. Among those of the newer, take the following:

Both forms of address occur in accordance with the prescribed usage in M.V. ii. 17, 3: *Tena kho pana samayena aññatarasmiṃ āvāse . . . sambahulā bhikkhū viharanti bālā avyattā . . . Te therayaṃ ajjhesiṃsu: 'Uddisatu bhante thero pātimokkhan ti.'* So evaṃ āha: *'Na me āvuso vattatīti.'* But the change of situation brings about, naturally enough, a change of social tone. These same bhikkhus no longer call any of their number down to the youngest novice as bhante, āyasmā, or indeed by any title at all. The novice, on the other hand, uses the term bhante to those held more worthy than he: *Eten' eva upāyena yāva Saṅghaṇa vakaṃ ajjhesanti: 'Uddisatu āyasmā* Pātimokkhan ti.'* So pi evaṃ vadeti: *'Na me bhante vattatīti.'*

In the concluding paragraphs of this section of the M.V. āvuso appears again, this time correctly applied, either to bhikkhus 'of equal or junior rank,' or, since this instance is of the Buddha's own words, as the general usage permitted during his lifetime: *'Tehi bhikkhave bhikkhūhi eko bhikkhu sāmanta āvāsā sajjukaṃ pāhetabbo "Gacchāvuso. . ."'*†

Equally instructive, and precisely in accordance with the injunction, is the etiquette of address in M.V. ii. 26, 6: *Evañ ca pana bhikkhave kātabbo: therena bhikkhunā ekaṃsaṃ uttarāsaṃgaṃ karitvā ukkukāṇaṃ nisīditvā añjaliṃ paggaḥetvā navo bhik-*

* This is not the 'Venerable Sir' prescribed by the Buddha along with 'bhante' as a title (D. xvi. 6, 2), but is the bhikkhu's usual prefix used in the third person. More hereon at the end of this chapter.

† In view of the passage (M.V. ii. 26, 6), this second eventuality is improbable.

khu evam assa vacanīyo: parisuddho ahaṇ āvuso . . . Z. Navakena bhikkhunā ekaṇsaṇ uttarāsaṅgaṇ karitvā . . . thero bhikkhu evam assa vacanīyo: parisuddho ahaṇ bhante.

In M.V. iv. 1, 14, an ordinary bhikkhu, though he is learned and competent (vyatto paṭibalo), uses in addressing the brethren, among whom, as it appears, is a Thera, the word bhante. The Thera follows, using in his speech to the brethren the word āvuso. Lastly, a novice under the same conditions uses bhante. The same etiquette is observed in iv. 5, 3-6; viii. 24, 5 and 6. Again, in M.V. viii. 31, 1, the Theras Sāriputta and Revata (who ranks under the former in the list given above, p. 23) and an ordinary bhikkhu conform throughout to the prescribed forms. Revata calls Sāriputta bhante; the bhikkhu, āvuso. Sāriputta calls Revata āvuso. The bhikkhu calls Revata bhante.

Let us turn to C.V. iv. 14, 25: Atha kho te bhikkhū taṇ āvāsaṇ gantvā te there etad avocuṇ: idaṇ bhante adhikaraṇaṇ evaṇ jātaṇ. In vi. 14, 31, sambahulā bhikkhū are addressed as bhante, because there are vuddhā bhikkhū among them: No ce labhetha tena bhikkhave bhikkhunā sambahule bhikkhū upasankamitvā ekaṇsaṇ uttarāsaṅgaṇ karitvā vuddhānaṇ bhikkhūnaṇ pāde vanditvā ukkuṭikaṇ nisīditvā añjaliṇ paggaḥetvā evam assu vacanīyā: ahaṇ bhante itthannāmaṇ āpatitiṇ āpanno taṇ paṭidesemīti.

An instance of the newer use of bhante in bhikkhus addressing a Thera occurs in Pārājika i. 7 (Vin. iii. 23): Tena kho pana samayena sambahulā Vesālīkā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū yāvadatthaṇ bhuñjiṇsu yāvadatthaṇ supiṇsu. . . . Te aparena samayena . . . āyasmantaṇ Ānandaṇ upasaṅkamitvā evaṇ vadenti: na mayaṇ bhante Ānanda buddhagarahino. . . . Other internal evidence leads us to suspect that this passage is derived from the M. Parinibbāna-S., to which we shall return (ch. v.). Compare

also in Nissaggiya xxii. 1 (Vin. iii. 247): *Thero vat-tabbo*: 'Gaṇhātu bhante thero pattan ti.'

With regard to the presumptive presence, in any conference, of elder, eminent bhikkhus, we find the Order, on the occasion of any motion, being addressed as *bhante*. It is only addressed as *āvuso* when the mover is himself the one held most worthy, or a bhikkhu of equal standing to any present. This is exemplified in the instance just given from M.V. iv. 1, 14.

Let us now, before going further, resume our results. In the older canonical texts there appears a certain customary mode of address, different from that prescribed for the future by the Buddha. Exceptions occur, referring distinctly to a later period, and sufficiently intelligible as due to the influence of the new tendency. Whether, however, this be so or not, in no matter how many exceptions, the fact remains that, in the literature referred to, there is an overwhelming number of instances which do not harmonize with the Buddha's injunction, but follow that older mode of address which he suspended, showing that it was still in vogue. Now, suppose that we suddenly meet, in the Canon, with instances where the new mode is both used, and used not casually, but with conscientious persistence (such treatment being alone sound evidence), we may here conclude with certainty that the compiler chose his words with conscious intention, and in conscious dependence upon that injunction of the Buddha—that is to say, in dependence not on the spoken injunction itself, but upon the literary record of it. For if the guiding influence had been the expression of the Buddha's will, and not the literary vehicle of it in the *M. Parinibbāna-S.*, it would be quite inexplicable why that influence should show itself so unequally, in such passages on the one hand, and in the passages quoted from the *Sutta-piṭaka* on the other—passages which unquestionably originated after the *M.P.S.* The only possible conclusion is, first, that the compiler of the passages consistent with the injunction must have been influenced by the record of the same; secondly, that the

Sutta-Pitaka compilers either deliberately ignored that record,* or overlooked it, or were ignorant of it, the newer custom resulting from it occasionally influencing them against their will.

The opposite result—consistent obedience to the new rule—may be traced with absolute precision from its inception. We can lay our finger on the very passage. (I do not yet refer to the C.V. passages showing it, with which we shall be chiefly concerned.) And that it occurs just where, in the available documents, it could only occur, points to the accuracy of my observation. We shall naturally look for the passage in the M. Parinibbāna-S. itself immediately after the account of the death of the Master. And there we find it, in D. xvi. 6, 8 (ii. 156): *Atha kho Bhagavā . . . nevasaññā - nāsaññāyatana - samāpattiya vutthahitvā saññāvedayitanirodhaṃ samāpajji. Atha kho āyasmā Ānando āyasmantaṃ Anuruddhaṃ etad avoca: 'Parinibbuto bhante Anuruddha Bhagavā' ti. 'Na āvuso Ānanda Bhagavā parinibbuto, saññāvedayitanirodhaṃ samāpanno' ti.* The Buddha is not yet actually dead, but Ānanda believes he is, and forthwith carries his will into execution by calling Anuruddha, the 'Therātara,' bhante. If the list of Theras given above, giving the relative position of these two, be consulted, it will be seen that Ānanda was bound to use the form he did use. And Anuruddha's āvuso is equally correct.

In xvi. 6, 9, the moment of death actually supervenes: *Catutthajjhānā vutthahitvā samanantarā Bhagavā parinibbāyi.* Thereupon (6, 11) Anuruddha begins: *Atha kho āyasmā Anuruddho bhikkhū āmantesi: 'Ahaṃ āvuso mā socittha. . . '* And the bhikkhus reply: *'Kathaṃ-bhūtā pana bhante āyasmā Anuruddho devatā manasikarotīti?'* Anuruddha in replying addresses himself to Ānanda, saying: *'Sant' āvuso Ānanda devatā. . . '* In § 12

* Because they narrate chiefly events as happening in the Buddha's lifetime.

Anuruddha calls on Ānanda: 'Gacch' āvuso Ānanda . . .' Ānanda replies: 'Evaṃ bhante.'

In 6, 20, as has been noticed, the old, but junior bhikkhu Subhadda addresses M. Kassapa's disciples, the leader being with them, as āvuso. But then they were on tour, and had not heard of the Buddha's death.

We see that all is in perfect order—that the change in the use of āvuso, with bhante, was precisely in accordance with the Buddha's injunction.

There is in C.V. xi. and xii. an account of certain events after the Buddha's death. We shall see whether this, too, harmonizes with the Master's injunction or not. I will sketch the contents of both chapters, pointing out as we go any changes in the use of the two forms of address.

C.V. xi. 1: The first two sections, as I have said, are on the whole derived from D. xvi. 6, 19, and 20 (ii. 162), and are to that extent irrelevant. Both use āvuso in the older way. But the compiler has, after his own fashion, put a few āvusos, not in the original, into the mouth of M. Kassapa, who is addressing the bhikkhus as their head, so as to adapt the passage more plausibly.

In the third section M. Kassapa continues in an undervived passage: 'Handa mayaṃ āvuso dhammañ ca vinayañ ca sangāyāma.'* After Sāriputta and Moggallāna were dead (cf. S. xlvii. 13, 14 [v. 161, 163])—*N.B.*, when they really were dead (cf. in Introduction, p. 3)—M. Kassapa, by our list of Theras, became the highest Thera, which explains his taking the lead after the Buddha's death, and perhaps the respectful attitude of Ānanda in S. xvi. 10, 3. He was 'Therātara,' senior to all other bhikkhus, and hence it was in accordance with the injunction of D. xvi. 6, 2, that he addressed the general assembly of bhikkhus, and later even the Council of Theras (C.V. xi. 3), as āvuso, and so in all subsequent sections.

* To recite together, to test by reciting. Passages like M.V. v. 13, 9 (=Ud. v. 6) and C.V. v. 3 show that the texts were occasionally recited in chanting.

Even if Sāriputta and Moggallāna were not dead, it is certain they were not present.*

In xi. 2, the assembly reply by calling on him to select those who are to take part in the proposed 'Council,' and repeatedly and correctly address him as *bhante*: 'Tena hi bhante thero bhikkhū uccinatū ti.' On their motion Ānanda is elected as the 500th (and last) member, although he is yet but a *sekho* (v. above, p. 18). This relative ecclesiastical inferiority of Ānanda, to which the *Dīgha* already alludes, is quite consistently maintained in the passages already cited, where Ānanda occupies a low degree in the hierarchy of the Order. In C.V. xi. this feature is distinctly and deliberately mentioned, as is also the fact that thenceforth the elected 500 are called exclusively 'Theras' (xi. 3, etc.). It follows that Ānanda has to address both M. Kassapa and the rest of the 500 as *bhante*, which he accordingly does (xi. 8, 9).

In xi. 3 the Conference of Theras proposes to hold the Council at Rājagaha. In 4 M. Kassapa moves this before the Order, and it is passed. He addresses the Order correctly with: 'Suṇātu me āvuso Sangho!'

In xi. 5 the 500 Theras propose among themselves to spend the first month of the rainy season in repair of dilapidations (*khaṇḍaphullaṇ paṭisankharoma*).†

* They would else have certainly been named. M. Kassapa's primacy is undisputed.

† So S.B.E. xx. 373. The *Samantapāsādikā* interprets the phrase as 'repair of monasteries,' and the *Dharmagupta* version speaks of putting in order dwellings and sleeping accommodation. Cf. C.V. vi. 5, 2: *navakammiko bhikkhave bhikkhu ussukkaṇ āpajjissati kinti nu kho vihāro khippaṇ pariyoṣānaṇ gaccheyyā ti, khaṇḍaphullaṇ paṭisankharissati*. 'Bhikkhus, the bhikkhu who is overseer shall zealously exert himself, to the end that the work on the Vihāra may be quickly concluded, and he shall repair dilapidations.' Building operations are again clearly referred to in C. V. vi. 17, 1, where *khaṇḍaphullaṇ paṭisankharaṇa* occurs, and are hinted at in vi. 11, 1: *tena kho pana samayena sattarasavaggiyā bhikkhū aññataraṇ paccantimaṇ mahāvihāraṇ paṭisankharonti idha mayaṇ vassaṇ vasissāmā'ti*. '... a company of seventeen bhikkhus made ready a large Vihāra ... with the intention of dwelling in it. ...'

As equals, where no distinction by way of name or otherwise is made, they call each other naturally āvuso.

6. Ānanda at length attains to spiritual maturity, and becomes an Arahat: anupādāya āsavehi cittaṃ vimucci.

7. M. Kassapa moves that a certain distribution arrangement be made in the revision of the Vinaya. Should he go through the registered contents of the Vinaya with Upāli by way of catechizing him? Upāli also moves that he be allowed to be questioned. The forms of address are again in order; M. Kassapa says, 'Suṇātu me āvuso Sangho!' Upāli, 'Suṇātu me bhante Sangho!' In the Therapist Upāli ranks among the lowest. Either, then, he has many superiors among the 500, or in any case there is the primate M. Kassapa. The revision then proceeds as proposed and sanctioned, Kassapa saying āvuso and Upāli replying bhante.

8. Revision of the Dhamma, with Ānanda in place of Upāli, and with the difference in the form of address.

9. Ānanda brings forward the dying Buddha's permission to the Sangha to revoke at will all the lesser and least precepts (*v.* above, p. 12). In correct fashion he calls the Theras bhante; they call him āvuso. Differences of opinion, as to which precepts are meant, are ended by Kassapa's motion that all precepts should be maintained. To this we shall return in chap. iii. He addresses the Council as before.

10. The Council rebuke Ānanda for various shortcomings, addressing him as āvuso, he replying correctly with bhante.

11. The ven. Purāṇa, with a following of 500 bhikkhus, returns from a tour in the Southern Hills to Rājagaha, and is invited by the Council to accept the results of their discussions. He approves, nevertheless declares that he will continue to retain in his memory his own recollection of the Buddha's preaching of both Dhamma and Vinaya. Addressed as āvuso, and himself so addressing the Council, he is treated as an equal.

12. Ānanda brings forward a dying injunction of the Buddha to impose the ban (*brahmadaṇḍaṇ*) on the bhikkhu Channa. The Council commission him to carry out the imposition, and to be accompanied by 500 bhikkhus.* Once more the correct appellations *bhante* and *āvuso*. Ānanda with his following proceeds by water to Kosambī, landing in King Udena's park. Here the ladies of the harem shower gifts of robes upon him, and he pacifies the grudging king by explaining the communistic and economic use to which they are to be put.

15. Channa is put under the ban. Here, then, arises an interesting problem in etiquette for the compiler. Ānanda, the lowest among the Theras, becomes for Channa an important personage! Consequently, the form of address is altered. He calls Channa *āvuso*; the latter calls him *bhante* Ānanda. In S. xxii. 90, 8 (iii. 133), Channa calls him *āvuso*. Eventually Ānanda removes the ban.

C.V. xii. But the problems of etiquette in titles of C.V. xi. are child's play compared with those in xii. It would almost seem as if, in composing chap. xi., the compiler had caught the infection for such puzzles. In xii. he seems to revel in complicated *rencontres* between persons of different rank. If one only reads the text unsuspectingly, one might break one's head over the bringing hither and thither of so many different bhikkhus. It is only when the reason for it becomes clear that one can afford to enjoy the ingenuity of the construction. The enjoyment is caused, be it said, more by the humour of the procedure than by historical or æsthetic reasons. The contents of C.V. xii. are as follows:

1. 1. One hundred years after the Parinibbāna of the Buddha, the Vajjian Bhikkhus of Vesālī set up a claim for ten indulgences: Salt may be stored in a horn vessel, etc., gold and silver may be received. They forthwith instituted the raising of a fund. The ven. Yasa, then residing at Vesālī, was unable to check them. The bhikkhus offered him a share of the Sabbath collection, with

* With this *cf.* chap. iv.

the words: 'Eso te āvuso Yasa hiraññaṣṣa paṭiviso'—'This, friend Yasa, is your share of the money.' He declines, saying: 'N'atthi me āvuso hiraññaṣṣa paṭiviso.' This mode of address is correct, Yasa being, as compared with the Vajjians, neither theratara nor navakatara. (So, again, in § 2.)

2. The Vajjiputtakas, addressing each other correctly as āvuso, now bind over Yasa to reconcile himself with the Vesālī laity, to whom, according to them, he has given offence by his opinions.* Yasa claims a companion, according to an enactment of the Buddha.† Āvuso is again used on both sides.

3. Yasa reports the accusation against him to the Vesālīans, and refers to a sermon of the Buddha's forbidding the use of gold and silver to the Order, recorded in A. iv. 50 (ii. 53 ff.). It should be noted that the compiler of C.V. xii., in introducing this quoted sermon, makes Yasa address the laity twice as āvuso: Ekam idaṃ āvuso samayaṃ Bhagavā Sāvatthiyaṃ viharati Jetavane Anāthapiṇḍikassa ārāme. Tatra kho āvuso Bhagavā bhikkhū āmantesi. This had previously been the usual mode of addressing laymen, and in itself, therefore, is not strange. But its adoption in this borrowed text shows what weight the compiler laid upon these matters.

4. Contains another quotation from a sermon = S. xlii. 10 (iv. 325).‡ Here āvuso is continued even in the quoted words: Ekam idaṃ āvuso samayaṃ Bhagavā Rājagahe viharati Veluvane Kalandakanivāpe. Tena kho panāvuso samayena. . . .

5. Reference to the Buddha's prohibition of the acceptance of gold and silver (Nissaggiya xviii.; Vin. iii. 236 f.)§

* Cf. C.V. i. 20.

† Cf. C.V. i. 22.

‡ The Mañicūlaka mentioned in it is consequently not a fictitious character, 'un doublet' of Yasa, as de la V. Poussin (*Muséon*, 1905, p. 296) believes.

§ Pointed out by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (S.B.E. xx. 392, n. 2).

6, 7. The friendly reception by the Vesālīans is reported by the escort to the Vajji Bhikkhus, who address him as āvuso: 'Khamāpitā āvuso Yasena Kākaṇḍaka-puttena Vesālikā upāsakā ti?' 'Have they forgiven Yasa?' He replies with āvuso: 'Pāpikaṇ no āvuso kataṇ. . . .' 'Evil, friends, hath been wrought against us.' They thereupon resolve to suspend Yasa temporarily (*ukkhepaniyakamma*). Yasa travels through the air to Kosambī, and sends messengers to the bhikkhus of Pāṭheyya, Avantī, and the Southern country to aid him in defending the Dhamma and Vinaya.*

8. He himself visits the ven. Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī on the Ahoganga Hill. It should be remembered that, in M.V. viii. 24, 6, one Sāṇavāsī occurs in a list of Theras. There are other such coincidences in names between C.V. xii. and parts of the Canon purporting to be narratives of the Buddha's own lifetime (*e.g.*, Revata, Sālha). There is, therefore, no doubt that the compiler of C.V. xi., xii., in his choice of names, was at least influenced by canonical names, unless he expressly claims to be treating of some one who was alive in the Buddha's time or in that of his immediate disciples. Such, *e.g.*, is the case with Sabbakāmi (*v.* below).† Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī will certainly have been not only a Thera, since the plural therā bhikkhū, C.V. xii. 1, 9, includes him, but also one having great reputation and authority, else Yasa would have no motive for invoking his aid. We are, therefore, quite prepared to find Yasa calling him bhante: 'Ime bhante Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā. . .' and 'Handa mayaṇ bhante imaṇ adhikaraṇaṇ ādiyissāma.' 'Come now, lord, let us take in charge

* Cf. S.B.E. xvii. 146 ff.; also below, § 8.

† According to the *Dīpavaṇsa* version of the second Council (*Dīp.* iv. 50 f., V. 24), these, as well as the delegates summoned (in C.V. xii. 2, 7), had all personally seen the Buddha. According to the *Dulva* (Rockhill, 'Life of the Buddha,' p. 176), Sālha was a contemporary of Ānanda. Moreover, according to Dharmagupta, not only Sabbakāmi, but 'Sambuno' (Sambuto?) and Revata had been pupils of Ānanda (Beal, Trans. Fifth Or. Congress, ii. 2, 44). See also de la V Poussin, *Muséon*, 1905, p. 50.

this controversy.' Sambhūta replies, with due heed to their relations: 'Evaṃ āvuso ti. . . .' (So again in § 10.) The two are joined by 148 bhikkhus from the above-named districts,* all of them Arahats, on the Ahoganga Hill.

In 9 all are called Theras: 'Atha kho therānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ mantayamānānaṃ etad ahosi. . . .' They, including Sambhūta, determine to win over Revata, since his help would be most effective (*balavantatarā*). He was wise, sagacious, learned, master of both Dhamma and Vinaya, and endowed with transcendent powers. He ranked high as a Thera, therefore, higher even than Sambhūta. He is called Thera in xii. 2, 3; and in 2, 5 he says of himself: 'Api ca mayā cirapattaṃ arahattaṃ.' However, Revata evades their messengers from place to place, till they catch up with him at Sahajāti. Possibly this causing himself to be much looked for is a mode of emphasizing his great pre-eminence; but an alternate explanation is given in Chap. III.

10. Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī commissions Yasa, calling him āvuso, to visit Revata, and consult him about the indulgences. Yasa addresses Sambhūta, and then Revata correctly as bhante: 'Kappati bhante singiloṇakappo?' (*cf.* xii. 2, 3). Revata knows nothing about the ten, nor even what is meant by the name given in each case: 'Ko so āvuso singiloṇakappo ti?' etc. The two forms of address are maintained.

2. 1. The Vajji bhikkhus also make overtures to Revata, further showing how highly the compiler thought of him. They set out with offerings.

2. One of them (*cf.* xii. 2, 7), the ven. Sālha, deliberating which side is right, the Eastern (*Pācīnakā bhikkhū*)—*i.e.*, the Vajjians—or the Pāṭheyyakas, decides for the latter, and is strengthened therein by a god in a vision. This vision is described very much in the same words as that of Brahmā to the Buddha (*M.V.* i. 5, 4-6). It may well have been inserted with the object of proving the

* On Pāṭheyya, *cf.* below, chap. iv.

importance of Sālha as a Thera, and his right to rank among the other Theras (2, 7) and be addressed by Revata as 'bhante.' It is just possible that the title of bhante, used in M.V. i. 5, 6, by Brahmā to the Buddha (and accordingly by the anonymous god to Sālha: 'Tena hi bhante Sālha yathādhammo tathā tiṭṭhāhi'), may have suggested reproducing M.V. i. 5, 4-6, here.

3. The Vajji bhikkhus present their offerings to 'bhante' Revata—'Paṭigaṇhātu bhante thero . . . '—which are declined: 'Alaṇ āvuso . . . ti na icchi paṭiggahetuṇ . . . ' They turn to Uttara, Revata's famulus, a bhikkhu of twenty years' standing (*vīsativasso*)—i.e., of about forty years of age or more (*c.f.* Pāc. 65, 1, Vin. iv., p. 180; and M.V. i. 49). It is a striking feature that the compiler should have alluded to this date in the case of Uttara. The more numerous the *dramatis personæ*, the more complicated becomes their mutual precedence. To give bases for the terms he uses, the compiler now begins stating their age. Uttara is of an age to treat the Vajji delegates as equals, and accordingly he calls them āvuso: 'Alaṇ āvuso . . . ti na icchi paṭiggahetuṇ.' They also, in persuading him, by analogy with the Buddha and Ānanda's procedure, call him āvuso: 'Manussā kho, āvuso Uttara, Bhagavato sāmaṇakaṇ parikkhāraṇ upanāmenti . . . ' Uttara, in taking one robe, engages himself to present their case to Revata, whom, of course, he calls bhante: 'Ettakaṇ bhante thero sanghamajjhe vadetu.'

4. Now comes the first sitting, Revata, preceding Sambhūta, is President, and of course addresses the Thera Council as āvuso: 'Suṇātu me āvuso Sangho!' all being of inferior standing to himself. On his motion, the company of Theras go to decide the matter where the dispute arose—to Vesālī—so that their decision shall be acknowledged by the instigators. There was then dwelling at Vesālī the oldest Buddhist Thera on earth (*pathavyā sanghathero*), by name Sabbakāmī. He had been ordained 120 years previously (*vīsatiṇvassasatiko*

upasampadāya), and had been a pupil (saddhi-vihāriko) of Ānanda. To consult an ancient of at least 140 years old was, no doubt, a very curious device, but it is not surprising to anyone who can see through this whole chapter. It has to be shown how Revata, theratara than all those previously named, and therefore called bhante by every one else, has himself to stoop before one yet higher. The progression leads quite naturally to one of so extreme a seniority as Sabbakāmī. (As residing at Vesālī he belongs—in xii. 2, 7—to the Western bhikkhus.) Revata agrees with Sambhūta Saṇavāsī, who is somewhat his inferior, that they shall both call on Sabbakāmī, to consult him privately. Revata calls Sambhūta āvuso: ‘Ahaṇ āvuso yasmiṇ vihāre Sabbakāmī thero viharati taṇ vihāraṇ upaga-cchāmi. . . .’ Sambhūta replies correctly with ‘bhante’: ‘Evaṇ bhante ti kho āyasmā Sambhūto S. āyasmato R. paccassosi.’ Without discerning the underlying object of the chronicle, it would not be very clear why these two go, and go at different hours, to Sabbakāmī. The object is this—that the compiler would not lose the opportunity of bringing either separately into conversation with Sabbakāmī, so that each might show his acquaintance with ‘good form.’

5. The very aged gentleman makes use of an unusual mode of address to Revata—‘bhummi’: ‘Katamena tvaṇ, bhummi, vihārena etarahi bahulaṇ viharasi. . . .’ I cannot explain it. If it is connected with bhūmi (ground), it may possibly mean what creeps on the ground, and so ‘my child.’ Buddhaghosa explains it by piyavacanaṇ etaṇ, and thus Rhys Davids and Oldenberg render it ‘beloved one.’ If the translation is correct, and thus the word be a sort of synonym of āvuso, it fits in with the compiler’s scheme of etiquette. In any case, this variety of address strengthens the probability that questions of form in intercourse were the author’s main concern. Revata replies, ‘by the book,’ with bhante: ‘Mettāvihārena kho ahaṇ bhante etarahi

bahulaṇ viharāmi. . . .’ The subject of their talk is not relevant to our argument.

6. Meanwhile enter Sambhūta, who addresses Sabbakāmi correctly with bhante, and consults him on the controversy. The latter takes the side of the Pāṭheyyakas.

7. The Council now takes place. Revata again presides, but this time, now that a theratara, Sabbakāmi, is present, he addresses the assembly, no longer as āvuso, but as bhante: ‘*Suṇātu me bhante Sangho!*’ He moves that a committee be appointed. This consists of four Pācinakas, including Sabbakāmi and Sāḷha, and four Pāṭheyyakas, including Revata and Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī.

8. Revata, using the correct bhante, asks permission of the committee* to question Sabbakāmi on the Vinaya; the latter, in his turn and using āvuso—‘*Suṇātu me āvuso Sangho!*’—asks permission of the committee to be questioned. Revata then questions him concerning the ten indulgences, whether they are feasible. Sabbakāmi asks, as Revata had done, what each of the ten, as labelled, signifies, deciding in each case in the negative. Both decide, by citing the Vinaya, that every one of the ten indulgences is illegal, the latter questioning with bhante, Sabbakāmi replying with āvuso. In declaring before the committee each question in succession as closed, the latter addresses all as āvuso: ‘*nihaṭaṇ etaṇ āvuso adhikaraṇaṇ. . . .*’ But he bids Revata question him again before the Sangha: ‘*Api ca maṇ tvaṇ āvuso Sanghamajjhe pi imāni dasa vatthūni puccheyyāsi.*’

Thus in the matter of āvuso and bhante, the text punctiliously carries out the Buddha’s injunction in D. xvi. 6, 2. In view of the freer and more frequent use of āvuso in the Sutta texts, which agrees with what the Buddha, on his death-bed, had described as the custom till then, this shows that the compiler of C.V. xi., xii., in his selection of forms of address, conformed to those prescribed by the Buddha. Now, the subject-matter is mainly unimportant,

* Also called Sangho, though, ‘of course, consisting of the eight referees’ only (Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, S.B.E. xx. 408, n. 2).

and only gains some significance as a vehicle for this conformity. And in C.V. xii. the confused and artificial construction only gains coherence when interpreted as compiled for that purpose. In other words, the two *Khandakas* which, from the age of the *Dīpavaṃsa* till to-day, have ranked as chronicles of the Councils, are in reality more or less readings in 'good form' for *bhikkhus* in all events and circumstances.*

Hence the influence of D. xvi. is felt, not only in the separate points adduced at first, but also throughout the scope of the narrative; not only in C.V. xi., but also in xii. The recognition of this gives us the right and the stimulus to determine other more or less radical influences.

III.—FURTHER UNNOTICED PARALLELS BETWEEN *DĪGHANIKĀYA XVI.* AND *CULLAVAGGA XI., XII.*

In *Dīgha* xvi. 6, 1 (ii. 154), the Buddha says to his disciples: 'Yo vo Ānanda mayā Dhammo ca Vinayo

* It may be asked how far the other modes of address prescribed by the Buddha prevailed? With regard to *āyasmā*, this is found in all cases, and it may be used as a vocative in direct speech to a second person, or, analogous to *bhavaṇ*, as nominative, used with the verb in the third person (and in all cases without the verb) to denote a second person. It is not clear which use Buddha had in mind in prescribing it; hence I could not bring *āyasmā* into my demonstration. Besides, the application of the term is far too comprehensive to make it possible to determine clearly what use the Buddha desired should be made of it. In the third person it can be applied to any and every kind of *bhikkhu*, and even to persons outside the Order, by way of epithet. Hence even the author of the '*M. Parinibbāna-S.*' made no attempt to use it in any definite manner as prescribed. And the compiler of C.V. xi., and xii. seems to have followed him, since the one instance to which the rule seems to apply is too isolated, viz.: (xi. 10), where Ānanda says to the Theras: '*Api cāyasmantānaṃ saddhāya desemi taṃ dukkaṭaṃ.*' 'Nevertheless, out of my faith in the Venerable (Gentlemen) I confess that as a fault.'

The addressing mostly of inferiors by name only was already in the Buddha's time, or at least at the time of the genesis of the oldest texts, so constantly in use, that the compiler of C.V. xi., xii. probably held any special illustration of the usage not worth while.

ca desito paññatto so vo mam' accayena Satthā.' 'The truths and the rules which I have declared to you, Ānanda, let them, after I am gone, be the Teacher to you.'

In xvi. 4, 8 (ii. 124) his admonition is, in its idea, the same, but set forth in greater detail: 'Idha bhikkhave bhikkhu evaṃ vadeyya: "Sammukhā me taṃ āvuso Bhagavato suttaṃ sammukhā paṭiggahitaṃ, ayaṃ Dhammo ayaṃ Vinayo idaṃ Satthu sāsanaṃ 'ti, tassa bhikkhave bhikkhuno bhāsitaṃ n'eva abhinanditabbaṃ na paṭikkositabbaṃ. Abhinanditvā appaṭikkositvā tāni padavyañjanāni sādhukaṃ uggahetvā Sutte otāretabbāni Vinaye sandassetabbāni. Tāni ce Sutte otariyamānāni Vinaye sandassiyamānāni na c'eva Sutte otaranti na Vinaye sandissanti niṭṭham ettha gantabbaṃ: 'Addhā idaṃ na c'eva tassa Bhagavato vacanaṃ, imassa ca bhikkhuno dugghaṭitaṃ' ti, iti h' etaṃ bhikkhave chaḍḍeyyātha. Tāni ce Sutte otariyamānāni Vinaye sandassiyamānāni Sutte c'eva otaranti Vinaye ca sandissanti, niṭṭham ettha gantabbaṃ: 'Addhā idaṃ tassa Bhagavato vacanaṃ imassa ca bhikkhuno suggahitaṃ' ti.

'If, brethren, a brother should say thus: "From the mouth of the Exalted One himself have I heard, from his own mouth have I received it; this is the truth, this is the law, this is the teaching of the Master," ye shall receive his word without praise, nor treat it with scorn. Without praise and without scorn every word and syllable should be carefully understood, and then put beside the Sutta, and compared with the rules of the Order. If, when so compared, they do not harmonize with the Sutta, and do not fit in with the rules of the Order, then you may come to the conclusion, "Verily, this is not the word of the Exalted One, and has been wrongly grasped by that brother." Therefore, brethren, you should reject it. But if they harmonize with the Sutta, and fit in with the rules of the Order, then you may conclude: "Verily, this is the word of the Exalted One, and has been well grasped by that brother."'

* Now, the scanty kernel of C.V. xii. is a report of precisely such a testing of assertions by the Vinaya (rules of the

Order) as the Buddha here prescribes.* When the committee, sitting in the Sand Park at Vesālī, is making its final pronouncements, Revata asks Sabbakāmī (C.V. xii. 2, 8), in connexion with the ten indulgences demanded by the Vajji Bhikkhus, 'Kappati bhante singiloṇakappo?' and then, in other words, 'Kappati bhante singinā loṇaṇ parihaṛitūṇ yaṭṭha aloṇakaṇ bhavissati tattha paribhuñjissāmīti?' 'Is it allowable, lord, to carry about salt in a horn with the intention of enjoying it when there is no salt?' This being negatived, he asks, 'Kattha patikkhittan ti?' 'Where has it been forbidden?' Sabbakāmī answers, 'In Sāvattihī, in the Sutta-Vibhanga.' And there certainly is, in the Sutta-Vibhanga, Pācittiya 38 (Vin. iv. 87), the prohibition of storing foods and condiments.† Similarly, against each one of the ten theses a passage from the Vinaya is brought forward, constituting, for the most part, fair refutations. It does not matter whether they fit exactly, without exception; it is only required that the compiler thought them suitable for comparison and refutation.

Is it possible to doubt, in view of the many coincidences pointed out above between Dīgha xvi. and C.V. xi., xii., that this is not the result of accident, but that C.V. xii. depends, as literature, on Dīgha xvi.? What is right in C.V. xii. will be approved by xi., which in so many points companions it. Even if, in this case, the matter is not so clear in xi. as in xii.,‡ the degree of certainty of connexion is levelled up by the greater number of parallels to D. xvi. in C.V. xi., as compared with xii.

* Purāṇa's affirmation (C.V. xi. 11) may, perhaps, be considered as an attempt to substantiate this passage from the D.: 'Api ca yaṭṭeva mayā Bhagavato sammukhā sutaṇ . . . tath' evāhaṇ dhāressāmīti.' But he gives no instance of testing.

† Pointed out by Oldenberg (Vin. ii. 306).

‡ Because here we do not get assertions which are tested by the texts, but simply the agreement concerning the latter; but the case is different. It would have been supererogatory, first to assert that a given text belonged to the Canon, then to confirm it as such forthwith.

Hence it is my belief that C.V. xi. is also an attempt to carry out the admonition given in D. xvi. 4, 8; xi. is an attempt from the positive; xii. an attempt from the negative side; xii. is devoted to the refutation of what was wrong; xi. to the acknowledgment of what was right. The sound doctrine is also elicited by question and answer, and established by bringing forward, as from a register, the external circumstances at the time the rule was made. These statements fit exactly what we find in our versions of the Sutta and Vinaya Piṭakas.

In C.V. xi. 7: *Atha kho āyasmā Mahākassapo āyasmantaṃ Upāliṃ etad avoca: paṭhamañ āvuso Upāli pārājikaṃ kattha paññattan ti. Vesāliyaṃ bhante ti. Kaṃ ārabbhā ti. Sudinnaṃ Kalandaputtaṃ ārabbhā ti. Kismiṃ vatthusmin ti. Methunadhamme ti, etc.*

'Then the ven. M. Kassapa said to the ven. Upāli: "Ven. Upāli, where was the first Pārājika promulgated?" "In Vesālī, sir." "Concerning whom was it spoken?" "Concerning Sudinna, the son of Kalanda." "In regard to what matter?" "Sexual intercourse."'

Cf. Vinaya iii. 15-21.

Next, C.V. xi. 8 with respect to the Dhamma: '*Atha kho āyasmā Mahākassapo āyasmantaṃ Ānandaṃ etad avoca: Brahmajālaṃ āvuso Ānanda kattha bhāsitan ti. Antarā ca bhante Rājagahaṃ antarā ca Nālandaṃ rājagāraṃ Ambalaṭṭhikāyaṃ ti. Kaṃ ārabbhā ti. Suppiyaṃ ca paribbājakaṃ Brahmadaṭṭhaṃ ca māṇavaṃ ti,*' etc.

'And the ven. M. Kassapa said to the ven. Ānanda: "Where, friend Ānanda, was the Brahmajāla (suttanta) spoken?" "On the way, sir between Rājagaha and Nālandā, at the royal resthouse at Ambalaṭṭhikā," "Concerning whom was it spoken?" "Concerning Suppiya, the Wanderer, and the young brahmin, Brahmadaṭṭha."'

See *Dīgha i.*

Both chapters are applications of the Buddha's admonition, stated above: 'The truths and the rules . . . let them, when I am gone, be a Teacher to you.'

There is one more circumstance that I should like to point out. In itself it may be reckoned as unobtrusive and unimportant—likely, indeed, to escape notice altogether. But from the standpoint of the mutual coherency of C.V. xi. and xii. as the positive and negative sides of one and the same subject, it gains a deep significance. This is the parallel between the two verbal forms *dippati* (xi. 1) and *dīpenti* (xii. 1, 1).*

In xi. 1, Mahā Kassapa proposes the first Council in the words: ‘*Handa mayaṇ āvuso dhammañ ca vinayañ ca saṅgāyāma, pure adhammo dippati dhammo paṭibāhiyati, avinayo dippati vinayo paṭibāhiyati. . .*’ ‘Well, then, friends, let us establish a concensus in the Dhamma and the Vinaya, before what is not Dhamma is proclaimed, and what is Dhamma is put aside; before what is not Vinaya is proclaimed, and what is Vinaya is put aside.’ Now, when the account of the second Council (in xii. 1, 1) is introduced with the words: ‘*Tena kho pana samayena vassasataparinibbute bhagavati Vesālīkā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū Vesāliyaṇ dasa vatthūni dīpenti,*’—‘Now at that time, a century after the Parinibbāna of the Exalted One, the Bhikkhus of Vesālī, Vajjians, promulgated at Vesālī ten theses’—it seems to me clear and evident that this latter sentence is spoken with reference to the former sentence, and that the contingency which M. Kassapa tried to exclude is come about. For compare, again, xii. 1, 7: Yasa opposes the Vajjians’ innovations with the precise words used by M. Kassapa: *Imaṇ adhikaraṇaṇ ādiyissāma, pure adhammo dippati dhammo paṭibāhiyati, avinayo dippati vinayo paṭibāhiyati. . .*†

The account of the establishment of Dhamma and Vinaya

* These both depend, of course, ultimately on C.V. vii. 5, 2 (*cf.* A. i. 11 [vol. i. 19]): . . . *adhammaṇ dhammo ti dīpenti . . . avinayaṇ vinayo ti dīpenti. . .*

† This coincidence of phrases has already been pointed out by de la V. Poussin (*Muséon*, 1905, p. 49).

might have finished with C.V. xi. 8, had not two mutually contradictory injunctions of the Buddha respecting rules for the brethren, according to D. xvi., lain before them. That C.V. xi. is occupied with the reconciliation of this discrepancy is a new proof of its dependence on D. xvi.

Mention has been made above of the permission given by the Buddha shortly before his death (in D. xvi. 6, 3) to suspend unimportant precepts. But in D. xvi. 1, 6 (ii. 77) we find another injunction: *Yāvakiṇvaṇ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū appaṇṇattaṇ na paṇṇāpessanti, paṇṇattaṇ na samucchindissanti, yathāpaṇṇattesu sikkhāpadesu samādāya vattissanti, vuddhiyeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnaṇ pāṭikankhā no parihaṇi.*

‘So long, brethren, as the brethren shall ordain nothing that has not been already ordained, and abrogate nothing that has been already ordained, and act in accordance with the precepts according as they have been laid down, so long, brethren, may the brethren be expected, not to decline, but to prosper.’

I believe I shall not be wrong in assuming that the discussions on the slackening in the minor precepts were determined by that twofold injunction of the Buddha. Ānanda, as we saw, knew of the permission given by the Master in this connexion (D. xvi. 6, 3). But Mahā Kassapa finally brings forward the motion in which we distinctly hear the words of D. xvi. 1, 6 reverberating: *Yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṇ, saṅgho appaṇṇattaṇ na paṇṇāpeyya paṇṇattaṇ na samucchindeyya yathāpaṇṇattesu sikkhāpadesu samādāya vatteyya.*

‘If the time seems meet to the Sangha, not ordaining what has not been ordained, and not abrogating what has been ordained, let it take upon itself and act in accordance with the precepts according as they have been laid down.’*

Another probable influence exerted by Dīgha xvi. on the conception and construction of C.V. xi., xii., is this: in

* This would render Minayeffs and de la V. Poussin's conclusions unnecessary.

D. xvi. 1, 6, the sentence quoted above is preceded by this sentence: *Yāvakīvaṇ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū samaggā sannipatissanti samaggā vuṭṭhahissanti samaggā sanghakaraṇīyāni karissanti, vuddhiyeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnaṃ pāṭikaṅkhā no parihāni.*

‘So long, brethren, as the brethren meet together in full and frequent assemblies, so long as they meet together in concord, and rise in concord, and carry out in concord the duties of the Order, so long may the brethren be expected not to decline, but to prosper.’

It seems to me, again, to be not accidental that C.V. xi. and xii. are instances of both possibilities. The assembly in C.V. xi. discharges its duties in concord. The resolutions carried by the assembly in C.V. xii., on the other hand, are directed against a want of unanimity in the assembly, against the divergent theses of an heretical minority, the Vajjian Bhikkhus.

In this connexion we cannot refrain from glancing at another point. Can it, after all that has been said, be still regarded as accidental that, in C.V. xi., xii., the two opposed tendencies in the Order are described, and the Vajjian Bhikkhus made responsible for the tendency that is condemned? And is it accidental if, on the other hand, we find, in *Dīgha* xvi. 1, 4 ff., and 1, 6 ff., two parallel groups of conditions for success laid down, the first of which are the special conditions for the welfare of the Vajjians? *Yāvakīvaṇ ca Ānanda Vajjī samaggā sannipatissanti. . . . Yāvakīvaṇ ca Ānanda Vajjī appaṇṇattaṃ na paṇṇāpessanti, paṇṇattaṃ na samucchindissanti, yathāpaṇṇatte porāṇe Vajjīdhamme samādāya vattissanti. . . .*

With so much incontestable evidence of the relations between *Dīgha* xvi. and C.V. xi., xii., it is quite obvious that the compiler of the latter was only following the inspiration of D. xvi. when he made the Vajjians the scapegoats for disregard of the conditions necessary to the welfare of the Order. And he had no need to tax his brain unduly as to

the particular way in which they were disregarded. He simply varied what he had said in C.V. vii. 4, 1, that the Vajjians, namely, had taken up theses divergent in principle, and held them to be correct Dhamma and Vinaya. This was, it is true, a century earlier, and Devadatta was the seducer; but that is a detail. Only those can boggle at this who are determined from the first to consider these statements as genuine history.

I shall proceed to prove that there is no reason to doubt the identity of the compiler of C.V. xi., xii., and of the rest of the C.V. The natural process of evolution will have been that the compiler, already in vii. 4, 1, supplemented Dīgha xvi. by planning the misdeed of the Vajjians, and in C.V. xii. repeated it. The reason why the innovation of the Vajjians in C.V. xii. is timed at 100 years after the Buddha's death is, even without the assumption of a historical basis, not difficult to understand. The Buddha's prediction concerning the Vajjians lays down that the revolt would not come immediately. But this prediction constitutes a reply to the inquiry made by King Ajātasattu, through his minister Vassakāra, of the Buddha concerning the eventual success of a plot against the Vajjians. The meaning, then, of the reply is, that the plot would at the present not succeed, because the Vajjians were fulfilling the conditions requisite for their welfare (the fact that they were so doing is explicitly established). In other words, the Vajjians were as yet prospering. In D. xvi. 1, 27 (ii. 87) they are still prospering, for they are to be checked by the building, under the superintendence of the Magadhese ministers, Sunidha and Vassakāra, of a fortified town in place of the village at Pāṭali (*Vajjīnaṃ paṭibāhāya*). Hence if the compiler of the C.V. wanted to speak of the Vajjians not fulfilling certain conditions, in other words, of their innovations and altered precepts, he had to place all this in an age after the Buddha's day. 'A hundred years' is a date that for such purposes most readily suggests itself, and it seems pretty clear that it was 'good enough' for him.

But we have to adduce yet another probable influence of

Dīgha xvi. D. xvi. 1, 4—the last above-given quotation—ends thus: ‘Yāvakīvañ ca Ānanda Vajjīnaṃ arahantesu dhammikārakkhāvaranagutti sasaṃvhitā bhavissati, kin ti anāgatā ca arahanto vijitaṃ āgaccheyyunt āgatā ca arahanto vijite phāsuṃ vihareyyunt ti vuddhi yeva. . . .’

‘So, long, Ānanda, as, among the Vajjians, the rightful protection, defence, and support shall be fully provided for the Arahats, so that Arahats from a distance may enter the realm, and the Arahats therein may live at ease, so long. . . .’

Any susceptible author could easily, from this passage, derive the idea that, in depicting the signs of a revolt, it would be fitting to say something about intrigues against an Arahāt, such as would drive him eventually out of the country. It is from this point of view, I think, that we should understand the arbitrary procedure taken in Yasa’s case (C.V. xii. 1, 1 f.), which has been sketched above, and which he finally evaded by his flight through the air.

As to the influence possibly exerted by two or three other passages in the M. Pari. S., I speak with less certainty. D. xvi. 1, 7 (ii. 78) contains the following pronouncements: ‘Yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū na bhassārāmā bhavissanti. . . . Yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū na niddārāmā bhavissanti. . . . Yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū na saṅgaṇikārāmā bhavissanti. . . . vuddhi yeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnaṃ pāṭikankhā no parihāni.’

‘So long, brethren, as the brethren shall not be in the habit of, or be fond of, idle talk ; so long as they shall not be addicted to sloth . . . shall not frequent, or be fond of, or indulge in society . . . so long may the brethren be expected, not to decline, but to prosper.’

In C.V. xii. Revata and Sabbakāmi are shown as belonging to the saintlier side of the Order, whom one may be sure to find striving to realize these conditions of salvation. Is it, then, perhaps with an eye to this passage* that the

* In C.V. itself the flight of Revata is explained in another manner.

compiler (C.V. xii. 2, 7) represents Revata moving that, in order to avoid much 'pointless speaking' (bhassāni), the investigation of the controversy be devolved upon a committee,* makes him, as guest of Sabbakāmi, forego his night's rest (xii. 2, 4), and withdraw himself repeatedly when sought (xii. 1, 9) ?

IV. PARALLELS BETWEEN CULLA-VAGGA XI. AND XII. AND
OTHER CANONICAL WORKS, ESPECIALLY THE VINAYA.

If we now glance over the essentials of the two accounts, which cannot be explained by the influence of Dīgha xvi., we have in the first place to point out once more that C.V. xii. 1, 3, is identical with A. iv. 50 (ii. 53 f.), and C.V. xii. 1, 4, with Saṃy. xlii. 10 (iv. 325 f.). We may, then, eliminate those passages which quite obviously owe their existence to the influence, either of earlier passages in the C.V., or of the Vinaya in general. That, for instance, which we may call the protocol to the motions and resolutions, corresponds word for word to the formula so constantly occurring in the Vinaya, and hence needs no further explanation. Again, the rebuke administered to Ananda, that he had supported the efforts of the Gotamī to be admitted into the Order, refers to matters which are narrated in the C.V. itself (x.), and is hereby sufficiently explained.

On the relation between the phrases *dippati* and *dīpenti* contained in C.V. xi. 1; xii. 1, 1, on C.V. vii. 5, 2 (cf. A. i. 11), the reader should consult above, p. 48. Again, on *khaṇḍaphullaṃ paṭisankharoma* in C.V. xi. 5, as connected with C.V. vi. 5, 2; vi. 17, 1, consult above, p. 35, n.

Chapters xi. and xii., with their contrasted base-ideas, were obviously elaborated under the influence of C.V. vii. 5, 2-3 (= A. x. 35 ff. [v. 73, 74], and cf. Itv. 18, 19) on *sanghabheda* and *sanghasāmaggi*—vii. 5, 2: Saṃ-

* In this case we should have to declare C.V. iv. 14, 19 derived from D. xvi. But that, as will appear presently, we should be able to piece into the general situation.

ghabhedo saṅghabhedo 'ti bhante vuccati. Kittāvataṃ nu kho bhante saṅgho bhinno hotīti. Idh' Ūpālī bhikkhū adhammaṃ dhammo 'ti dīpenti, dhammaṃ adhammo 'ti dīpenti, avinayaṃ vinayo 'ti d., vinayaṃ avinayo 'ti d., abhāsitaṃ alapitaṃ tathāgatenā bhāsitaṃ lapitaṃ tathāgatenā 'ti d., bhāsitaṃ lapitaṃ t. abhāsitaṃ alapitaṃ t. 'ti d., anāciṇṇaṃ t. āciṇṇaṃ t. 'ti d., . . . apaññattaṃ t. paññattaṃ t. 'ti d., paññattaṃ t. apaññattaṃ t. 'ti d., anāpattiṃ āpattīti d., āpattiṃ anāpattīti dīpenti. . . .

3. Sanghasāmaggī sanghasāmaggīti bhante vuccati. Kittāvataṃ nu kho bhante saṅgho samaggo hotīti. Idh' Ūpālī bhikkhū adhammaṃ adhammo 'ti dīpenti dhammaṃ dhammo ti dīpenti, etc., as in § 2.

In C.V. xi. and in C.V. xii., what we note in the positive party is all borne along by the current of C.V. vii. 5, 3; and everything schismatic in C.V. xii. by the current of vii. 5, 2. This is proved, not only by the identity of the base-ideas, but also by manifold coincidences of phraseology. The C.V. relates not only the settlement as a whole of Dhamma as Dhamma and of Vinaya as Vinaya, but also the instructions (paññattaṃ) of the Buddha in this or that place, what is āpatti and anāpatti (xi. 7), as well as what the Buddha preached (bhāsitaṃ, xi. 8).

In xii. Yasa takes his stand, with fastidious correctness, on the Vinaya, when he, *e.g.*, asks for an escort on his expedition to apologize to the Vajjians (see above, p. 38, and below, p. 55), expressly referring to the Buddha: Bhagavatā āvuso paññattaṃ. Again, before the laity, he emphasizes his adherence to Dhamma and Vinaya with the words (vii. 5, 3): 'Yo 'haṃ adhammaṃ adhammo 'ti vadāmi, dhammaṃ dhammo ti vadāmi, avinayaṃ avinayo 'ti vadāmi, vinayaṃ vinayo 'ti vadāmi' (xii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). In xii. 1, 5, he refers the bhikkhus to Buddha's instructions respecting gold and silver observed by himself: 'Bhagavā . . .

jātarūparajataṃ paṭikkhipi sikkhāpadañ ca paññāpesi.'

On the other hand, the theses put forward by the Vajjiputtakas are adhamma, avinaya, apaññatta, called in xii. 2, 8, by the synonymous terms uddhamma ubbinaya, apagatasatthusāsana. When the Vajjiputtakas act in accordance with their theses, this is anāciṇṇaṃ Tathāgatenā; the āciṇṇakappa is, moreover, one of the liberties they take, and they punish Yasa, who opposes them in the name of Dhamma and Vinaya, as if his conduct, which is anāpatti, were āpatti (xii. 1, 2, 7).

Their finding of a sentence (paṭisāraṇiyakamma) against Yasa (xii. 1, 2) is distinctly based on i. 20. As if to leave no doubt about it, Yasa is accused, in the words taken from i. 20, akkosati paribhāsati, of an offence which, in his case, is quite out of the question. Yasa thereupon, as has been related, demands the escort of a colleague, which the Buddha had prescribed in the case of one charged with paṭisāraṇiyakamma. This injunction is in C.V. i. 22.

C.V. xii. 1, 8: Atha kho saṭṭhimattā Pāṭheyyakā bhikkhū sabbe ārañṇakā sabbe piṇḍapātikā sabbe paṇsukūlikā sabbe tecīvarikā, belongs partly to M.V. vii. 1, 1, : Tena kho pana samayena tiṇṣamattā Pāṭheyyakā bhikkhū sabbe ārañṇakā sabbe piṇḍapātikā sabbe paṇsukūlikā sabbe tecīvarikā, partly to Saṃy. xv. 13, 2: Atha kho tiṇṣamattā Paveyyakā (S. 1-3 Pāṭheyyakā) bhikkhū sabbe ārañṇakā sabbe p° s° pa° s° t°.

C.V. xii. 2, 2: A god inspiring Sālha to persevere may derive from the Buddha's being incited by Brahmā, M.V. i. 5, 4-6.

The connexion between C.V. xii. 2, 4: Sace mayaṃ imaṃ adhikaraṇaṃ idha vūpasameyyāma siyāpi mūlādāyakā bhikkhū punakammāya ukkoṭeyyaṃ, and Pācittiya 63 has already been pointed out by de la V. Poussin, *Muséon*, 1905, p. 266, n. 1.

On the parallel between the end of xii. 2, 4, and C.V. vi. 13, 1, see note on p. 80.

The story of the appointment of a committee in C.V. xii. 2, 7, rests on C.V. iv. 14, 19, which is reproduced verbatim.* The sentences are given side by side.

C.V. xii.

Tasmiṃ kho pana ad-
hikaraṇe vinicchiya-
māne anaggāni c'eva
bhassāni jāyanti na
c'ekassa bhāsitassa
attho viññāyati.

Atha kho āyasmā Re-
vato sanghaṃ ṇāpesi:
suṇātu me bhante
sangho, amhākaṃ ima-
smiṃ adhikaraṇe vini-
cchiyamāne anaggāni
c'eva bhassāni jāyanti
na c'ekassa bhāsitassa
attho viññāyati, yadi
sanghassa pattakallaṃ,
sangho cattāro Pāci-
nake bhikkhū cattāro
Pāṭheyyake bhikkhū
sammanneyya ubbāhi-
kāya imaṃ adhikara-
ṇaṃ vūpasametug.

C.V. iv.

Tehi ce bhikkhave
bhikkhūhi tasmiṃ ad-
hikaraṇe vinicchiya-
māne anaggāni c'eva
bhassāni jāyanti na
c'ekassa bhāsitassa
attho viññāyati.

Yācitvā vyattena
bhikkhunā paṭibalena
sangho ṇāpetabbo:
suṇātu me bhante
sangho, amhākaṃ ima-
smiṃ adhikaraṇe vini-
cchiyamāne anaggāni
c'eva bhassāni jāyanti
na c'ekassa bhāsitassa
attho viññāyati, yadi
sanghassa pattakallaṃ
sangho itthannāmañ ca
itthannāmañ. ca bhi-
kkhuṃ sammanneyya
ubbāhikāya imaṃ ad-
hikaraṇaṃ vūpasa-
metug.

The following similarities are less clearly made out.

The second rebuke levelled against Ānanda in C.V. xi. 10 is: Idam pi te āvuso Ānanda dukkaṭaṃ yaṃ tvaṃ bhagavato vassikasāṭikaṃ akkamitvā sibbesi. 'This also, friend Ānanda, was ill done by thee, in that thou trodest upon the Exalted One's rainy-season

* Already pointed out by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (S.B.E. xx. 407, n. 1).

garment to sew it' (or, 'that thou trodest upon . . . garment and then sewedst it—i.e., because it had thereby become torn'?). There is in the Canon no mention of any episode with which this rebuke can be referred without objection. But it is conceivable that the compiler's imagination may have been guided by dim memories of phrases in earlier passages of the Vinaya.* Now, in C.V. v. 11 the subject turns on the sewing of bhikkhus' robes (cīvaraṇ sībḍenti); then on a frame in which the garment is stretched while it is sewn (kaṭhina; v. 11, 3: anujānāmi bhikkhave kaṭhinaṇ kaṭhinarajjuṇ tattha tattha obandhitvā cīvaraṇ sībḍetuṇ); then on the treading upon this frame (with the garment stretched in it?). C.V. v. 11, 4: Tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū adhotēhi pādehi kaṭhinaṇ akkamanti; and the Buddha declares this to be an offence: Yo akkameyya āpatti dukkaṭassa. I believe that this dukkaṭa was the bridge by which the Council chronicler, in counting up Ānanda's dukkaṭas, got into this chapter of the C.V. And the reason why, among all the many dukkaṭas treated of in the Vinaya, he should light on this one, may well have been the fact that Ānanda is repeatedly involved in affairs concerning garments. More of this presently. Perhaps, too, a dim memory of C.V. v. 21 unconsciously played its part. Ānanda is there mentioned in connexion with a proceeding which results in eliciting this injunction from the Buddha: Na bhikkhave celapattikā akkamitabbā. Yo akkameyya āpatti dukkaṭassa.

C.V. xi. 11 and 13 *f.* still remain to be connected with other passages. Purāṇa comes with 500 bhikkhus from the southern hills to Rājagaha, and expresses his esteem for the work achieved by the Council. Ānanda, commissioned to impose the penalty on Channa, at Kosambī (*cf.* above, p. 37), receives an offering of 500 robes† in the park of

* I have pointed out analogous occurrences in other Pali books (W.Z.K.M. xx., xxi.), and could produce other instances

† Called both *uttarāsanga* and *cīvara*.

King Udena from the Court ladies, and explains to the indignant monarch* that he will divide them among the bhikkhus escorting him; that out of the robes when worn out bed-spreads will be made, then cushion covers, then carpets, then towels for feet-ablution, then dusters; that finally, torn into shreds and stiffened with mud, they will be made into flooring.

Now it will be admitted that in all this, beyond Purāṇa's opinion, there is no connexion with the Council, and that, therefore, a discussion on the originals of these passages has little bearing upon its probability. Notwithstanding this, I will try to explain their literary *raison d'être*. Should the attempt not be reckoned conclusive in every detail, this will not cut us off from the aim of our inquiry. It will, anyway, not be an utter failure.

The Theras had decided that Ānanda should carry out the brahmadāṇḍa, or higher penalty, imposed by the Buddha himself upon Channa (C.V. xi. 12). Two motives seem to have determined their choice, both of a literary character. Ananda had already been represented, in the C.V., as carrying out a penalty. This was against the Licchavi Vaddha; and I take that episode (v. 20) to be the prototype of xi. 16. The verbal agreement in particular phrases removes all doubt:

V. 20, 5.

... etad avoca: San-
ghena te āvuso Vad-
ḍha patto nikkujjito
... atha kho Vaddho
Licchavi ... 'ti tatth'
eva mucchito papato.
Atha kho. . . .

XI. 15.

... etad avoca: San-
ghena te āvuso Channa
brahmadāṇḍo ānāpito
'ti . . . 'ti tatth'eva
mucchito papati. Atha
kho. . . .

The second motive was, I believe, the following: The compiler of C.V. xi. designed it as a crowning witticism that Ānanda, who had hitherto, by the way in which he

* The King asked Ānanda humorously whether he intended to open a shop.

was addressed, been distinguished as the lowest among the Theras, should finally appear before the overthrown Channa as a gentleman of eminence, to be respectfully addressed as *bhante*. For this purpose Ānanda had to come on as leader of the deputation. But he would not take his escort from the Theras at Rājagaha, in whose presence he would have been dwarfed. He needed a troop of ordinary *bhikkhus*, in no way distinguished. Only the 500 Theras were in Rājagaha at the time (*cf.* xi. 4). The escort Ānanda was bound to have, by the statue of *brahmadāṇḍa*, as defined by the Buddha. As defined in C.V. xi., Ānanda needed one to defend him against the violence of Channa. Where should the escort be found? From somewhere in the neighbourhood, of course. Now, the Southern Mountain (*Dakkhiṇāgiri*) was known as a centre for *bhikkhus*, not very far from Rājagaha (*cf.* *Mahāvagga* i. 53): 1. *Tena kho pana samayena bhagavā tatth'eva Rājagahe vassaṇ vasi. . . .* 2. *Atha kho bhagavā āyasmantaṇ Ānandaṇ āmantesi: . . . icchat' āvuso bhagavā Dakkhiṇāgiriṇ cārikaṇ pak-kamituṇ; viii. 12, 1: Atha kho bhagavā Rājagahe yathābhirantaṇ viharitvā yena Dakkhiṇāgiri tena cārikaṇ pakkāmi; Saṃy. xvi. 11, 4: Atha kho āyasmā Ānando Dakkhiṇāgirismiṇ yathābhirantaṇ cārikaṇ caritvā yena Rājagahaṇ Veluvanaṇ . . . tenupasaṅkami* (see also S.B.E. xvii., p. 207, *n.* 2). Hence the compiler makes the troop appear from thence.

Now, in one of the passages where the *Dakkhiṇāgiri* occurs, M.V. viii. 12, 1, the subject turns on *bhikkhus'* garments, which Ānanda is to provide, as we find him doing: *Atha kho bhagavā Dakkhiṇāgirismiṇ yathābhirantaṇ viharitvā punad eva Rājagaṇ paccāgacchi. Atha kho āyasmā Ānando sambahulānaṇ bhikkhūnaṇ cīvarāni saṇvida-hitvā yena bhagavā ten' upasaṅkami. . . .*

Does not the thought obtrude itself that the compiler of the episode in C.V. xi. 13, 14, had it suggested to him by

M.V. viii. 12, especially if, as I believe, he simply copied what he had himself written? To complete the details of the same he would have to draw suggestions from the following chapters in the M.V., where there is a series of particulars concerning bhikkhus' clothing: In M.V. viii. 13, 6, the Buddha proscribes: 'na bhikkhave atirekacīvaraṇaṃ dhāretabbaṃ.' 'Ye shall not, brethren, wear an extra suit of robes.' And in viii. 24, 3: Tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu utukālaṃ eko vasi. Tattha manussā sanghassa demā ti cīvarāni adaṃsu. Atha kho tassa bhikkhuno etad ahoṣi: bhagavatā paññattaṃ catuvaggo pacchimo sangho ti, ahaṃ c'amhi ekako, ime ca manussā sanghassa demā ti cīvarāni adaṃsu . . . bhikkhū bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. Anujānāmi bhikkhave sammukhībhūtena sanghena bhājetuṃ.

'Now at that time a certain bhikkhu spent the rest of the year (besides the rainy season) alone.* The people then gave him robes, saying: "We give them to the Sangha." Then that bhikkhu thought: "It has been laid down by the Blessed One that the lowest number which can constitute a Sangha is four. Now, I am by myself, and these people have given the robes, saying: . . ." The bhikkhus told the matter to the Exalted One. "I prescribe, O bhikkhus, that you are to divide such robes with the Sangha (whether large or small in number) that may be present there."'

Not all the details fit in with my hypothesis, but that the two cases are related is inexpugnable; and that suffices to make the possibility of the one suggesting the other plausible. It may be said that C.V. xi. should not merely repeat and apply, but should form a complement on several points.

But that a literary reminiscence of this sort has really been efficient is rendered probable by another aperçu. In C.V. xii. 2, 3, the compiler stumbles once more against Ananda's rôle of clothes-receiver, and, in contrast to xi. 13 f., places this episode in the Buddha's lifetime. I refer to the

* Cf. Buddhaghosa, *apud* S.B.E. xvii. 236, n. 1.

attempt made by the Vajjian bhikkhus to bribe Revata and his attendant Uttara by presents of robes, etc. When both have declined to receive any with the words, 'I possess the triple garment,' they persuade Uttara: 'Manussā kho āvuso Uttara Bhagavato sāmaṇakaṃ parikkhāraṃ upanāmenti . . . no ce Bhagavā paṭigaṇhāti āyasmato Ānandassa upanāmenti paṭigaṇhātu bhante thero. . . .

'People used to offer such requisites to the Exalted One. . . . If he did not receive them, they used to offer them to the ven. Ānanda, saying, "Let the Pater Ānanda receive these requisites."'

If in chronicles of events purporting to be 100 years apart one and the same theme appears, it is not too bold an assumption that this arose, not from the event repeating itself, but either in the mind of the compiler, or on literary grounds. And besides the passages in M.V., it is possible that the memory of some organization for the reception of robes (cīvarapaṭiggāhaka), as in C.V. vi. 21, 2, may have been a factor. We cannot overlook the remark by King Udena: 'Kathaṃ hi nāma samaṇo Ānando tāva bahuj cīvaraṃ paṭiggahessati?'

Some details of this episode may well have been due to the influence of other passages in the Vinaya, such as the mention of uttarattharaṇas, bhummattharaṇas, and pādapuñchanīs, to that of Pāc. xiv. 2 (Vin. iv. 40); or that of uttarattharaṇa's, bhummattharaṇa's, and bhisicchavi's to that of Niss. vi. 2 (Vin. iii. 212); and tā . . . bhummattharaṇaṃ karissāma and tāni . . . pādapuñchaniyo karissāma cf. C.V. vi. 14: . . . 'tūlikaṃ vijatetvā bimbohanaṃ kātuṃ, avasesaṃ bhummattharaṇaṃ kātuṃ.' 'I allow you, O bhikkhus, to comb out the cotton of the mattresses, and make pillows of it, and to use all the rest as floor-covering.' Again, vi. 19: colakaṃ uppannaṃ hoti. 'Anujānāmi bhikkhave pādapuñchaniṃ kātuṃ.' Now at that time the Sangha had received . . . a colaka cloth . . . 'I allow you, O bhikkhus, to make foot-towels of them.'

Or, again, with *cikkhallena madditvā* cf. *cikkhallaṃ madditvā*, C.V. vi. 5, 1, and *Pārājika* ii. 1, 1 (Vin. iii. 41).*

It is, perhaps, no accident that, in C.V. vi. 5, 1, a tailor busies himself over this clay-preparation, since we know, from xi. 14, that, when mixed with shreds of stuff, the mortar gained in stiffness. Thus one passage dovetails with another, and the literary connexion becomes ever more probable through such details.

This clothes story is placed at Kosambī because the Ghositārāma, in which Channa dwelt, was near Kosambī. And Channa dwells there, because he does so in C.V. i. 25, 1: 'Tena samayena Buddho Bhagavā Kosambiyaṃ viharati Ghositārāme. Tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Channo āpattiṃ āpajjitvā . . .' Whoever is disposed to regard the Culla-vagga as history has some reason to wonder at the persistence with which Channa resides so long in that same park. Once these matters and personal touches are looked upon as constant literary types and artifices, there remains no room for wonder. Again, the appearance of the 500 Court ladies of King Udena of Kosambī is nothing surprising. Udāna vii. 10 shows that the Ghositārāma, King Udena, and his 500 wives are linked by a strong association of ideas: *Ekaṃ samayaṃ bhagavā Kosambiyaṃ viharati Ghositārāme. Tena kho pana samayena rañño Udenassa uyyānagatassa antepuraṃ daḍḍhaṃ hoti, paṇca itthisatāni kālaṅkatāni honti.*

It remains only to consider the two central elements of either chapter in respect of their descent—the account of what was transacted at the two Councils. Do they, too, betray literary motives? The reply must be, Yes.

The following is a translation of the passage describing the first Council:

* Cf. also C.V. viii. 8, 2: 'Yo pacchā jantāgharā nikkhamati, sace jantāgharaṃ cikkhallaṃ hoti, dhovitabbaṃ': —'Whoso comes last out of the bathroom is to wash it out, if it be dirty (with lime).'

xi. 7: . . . The ven. Mahā Kassapa then said to the ven. Upāli: 'Friend Upāli, where was the first Pārājika promulgated?' 'In Vesālī, sir.' 'Concerning whom?' 'Concerning Sudinna, the son of Kalanda.' 'In regard to what matter?' 'In regard to sexual intercourse.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Upāli as to the matter, as to the occasion, as to the individual concerned, as to the rule, as to its supplement, as to who would be guilty, and as to who would be innocent of the first Pārājika. 'Again, Friend Upāli, where was the second Pārājika promulgated?' 'At Rājagaha, sir.' 'Concerning whom was it spoken?' 'Concerning Dhaniya, the potter's son.' 'In regard to what matter?' 'The taking of what had not been given.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Upāli as to the matter . . . of the second Pārājika. 'Again, friend Upāli, where was the third Pārājika promulgated?' 'At Vesālī, sir.' 'Concerning whom was it spoken?' 'Concerning different bhikkhus.' 'In regard to what matter?' 'In regard to (the murder of) human beings.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Upāli as to [all the particulars, as before], of the third Pārājika. 'Again, friend, where was the fourth Pārājika promulgated?' 'At Vesālī, sir.' 'Concerning whom was it spoken?' 'Concerning the bhikkhus dwelling on the banks of the Vaggumudā River.' 'In regard to what matter?' 'In regard to superhuman conditions.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Upāli as to [all the particulars, as before] of the fourth Pārājika. And in like manner did he question him through both the Vinayas, and as he was successively asked, so did Upāli make reply.

8 . . . And the ven. M. Kassapa said to the ven. Ānanda: 'Where, friend Ānanda, was the Brahmajāla spoken?' 'Between Rājagaha, sir, and Nālandā, at the royal resthouse at Ambalatthikā.' 'Concerning whom was it spoken?' 'Suppiya, the wandering recluse, and the young Brahmin, Brahmadaṭṭa.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Ānanda as to the occasion of the Brahmajāla, and as to the individuals concerning whom it was spoken. 'And, again, friend Ānanda, where was the Sāmaññaphala spoken?' 'At Rājagaha, sir, in Jīvaka's mango-grove.' 'In whose presence?' 'In the presence of Ajātasattu, the son of the Vedehi.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Ānanda as to the occasion of the Sāmaññaphala, and as to the individuals concerned. In like manner did he question him concerning the five Nikāyas, and as he was asked, did Ānanda make reply.

All the questions and answers referring explicitly to specific Pārājika statutes agree exactly with those which we find in the Pārājika Book, Vinaya, vol. iii. This gives us, strictly reckoned, a guarantee for the existence, at the time of the compilation of C.V. xi., of only the four first

Pārājikas out of the whole Vinaya. And even then it is only a guarantee that their skeletons existed. Nevertheless, it may be ungrudgingly admitted that if the questions and answers in C.V. xi. had all been given *in extenso* they would probably have revealed the contents of both Vinayas—that for bhikkhus, and that for bhikkhunīs.* But however much we may concede after this sort, there is nothing to be got out of C.V. xi. as a chronicle beyond what is always given in the fact of its existence; nothing that tells us anything positive over and above its relations with other documents. The very existence of C.V. xi., as a chapter at the end of the Culla-Vagga, Book IV. of the Vinaya,† establishes the fact that, when this chapter was compiled, the contents of the rest of the Vinaya books had already been compiled, no matter whether by the same, or by a different author. All that we need for the alleged revision of the Vinaya in C.V. xi. 7 is simply to assume a literary basis. And this suffices equally for the allusion to ‘Four Pārājikas,’ to ‘Thirteen Sanghādisesas,’ etc., in xi. 9. Here, too, we get along quite well without requiring to assume a historical fact—the fact, namely, of any Council to establish the text really having taken place. We may, indeed, go so far as to say that to come to a conclusion concerning form and diction of the texts, and to gain any feeling of certainty respecting the age and the genuineness of the texts as handed down to us, the assumption of any historical fact—the assumption that a revision of a register of contents actually took place—is of no importance whatever.

The assertions in xi. 8 as to the maintenance of the Dhamma are in precisely the same position. Taken strictly, only the first two Suttantas of the Dīgha Nikāya are catechetically determined, and these only as in a

* See, *e.g.*, Oldenberg, Z.D.M.G., 52, p. 618.

† The text is not preserved in the order indicated by its subject-matter, for it does not put, as it ought, the two volumes of the Sutta Vibhanga before the Mahā-Vagga and Culla-Vagga. Cf. also Oldenberg, Z.D.M.G., 52, p. 629.

register, with the Nikāya as we have it. But it does not follow that the whole of the Nikāya was present to the mind of the compiler. Nevertheless, from his ample exploitation of the Mahā Parinibbāna-Suttanta, a text taken from the middle of the Nikāya, we may credit his affirmation of the existence of 'the Dhamma' so far at least as the Dīgha-Nikāya is concerned. Further than this, as we shall presently see, blind confidence cannot take us. We must, it is true, go so far as to believe that in his time—and when that was we do not know*—there was known to be a division of the Dhamma into Five Nikāyas, and that there were other texts besides the Dīgha. He mentions Five Nikāyas, and we can believe him the more readily, in that relatively early epigraphical evidence testifies to their existence.† But just what is of most importance we do not learn, and that is, which texts, and of what form, were those called the Five Nikāyas? Of how little use such a mere framework title as this really is, we may see, for example, in the allusions to 'Vinaya,' 'Dhamma,' 'Sutta,' occurring in the very earliest texts of the Canon, and certainly not implicating all the contents as known to us. Cf., e.g., the above-given quotation from Dīgha xvi. 4, 8 (ii. 124). And how could the author of C.V., as not identified with the author of the last two chapters, have known a five-fold Nikāya which includes the Jātaka Book, when the Jātaka Book itself refers to the Culla-Vagga? In any case, however, the chronicler of C.V. xi. could perfectly well allude to the Dhamma and Five Nikāyas in virtue of his literary knowledge of them, whatever the contents as known to him may have been. But to make this possible, it is not necessary to assume that a revision and settlement of these texts did actually take place.

To come to the innovations, for the sake of which the second Council takes place, these are subsumed by the compiler of C.V. xii. (2, 8) himself, with explicit reference,

* Also, e.g., according to Kern's 'Manual of Ind. Buddhism,' p. 102, this was relatively late.

† Cf. also Oldenberg, Z.D.M.G., 52, p. 676.

under the rules of the 'Sutta-vibhanga,' and without naming the book, but with distinct particularization, under cases occurring in the Mahā-Vagga.* Here, then, again the possibility of a literary basis is beyond all doubt.

V. ON THE LITERARY DEPENDENCE OF CULLA-VAGGA XI. AND XII.

The question of literary borrowing being admitted, it may be possibly asked whether the indebtedness is not on the other side? Does Dīgha xvi. refer to C.V. xi., xii.? So very little is known of the chronology of the Pali Canon that, considered by itself, the question is not less reasonable than the assumption of the inverse case. There is this, moreover, to support it, that the M. Parinibbāna-Suttanta does not impress one as an original work. The abrupt changes of subject, the numerical schemata,† recalling strongly the Anguttara-Nikāya and other features, are by no means a guarantee for the absolute authority of the work.‡ The Dīgha-Nikāya, nevertheless, is, if not the oldest, at least one of the oldest parts of the Canon. And of it the M. Parinibbāna-Suttanta is older than C.V. xi. xii. and has been the basis of both chapters. This is demonstrable by a comparison of the coinciding passages.

On the assumption that the Dīgha is the relatively original work, we easily understand why, in C.V. xi. 1, Subhadda's words, mentioned by Mahā-Kassapa, are transposed from their order in the Dīgha, by the reverse assumption it is less intelligible.

If the mutually conflicting injunctions of the Buddha concerning the treatment of precepts after his death (D. xvi. 1, 6, and 6, 3) had been originally related in C.V. xi. 9, they would not, in the Dīgha, have been stated in two separate passages, or rather, they would not have been stated without being mutually adjusted. The story, told

* Verified by Oldenberg himself in C.V. *loc. cit.*, which see.

† 1, 5 ff.; 1, 23 f.; 2, 2; 3, 13 ff.; 3, 21 ff.; 3, 24 ff.; 3, 33 ff.; 4, 2; 4, 7; 5, 8; 5, 12; 5, 16; 5, 18.

‡ Cf. also Introductory above, p. 3, 4.

in very general terms (D. xvi. 5, 20 ff.), of the visiting the dying Buddha by both sexes could not well have been elaborated out of the rebuke levelled at Ānanda (C.V. xi. 10) for his admission of women to the death-bed. On the other hand, a jealous monkish disposition might very well have found ground for a rebuff in the pre-existing story.

Again, had the string of rebukes uttered against Ānanda been the earlier compilation, the occasions for which he was rebuked would scarcely have been scattered about the borrowing compilation.

The application, in C.V. xi., xii., of the rule of etiquette respecting 'friend' and 'sir,' promulgated in D. xvi. 6, 2, is intelligible. But it is very questionable whether the compiler of Dīgha xvi., viewed as a later work, would, with all the complicated machinery of intitulation in C.V. xii., have stated the original injunction of the dying Buddha in terms so simple.

And so on. It is scarcely necessary to go over all such points to establish my case. Nor has it, indeed, ever been asserted or surmised that the author of D. xvi. made use of C.V. xi. Even if some of the congruent passages leave us vacillating, there are sufficient to establish the fact of literary dependence. A literary dependence! If the parallels hitherto published between the M. Parinibbāna-S. and C.V. xi. (none had been pointed out in xii.) have suffered the hypothesis that they rested on a basis of historical fact to stand,* the quantity of connected passages now brought forward should show that to be an impossibility. How is it intelligible that, out of the multitude of events in real history, by pure accident in two different compilations, each having an entirely different object, one and the same matter should come up so amazingly often, and in exactly similar words?

We saw in our introduction† that even the same work (Dīgha) treats of the same matter in two different places (xvi., xvii.) in a different style. Are we to suppose that two

* For me those few would have upset it.

† Above, p. 3, 4, n. 2.

different works may quite accidentally relate the same things in the same words? This is so incredible that Oldenberg himself, who at bottom upholds the historical theory, has established the derivation of the congruent passages in C.V. xi. from those in the M.P.S. But the settlement of this matter brings us to further important conclusions.

In the first place, to inquire into date, object, and procedure of the first two Councils as something historical is a question quite falsely put.

Our one original source of knowledge respecting them is C.V. xi., xii.* But these chronicles are elaborated out of *Dīgha* xvi. and other canonical passages. Hence the two Councils have for us only a literary existence, and only that, paradoxical as it sounds, because *Dīgha* xvi. exists. To seek a historical background is to make something merely literary into something actually real, and indicates a logical fallacy. To inquire into the date of the first Council is to inquire into a point of time later than the compilation of D. xvi. This *Suttanta* is a text of about 100 printed pages in length. And this text, quite apart from the probability of its being a secondary conglomerate, cannot have been compiled in less than one or two weeks after the Buddha's death, even if the inconceivable be held possible—namely, that the compiler set to work immediately. Hence to ask about the date of this Council is impossible, or at least irrational.

It is no less a catching at soap-bubbles to make out that a Council took place a few weeks after the Buddha's death, than it is to believe that the assumption of such an event is to be refuted on historical grounds. Had there been no pros and cons, both in tradition and in criticism, the matter need not have been held to be sufficiently real to be argued about at all. There is no need to accuse the compiler of C.V. xi. of having led us astray in regard to the date of a first Council. He neither says that what he describes happened in connexion with what happened at or soon

* On the northern Buddhist Councils, see Conclusion.

after the Master's death, nor brings about this misunderstanding by any ambiguities of phraseology. There is no point of time given in C.V. xi. when that may have taken place which we call the First Council. From the outset of the chronicle we are *in mediis rebus* in an assembly of bhikkhus, to whom Mahā-Kassapa is speaking. He tells—using, for the most part, words taken from Dīgha xvi.—of a conversation which he once had (*ekaṇ samayaṇ*), on a journey from Pāvā to Kusinārā, with an Ājīvaka and Subhadda. How long ago this was we do not learn. To assume that it was but weeks ago is unjustifiably arbitrary, and the 'once upon a time' betrays at least so much, that the compiler did not know precisely himself. But if it is contended that this '*ekaṇ samayaṇ*' was the stereotyped way of beginning a Sutta, and adopted from that customary style, then this only amounts to what I said before: that it is a literary idiom which excludes any idea of a definite, especially of a recent, point of time.

So much only is clear—that the compiler of the C.V. puts the event in the lifetime of M. Kassapa, Ānanda, and Upālī. In view, however, of the longevity of saintly personages, such as we meet with in C.V. xii. and repeatedly in the Dipavaṇsa, this does not help us much to a more precise determination of date. And besides, anyone whose imagination is not bound by the historical, is entirely free to choose his own point of time.

But we may put all these possibilities on one side. The only question with which we are really concerned is: Does the Culla-Vagga give a date? Or, at least, does it let us infer a date, or does it not? The reply to this is, No! Herewith we are rid of the whole question as to its credibility. It is to Oldenberg's credit that, many years ago, in spite of other suppositions, he declared the First Council to be fictitious.* If I have here once more pronounced concerning a *res judicata*, I do so because Oldenberg's approximately correct conclusion, being drawn from false premises, needs new data if it is to stand.

* Vinayapīṭaka, vol. i. xxvii., xxxi.

So far as I can see, it would be, for the canonical literature, but a gift of the Danaæ to have proved that it was settled at that 'First Council.' The remark made in C.V. xi. 11 would suffice, in that case, to wipe out the attribute of authenticity. Purāṇa, namely, when invited to approve of the revised Canon, answers: 'Friends, the Dhamma and the Vinaya have, by the consensus of the Theras, been well rehearsed (*susangīto*). Nevertheless I, even in such manner as it has been heard by me, and received by me from the very mouth of the Exalted One, will in that manner bear it in memory.'*

We may confront the chronicle of the 'Second Council' with even greater indifference. This is not only a merely literary construction; it does not even possess any relevant subject-matter. Whether such monkish steam as those ten puerilities was ever let off has little or no importance for the history of Buddhist literature. We do not hear whether, on that occasion, anything was done by way of settling the Canon, except from secondary sources.† That the prior existence of the Vinaya is attested is a fact that did not need the help of C.V. xii. The only point of interest about the chapter is the persuasion, both past and present, of the historical value of its contents,‡ and the conclusion that attaches thereto.§ We must go into the latter.

Oldenberg's keen eye detected the sharp line dividing most of the C.V. (i. to x.) from the last two books. C.V. x. gives an account of the founding of the sisterhood and of rules for the sisters. Books i. to ix. contain the rules for the brethren, a cleavage that is unquestionably made deliberately. But we may by no means conclude that the cleavage between x. and xi. is one between an actual work and its appendices.|| To me it seems fairly obvious that the compiler had a very different dividing line in his eye.

* Cf. already de la V. Poussin, *Muséon*, 1905, p. 250.

† Pointed out by Oldenberg (*e.g.*, 'Vinayapīṭaka,' i, p. xxx. ff.), and Kern's 'Manual,' p. 106.

‡ Oldenberg, *ibid.*, p. xxix.

§ *Ibid.*, p. xxxv. ff.

|| See also Oldenberg, *Z.D.M.G.*, 52, p. 618, n. 1.

Books i. to x. treat of the life of the community during the Buddha's lifetime; xi., xii., of proceedings in the community after his death.* Where else could Book x. have been placed but where it is? And since hereby the only argument against the unity of scheme in the C.V. falls through, and since I can see, in the diction of the two groups of chapters, no support for the theory of a distinct origin, I cannot doubt that i. to x. and xi., xii. are by one and the same author. For it will be admitted by every one that, as a general principle, a work handed down as a unit is to be reckoned as such till its unity is refuted, or till there is good evidence to hold it as suspect.

Oldenberg, it is true, has not contented himself with one reason, but has given two more—reasons which I, too, bring forward separately because they were intended to prove something else.† He is of opinion that C.V. i. to x. must have been in existence some time before xi. was compiled, because the compiler of xi. believes that the whole Vinaya was edited, after the Buddha's death, at the First Council, and also because the first ten books of C.V. do not contain detailed precepts sufficient to quash the ten controversial theses; and yet there would certainly have been no delay in settling such adequate precepts if C.V. i. to x. was compiled at the same time as xii.—that is, after the Council at Vesālī.‡ This explanation suffers through those erroneous premises which I have been attempting in my article to

* Oldenberg, Z.D.M.G., 52, p. 630, 'can scarcely believe' this, because the Suttapiṭaka follows no chronological order. This is true in more ways than his illustrations show. But if some works are not chronologically arranged, it does not follow that others are not. Anyway, the compiler of C.V. has certainly tried here to write chronologically. Besides, it is one thing to relate disconnected events, mixed with philosophical and dogmatic views, and another to bring together precepts for the life of a community, where the system is made to work in a definite period. In the former case chronological treatment is a detail; in the latter it is very important to know whether the statute was created by the Buddha himself, or by bhikkhus after him.

† Vinayapiṭaka i., p. xxxv.

‡ Cf. also Z.D.M.G., 52, p. 630 ff.

confute. It is an error to say that C.V. xi. places the First Council immediately after the Buddha's death. And to assert that the historical nature of certain things ought to have led to their being mentioned, when this historical character is that which has to be proved, or rather, is unprovable, is to reason in a circle.* As to that setting back of the date of compilation of the Vinaya and of C.V. i. to x., the author of xi. sets it not only before the First Council, but even in the Buddha's lifetime. Now, if such claims proved anything, they would show that the antiquity of C.V. i. to x. is really much greater still.† As to the form, however, of these books, with which Oldenberg is, of course, mainly concerned, nothing by such a claim is established regarding their existence at the time of the First Council. And for this reason, that the alleged revision only consists in the rehearsal of a scanty register. Even in the earlier portions of the Vinaya, 'Vinaya' is always assumed as already existing. Moreover, to require of the one C.V. compiler that he should, already in the earlier chapters, have given precepts in detail adequate to meet the controverted matters in xii. would be giving an author prescriptions how to make his books. Possibly, it was a great enjoyment for him to be handling, in C.V. xii., particular cases which did not definitely come under any of the statutes of Books i. to x., ascribed to the Buddha himself. After all, we do not expect a dramatic author to spoil his plot for himself, his readers, his audience, by telling in the first act the events of the last.

We may, indeed, possibly find even in the earlier portions of C.V. and of the Vinaya traces of that influence of Dīgha xvi., to which I have said that we owe the existence of C.V. xi., xii. If so, we should add positive to the nega-

* Cf. also de la V. Poussin, *Muséon*, 1905, p. 302 f.

† Oldenberg, however, himself excludes such a view with the words (Vinaya, i., p. xxxv.): 'No reader of the Vinaya will hesitate to admit that this collection contains not an historical account of what Buddha permitted and forbade, but an account of what was regarded as allowable and forbidden at a certain period long after Buddha's time.'

tive proof of the author of the C.V. being but one person. Now Pārājika i. 7 seems to me to be due to the suggestion in D. xvi. 1, 4 (ii. 73-5). This passage, quoted already on p. 50, holds out to the Vajjians that their welfare depends upon their loyalty to the precepts. Pārājika i. 7 shows how the novices among the Vajjians disregarded the rules of the Order, and how, in consequence, they got into all sorts of trouble: *Tena kho pana samayena sambahulā Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū yāvadattahaṃ bhuñjīsu yāvadattahaṃ supīsu yāvadattahaṃ nhāyīsu . . . methunaṃ dhammaṃ paṭisevīsu. Te aparena samayena ñātivyaśanena pi phutṭhā . . . rogavyāśanena pi phutṭhā āyasmantaṃ Ānandaṃ upasankamitvā evaṃ vādenti: na mayaṃ bhante Ānanda buddhagara-hino na dhammagarahino, . . . attagarahino mayaṃ bhante Ānanda anaññagarahino. Mayaṃ ev' amhā alakkhikā mayaṃ appapuññā, ye mayaṃ evaṃ svākkhāte dhammavinaye pabbajitvā māsakkhimhā yāvajīvaṃ paripuññaṃ parisuddhaṃ brahmacariyaṃ carituṃ.*

At that time many of the Vajjian Bhikkhus at Vesālī ate, slept, and bathed as it pleased each one . . . and permitted themselves sexual intercourse. Thereupon sorrows befell them and those related to them . . . and trouble through sickness. They went to the ven. Ānanda and said to him 'Lord* Ānanda, we make no reproaches to the Buddha, nor to the doctrine . . . we reproach only ourselves, none other. We are miserable sinners, in that, having been induced by a so excellently proclaimed Dhamma and Vinaya to renounce the world, we did not go on to perfection, and throughout our whole life lead the perfect, pure course of holiness.

The alleged opposition of the 'Six' to the recitation of the smaller and minor precepts (*khuddānukkhuddakehi sikkhāpadehi uddiṭṭhehi*), in celebrating the Pātimokkha, may also show literary dependence on D. xvi. 6, 3, although there is no substantial warrant for this. But, on the other hand, it fits equally badly with

* The word 'bhante' itself speaks for Dīgha influences. See above, chap. ii.

the dying Buddha's ordinance in D. xvi. 1, 6,* to assume that the Buddha's prohibition of such opposition, at the end of the cited Pācittiya paragraphs, is original and genuine.

C.V. i. 28: Atha kho sangho Channassa bhikkhuno āpattiyaṃ adassane ukkhepaniyakammaṃ akāsi asambhogaṃ sanghena. so . . . tamhā āvāsā aññaṃ āvāsaṃ agamāsi, tattha bhikkhū n'eva abhivādesuṃ na paccuṭṭhesuṃ . . . na mānesuṃ na pūjesuṃ.

So the Sangha carried out against Channa the Bhikkhu the Ukkhepaniya-kamma, for not acknowledging a fault, to the effect that he should not eat or dwell together with the Sangha. And . . . he went from that residence to another residence. And the Bhikkhus there did no reverence to him . . . and refused him . . . honour and esteem.

This passage seems to rests upon Dīgha xvi. 6, 4 (*cf.* above p. 17).

The forms of address in the Vinaya Pit show Dīgha influence, as I have pointed out above, pp. 29-32.

That the M.V. is later than Dīgha xvi., and dependent upon it, may be seen in the coincidence between M.V. vi. 28 *ff.* and D. xvi. 1, 19 *ff.* and 2, 1 *ff.* (ii. 84, 90). In the M.P.S. these two passages occur in their natural connexion, while in M.V., although it is a work that treats of the rules of the Order, their appearance is unexpected.†

CONCLUSION.

The Pali Canon offers thus no support, however modest, to the theory of the Councils. Hereby must we judge that theory. The Northern Buddhist Canon is not original, but is throughout derived from the Pali Canon (or from a sister-recension of it, but anyway, not from any more original, as yet undetermined tradition). If there are discrepancies in details, this is a common feature of any two exemplars of any literary work of ancient India. The handing on of texts was a flowing stream, and accuracy was for the Indian handing them on a thing inconceivable.

* See above, p. 49.

† Already pointed out by Rhys Davids, S.B.E. xi., p. xxxiv.

We are thus in a position to quote here and there from North Buddhist works features that look older than their equivalents in the Pali; but we can do no less from any work of the Pali Canon as compared with its equivalents in other works. Such discrepancies are manuscriptural, or, in the case of older oral tradition, quasi-manuscriptural nuances of deterioration or of more faithful retention, such as may be distributed to the disadvantage of the Pali Canon. The originality of the Pali Canon, as compared with the Northern, has been thoroughly established by Oldenberg.* Much has yet to be said on the more precise definition of the relations between the different recensions. In this connexion any more circumstantial discussion on recensions may be put aside. That which concerns us is whether, in that form of the Canon which the Northern Buddhists either translated or elaborated, the Culla-Vagga contained chaps. xi. and xii., and whether they occupied a corresponding place in that work. In view of Oldenberg's inquiry, there can about this be no room for doubt.†

If we compare the Dharmagupta chronicle of the two First councils, translated from the Chinese by Beal,‡ with C.V. xi. and xii., it is impossible, as I think, to get away from the conviction that we there have two versions of one and the same work, differently written down, and not two independent registrations of one and the same tradition.§ The Chinese version, I grant, contains in some passages more, in some less. But it is evident that the 'more,' for the most part, has been amplified from the M.P.S.,|| the Vinayapīṭaka,¶ and the rest of the Canon.** The 'less'

* In the Z.D.M.G. 52, pp. 613 ff., and especially p. 652. With the relation between particular books certain other scholars have dealt in a similar way (e.g., Barth, *J. des Sav.*, 1899, p. 628).

† Cf. *loc. cit.*, pp. 648, 651, 653; Vinayapīṭaka I., xxxiv., xlv., xlvii.

‡ Trans. of the Fifth Internat. Or. Congress, ii. 2.

§ The Chinese version, it should be admitted, is only a derived, and, at best, secondary work. It has certain features in common with the Tibetan version of the *Dulva*, hence we must assume the probable existence of an intermediate version.

|| Viz., in Beal, *op. cit.*, 13 f., 23 (= *Dīgha* xvi. 4, 22 ff.).

¶ In Beal, *op. cit.*, 25 ff.

** In Beal, *op. cit.*, 28.

consists of omissions. If we take the small residuum wherein the Chinese version has the advantage over C.V. xi., xii., and trace it back to the exploitation of a specific source, thus claiming for the former a higher antiquity, we should, for one thing, affirm that, before C.V. xi., xii. were compiled, the Abhidhamma-piṭaka was already existing and known. Whereas the non-existence of that Piṭaka is perhaps one of the safest historical conclusions to be drawn from C.V. xi. For the Dharmagupta narrative tells that at the First Council the Abhidhamma-piṭaka was also compiled.*

Beal's translation is, unfortunately, not sufficiently literal to enable us to decide whether the forms of address are analogously distributed in the Chinese report with the punctiliousness characterizing C.V. xi., xii. But so much is clear from the translation that the highest Thera at the Second Council, Sabbakāmi, is addressed by a specially reverential title, stated to be equal to mahābhādanta sthāvira.†

A consideration of the Tibetan version of Dulva yields similar results.‡ Here, however, we are much further from any prototype than in the Dharmagupta version. It would be scarcely correct to see, in those features where it differs, the basis for a reconstruction of some older tradition divergent from C.V. xi., xii., since it is easy to recognize its late origin in several peculiarities of the Dulva version. We find here, again, the false assertion that the Abhidhamma-piṭaka was in existence at the time of the First Council.§ It differs from both the Dharmagupta and C.V. in making Mahākāśyapa ask Ānanda concerning the Sūtranta, and then Upāli, concerning the Vinaya.|| This divergence is unquestionably not the older form of the

* Beal, *op. cit.*, 29.

† Beal, *op. cit.*, 38 ff. In Dulva, too, he is always addressed as Sthāvira, hence, anyway, not as 'friend.'

‡ See Rockhill, 'The Life of the Buddha,' London, 1884, 148 ff.

§ Rockhill, *op. cit.*, 156.

|| *Op. cit.*, 156, 158; also *Ann. du Musée Guimet*, ii. 196.

account, wherever we may look for the latter, for, since one Northern version (Dharmagupta's) and the Southern (C.V. xi.) agree that the Vinaya was first settled, this alone can be the correct order.

Equally false, and for the same reason, must be many of the questions relating to particular texts put by the Dulva into the mouth of Mahākāśyapa. A striking feature in the Dulva account, shared by neither of those other versions, is the admission of Ānanda to the First Council only in the character of water-server to the Council delegates.* We need not look far for the source of this statement. I know of two cases in the Pali Canon where Ānanda is dispatched by the Buddha to fetch water (D. xvi. 4, 22, *f.* [ii. 128], and Ud. vii. 9). And in both Dharmagupta and the Dulva the episode in the former of these two passages furnishes yet another occasion for indignation against Ānanda. Hence Ānanda's function as a water-carrier was a familiar association of ideas, and easily hit upon by the compiler of the Dulva in the absence of a better idea.

From my point of view it does not matter at all whether our Pali recension of the Culla-Vagga, or, indeed, any version of the C.V., created and contained the original record of the Councils. But this one thing I should like to say against De la Vallée Poussin's preference for non-Sinhalese schools; and that is, that everything which we learn respecting their origin stands or falls with the trustworthiness of the oldest records of the Councils. And on these I have already expressed my opinion.

I am, of course, not competent to form a correct and adequate judgment as to the relations of the Northern versions to the Southern considered with respect to every detail, and it would not, therefore, beseem me to enlarge on this matter. But on this I may and must lay stress: 1. The Pali accounts of the two Councils are brought up in their place for quite special literary reasons which we now know. 2. The Northern Buddhist accounts of the two alleged First Councils are also contained in the Vinayapi-

taka (and apparently for the most part in the corresponding part of it).*

This being so,† it seems to me that first and foremost two points will have to be demonstrated: that, in the first place, we miss, in the Northern records, those characteristic features which led us to conclude, in the case of C.V. xi. and xii., a literary dependence on the Southern Canon; that, in the second place, the Northern records, in spite of the close agreement there certainly is between their contents and those of the C.V. chronicle, have grown, independently of the latter, out of a common base-tradition. If these two points could be proved, then and then only would the Northern records merit consideration as self-dependent sources of history, and as noteworthy evidence for the Council-theory. In my opinion it is not likely that these two proofs will ever be established.

Still less importance, if that be possible, attaches to the alleged testimony of the *Dīpavaṃsa* to the councils. After what I have said in my Introduction,‡ I need here only point out that the dependence of *Dīp.* ch. iv. on C.V. xii. is put beyond all doubt, when in the midst of the *Dīp.* verses there falls on our heads this prose sentence: ‘Tena kho pana samayena vassasatamhi nibbute bhagavati Vesālīkā Vajjiputtakā Vesāliyaṇ dasa vatthūni dīpenti: kappati singilonakappo, kappati dvaṅgulakappo, kappati gāmantarakappo, kappati āvāsakappo, kappati anumatikappo, kappati āciṇṇakappo, kappati amathitakappo, kappati jalogiṇ pātuṇ, kappati adasakaṇ nisīdanaṇ, kappati jātarūparajatan ti’ which reflects

* De la V. Poussin also testifies: ‘La ressemblance ou l’identité des Vinayas Mahīśāsaka (Beal), Mahāsarvāstivādin (sources tibétaines) et pali, la légende des deux premiers conciles conservée dans ces diverses traditions.’ (*Études et Matériaux*, 55). But these are the oldest schools.

† Although this is no indispensable condition for the certainty of my argument.

‡ Cf. Kern’s critique of the *Dīp.* (*‘Man. of Ind. Buddhism,’* 105, 107 ff.); also Barth (*J. des Sav.*, 1899, 531), who pronounces the *Dīp.* and the Northern records dependent on C.V. xi., xii.

in C.V. xii. 1, 1: 'Tena kho pana samayena vassasataparinibbute bhagavati Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū Vesāliyaṃ dasa vatthūni dīpenti: kappati singilonakappo . . . jātārūparajatan ti.'

The two accounts in C.V. xi., xii. are but air-bubbles. Those of the Dīp. could not therefore well be anything else, even had the author not, in divers ways, done everything he well could to force their impossibility as history upon us. That he could so construe the statements in C.V. xi., xii. as he does, especially to make out, like the compiler of the Dharmagupta version,* that the decision to hold the First council at Rājagaha was made at Kusinārā, only shows that those two chapters had at an early date been misunderstood. Anyone who has been compelled to get a clear idea as to sense and coherence in the text of C.V. xi. 1 will know how much thought is required, and will not be surprised that misunderstandings should arise.

Regarding yet later witnesses to the two Councils, based not only on Dīgha xvi. and C.V., but also on the Dīp. — Buddhaghosa and Mahāvamsa — comment is superfluous.†

The Third Council, alleged to have been held at Pāṭali-putta, does not come into the scope of scientific discussion, its oldest and best witness being the Dīp. Only one point becomes salient in that testimony, and this is, that when the Dīp. came into being, the Kathāvatthuppakaraṇa, and, indeed, all the Abhidhamma was in existence (Dīp. vii. 41, 43, 56) — a matter that is sufficiently probable otherwise. On the other hand, we are not bound to believe that the Kathāvatthu was composed in the time of Asoka.

Oldenberg himself does not maintain that the allusions to particular texts in Asoka's Bhabra Edict is a proof of the existence of our entire Vinaya and Sutta-Piṭaka.‡ As much may be said concerning the Bharhut inscriptions, etc. All that is proved is the existence of just what is named and depicted, nor even then does this involve the

* See in Beal, *op. cit.*, 17.

† Cf. W.Z.K.M. xxi. 317 ff.

‡ Cf. Z.D.M.G. 52, p. 676.

text as we know it. But neither do I maintain that everything not so named or depicted is more recent. I only ask unrestricted freedom for the historical and comparative examination of the texts themselves.

This all had to be said sooner or later, so that we should not be eternally wrestling with phantoms. Phantoms may be really but air, and yet they have most effectively barred the way to the fruitful historical consideration of the gradual growth of our Pali Canon.

NOTE.—The quaint narrative, in C.V. xii. 2, 4, in which Revata and Sabbakāmi are made, from mutual politeness, to deprive each the other of his night's rest, is also rendered more intelligible, if C.V. xi. and xii. be regarded as model lessons in refined deportment. Moreover, the compiler had, in this case, too, a pattern in an earlier passage of the work: in C.V. vi. 13, 1, Upāli remains standing while he teaches, out of deference to his audience of *theras*; and the *theras* remain standing out of respect for the Dhamma, so that, in the end, both parties are sorely tried.

Translated by MRS. RHYS DAVIDS.

EARLY PALI GRAMMARIANS IN BURMA

By MABEL BODE

I.

THAT there is a Pali literature indigenous to Burma has long been known to Palists. The results achieved by Forchhammer, Minayeff, and others in their researches, the literary material contained in the Pali chronicle *Sāsanavaṅsa*, and the 'Book History,' or *Gandhavaṅsa*, suffice for a useful, if very summary, record of that literature. The Burmese tradition as to date and authorship of a great number of Pali works is summed up in a modern book, the *Piṭakatthamain*.* But there will soon be much new material to add, for Burmese Buddhist scholars have been busy of late years republishing ancient works and producing new ones. And in these times of printing-presses and educational associations it is interesting to look back to the days before Burmese was employed as a literary language, and when a knowledge of Pali grammar was a prize that the few only could hope to win.

Towards the end of the twelfth century two monks of Burma proudly bore a text of Burmese authorship to Ceylon. It was a treatise on Pali grammar, the *Saddanīti*. Thus began the first chapter in the history of Burmese scholarship.

* Rangoon, 1905-1906. This useful work of reference was first shown to me by Dr. Barnett, of the British Museum, who has kindly given me much help in the following article, and in a sketch, now in preparation, of the later literature.

Some obscurity hangs over the beginnings of this Buddhist culture in Burma. According to a well-established tradition, Indian Buddhism moved from the south coast—that is, from the region called in the ancient chronicles *Suvannabhūmi*—northwards, while some scanty archaeological evidence allows us to suppose that it also found its way through the mountain passes of the north.* But it was certainly not in the upper valley of the Irrawaddy that the Pali literature of Burma had its origin. This gift the Burmese owe to their more advanced neighbours, the Talaings of *Rāmaññadesa*, now called Lower Burma.

The origin and history of the Mōn or Talaing people, who were to be (unwillingly as it happened) the messengers of the purer Buddhism, need not be discussed here.† The point from which we start is their acceptance of Buddhist teaching from India and the rise of a body of learned monks in *Rāmañña* who preserved the ancient Doctrine and Discipline, and conveyed them to Upper Burma, where both had long been forgotten.‡ We say ‘forgotten,’ for this much even Burmese authors admit. But their tradition that no less than three out of the nine missions sent forth by Asoka in the third century B.C. went to Upper

* See Taw Sein Ko, ‘The Origin of the Burmese Race’: Buddhism, vol. i., No. 3, p. 455. ‘Preliminary Study of the Po ။ U ။ Daung Inscription’: *Ind. Ant.*, vol. xxii., p. 7. Phayre, ‘History of Burma,’ p. 14. R. C. Temple, ‘Notes on Antiquities in Ramannadesa,’ *Ind. Ant.*, xxii., pp. 37 *fol.* A. Grünwedel, *Buddhistische Kunst.*, pp. 132, 136, 138.

† For views of different authorities on this subject, see Reports on the Census of Burma (Eales), 1891 and (Lowin), 1901. The Talaing chronicles and inscriptions are rich in material for study, material which we are less and less likely to unearth as time goes on, for this ancient language is fast disappearing from Burma, and students of it are very few.

‡ ‘It is difficult to judge the degree of culture reached by the Burmese before their conquest of the Talaing country in the eleventh century. Forchhammer believed that there was no Burmese civilization to speak of till the two countries came under one rule, and the people of Upper Burma became partakers in the culture of the Southern Provinces’ (Jardine Prize Essay, p. 15).

Burma* looks like a piece of the national pride that is so inventive in these matters, and can only be quoted as 'an uncorroborated legend.'†

We can be clear at least as to the starting-point. The Pali scriptures by Buddhism became known to Burma in the eleventh century A.D., and were known through Talaing teachers. The existence of a strong Buddhist community in the maritime provinces (Rāmaññadesa) long before this date is not surprising. It has been supposed that Indian colonies were flourishing in Talaing territory‡ at the time of the Asokan mission. If so, the missionaries brought the teaching of Gotama to a country where Indian religion and customs had already made a home, and, whether they were opposed or not,§ they could be understood; and in time the doctrine of the Buddha prevailed.

There is no elaborated and ancient Pali chronicle for Further India to be compared with the Mahāvamsa and Dīpavamsa of Ceylon, but there are allusions in these works which throw some light on the religious history of Pegu and Arakan. The Burmese and Talaing chronicles are of more recent date, and help must be sought from monuments which do not always yield up their secret readily. But we may safely say that events in India and Ceylon greatly affected religion in the maritime provinces, otherwise Rāmaññadesa. Refugees from the countries where Buddhism was persecuted or declining, as in India after the eighth century, strengthened the Buddhist element in the Talaing country. Captain Forbes, who follows the Talaing record, says of the early days following the Indian

* Or, rather, Upper Burma and the Shān States. See Sāsana-vamsa, Introduction, pp. 5-10, and note by Dr. Burgess, 'Fabricated Geography,' in *Indian Antiquary*, vol. xxx., 1901, pp. 387 ff.

† Forbes, 'Legendary History of Burma and Arakan,' p. 10.

‡ 'From Chittagong to the Straits,' see Forchhammer Essay, p. 22.

§ 'According to the Talaing legend the Buddhist missionaries on their arrival met with great opposition from the local teachers—probably Brahmins—being denounced and reviled by them as heretics' (Forbes, 'Leg. Hist.,' p. 10).

mission : 'Gradually the new doctrines gained ground, pagodas arose, and the faith of Buddha or Gaudama established itself in Thatone, to flourish amid all vicissitudes for over two thousand years to the present day, on the spot where the great Thagya pagoda lifts its worn and ancient head, probably the oldest architectural monument of Buddhism in Burma.'*

When a religious reform in the eleventh century drew Ceylon and Burma together, Anorahta, King of Burma, fresh from vigorous measures against heresy in his own country, agreed with Vijayabāhu of Ceylon on the Pali texts, which were to be accepted as representing the true teaching of the Buddha. Afterwards, in the reign of Parākramabāhu I., a Council was held (A.D. 1165) in Ceylon to revise this agreement and settle all such questions.†

We shall see that from the twelfth century onwards new recruits press into Pali scholarship. And whence? Not only from the Talaing country, but from Upper Burma, an advance which was directly due to the action of the strenuous Burmese King.

The reforms with which Anorahta's name is associated were greatly needed.‡

* 'Leg. Hist.,' p. 10.

† Kern, 'Manual of Indian Buddhism,' p. 132 (Grundriss, vol. iii., part 8).

‡ See Sāsanavaṇṣa, p. 56. In full agreement with Forbes' account drawn from Burman chronicles, says : 'It would be difficult to decide what the system of religion that at this time prevailed in Burma can be termed. It was certainly not Brahmanism. The native records state that King Sawlahan built five hollow temples. In each temple was placed an image resembling neither nat nor para. To these, morning and evening, food and spirits were offered, and so they were worshipped and propitiated. The priests or teachers of this religion are called the thirty great Arees, and their disciples. Their doctrines are represented as a complete subversion of all moral law. They taught, it is said, whosoever shall commit murder, he is freed from his sins by repeating a prayer or invocation ; whosoever shall kill his parents, by repeating a prayer he is freed from the punishment due to the five greatest sins. These teachers also were addicted to the practice of gross immorality' ('Legendary History,' p. 22).

A religion * which a Buddhist from the south would have scorned to call 'religion' completely possessed the region over which Anorahta ruled; and the Burmese King himself, with mistaken piety, supported it in default of a better. A community numbering many thousands of monks, with their disciples, flourished on the popularity of their debased doctrine, teaching the laity that the worst crimes need bring no retribution, if the guilty man recited (or engaged some one to recite) an appropriate *paritta*.† The tyranny of these monks went so far as to exact from parents the handing over of either sons or daughters to the teacher before giving them in marriage.‡

But in course of time a Buddhist from the South was in Anorahta's counsels, and a sweeping change was brought about. Arahanta, a Talaing monk from Thatôn (Sudhammapura), became the King's preceptor and adviser, and used all his great influence to break up the supposed order of *Samaṇas* (ascetics). In spite of the credulity of the people, he succeeded, for he had convinced the King. But

* As to the corruption of Buddhism in Upper Burma before the conquest of the Talaings in the eleventh century, 'Burmese history relates that on the accession of Thaik taing, the thirteenth King of Pagan, who began his reign in 513 A.D., the Nāga worship, with the Aris as its priests, arose at Pagan. It lasted for over five centuries, till it was finally suppressed by Anawrata. . . . At about the same period in Northern India Buddhism had lost its vigour and force of expansion, and Indian Buddhists had migrated to China and neighbouring countries. Buddhism itself had been corrupted by the Tantric system, which is a mixture of magic, witchcraft, and Siva-worship; and this Tantric Buddhism apparently percolated into Burma through Bengal, Assam, and Manipur, and allied itself with the northern school prevailing at Pagan' (Taw Sein Ko, 'Introduction of Buddhism into Burma': Buddhism, vol. i., No. 4, p. 589).

† The legitimate use of the *paritta* is instanced in the *Sāsanavaṃsa*, pp. 38, 101. Compare also *Milindapañha* (ed. Trenckner, p. 150) and Rhys Davids' translation (S.B.E. xxxv., pp. 213 ff.).

‡ I do not yet understand this curious passage. The mention of sons as well as daughters prevents our concluding the custom mentioned to be that prevailing in Cambodia where marriageable virgins were yielded up to a *bonze* before the marriage ceremony (see article in *B.E.F.E.O.*, by P. Pelliot, tome ii., p. 153: 'Mémoires sur les contumes du Cambodge').

even when the communities were dissolved, and the 'false Samanas'* reduced to the state of 'ownerless dogs,' confusion, heresy, and ignorance still reigned in the land; and Arahanta pointed earnestly to the only means of putting religion beyond all danger: The true doctrine must be obtained and guarded (he preached) with the sacred texts. They were not to be had in Burma, but existed in abundance in Sudhammapura, besides relics of the Buddha. Anorahta was full of faith, and he was not a man to believe passively. He sent an embassy to the Talaing King, Manohari, to ask, as a believer having the right to ask, for relics and copies of the scriptures.

But Manohari was, or chose to appear, too strict a Buddhist to allow holy relics and texts to go to a country with such an indifferent religious reputation as Burma. He refused Anorahta's request, and refused in wounding and contemptuous terms. The King of Burma, outraged and furious, descended the river with his armies and laid siege to Sudhammapura. In the year 1058 the Talaing capital fell before the besiegers. Spoils and prisoners, among whom were Manohari and a number of learned monks, were carried off to Pagān. Anorahta's end was gained, and the Pali Tipiṭaka came to Burma.

II.

Though the Burmese began their literary history with borrowing from their conquered neighbours, the Talaings, and not till the eleventh century, the growth of Pali scholarship among them was so rapid that the epoch following close on this tardy beginning is considered one of the best that Burma has seen. The works then produced supplied the material or afforded the favourite models for much of the Pali-Burmese literature of later times.

The causes of this speedy maturity are easy to trace. Rāmañña was conquered. Relics, books, and teachers had been forcibly carried to Burma. Instead of suffering by

* Samanakuṭṭakā.

transplantation, the religion of the Buddha seems to have flourished more vigorously in its new centre. The Burmese King had conveyed the whole state and dignity of the conquered Sudhammapura to his own capital, and even his captive Manohari helped to add to the religious splendour of Pagân.* About Manohari a curious little legend is related,† perhaps to show that his religion needed purifying, notwithstanding that he had scorned the Burmese as heretics. It is said that he possessed a magical power by which fire issued from his mouth when he spoke. Thus, whenever he came to pay a vassal's duty to Anorahta, the flames burst forth, to the great terror of his liege, who anxiously applied a religious cure to the dreadful prodigy. Food was taken from a holy shrine, and after due homage it was given to Manohari to eat. The flames appeared no more. Manohari, filled with awe at the loss of his magical attribute, sold one of his royal gems, and devoted the price to two great images of the Buddha, which are said to exist to the present day.‡

Anorahta, mindful of Arahanta's counsels, was, above all, eager to enrich his city with the sacred texts. Those brought from Thatôn had been stored in a splendid pavilion,§ and placed at the disposal of the Saṅgha for study. Not content with his large spoils, the king sent to Ceylon for more copies of the Tipitaka, which Arahanta afterwards examined and compared with the Thatôn collection.|| So the ground was prepared for the harvest that soon followed.

* Called Arimaddana in the Pali chronicles. A temple exists at Myin Pagân, two miles south of Pagân, built by Manohari (or Manuha) in 1059 A.D. (see note by M. Fînot, *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient*, tome iii., p. 677).

† Sāsanavaṇṇa, p. 64.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

§ Ratanamaye-pāsāde (Sās., p. 63). The libraries of the ancient monasteries were mostly buildings apart.

|| Sās., p. 64. The Siṅhalese chronicles say that a common canon for Burma and Ceylon was arranged by Anorahta and Vijāyabāhu the Great (see Appendix to Mr. Nevill's manuscript catalogue of his collection now at the British Museum).

Anorahta did not live to see the first-fruits of his husbandry,* but during the reigns of his immediate successors, learning took firm root at Pagân, and in the year 1154 the monk Aggavaṇṣa completed the *Saddanīti*, a grammar of the Tipiṭaka described as 'the most comprehensive in existence.'† It established the reputation of Burmese scholarship in that age and of the author to the present day, for the *Saddanīti* is still republished in Burma as a classic. It consists of aphorisms on Pali grammar divided into twenty-five *paricchedas*, or sections. It is very interesting to see that in the second part of the work (the *Dhātumālā*) the grammarian gives the Sanskrit equivalents of the Pali forms.

Aggavaṇṣa was tutor to King Narapatisithu [1167-1204], a powerful and peaceable monarch whose reign was the most prosperous epoch in the history of the kingdom of Pagân.‡ According to the *Gandhavaṇṣa*, Aggavaṇṣa was of Jambudīpa (strictly meaning India, but with Burmese writers often Burma).§ Forchhammer mentions him among the famous residents in the retired monastery on the northern plateau above Pagân, 'the cradle of Pali-Burmese literature.'||

The *Saddanīti* was the first return-gift of Burma to Ceylon. A few years after its completion the *thera* Uttarā-jīva left Pagân and crossed the sea to visit the celebrated Mahāvihāra, taking with him a copy of the *Saddanīti*, which was received with enthusiastic admiration, and

* M. Duroiselle mentions inscriptions which confirm the date A.D. 1059 as the year of Anorahta's death (*B.E.F.E.O.*, tome v., p. 150: 'Notes sur la géographie apocryphe de la Birmanie').

† C. Duroiselle, *B.E.F.E.O.*, tome v., p. 147, note. The *Sāsana-vaṇṣa* mentions that another learned monk of Pagân, Aggapaṇḍita, third of that name, was also called Aggavaṇṣa. Aggapaṇḍita, who belongs to the thirteenth century, wrote the *Lokupattipakāsanī* (see the *Piṭakatthamāin*, pp. 60, 66).

‡ Forbes, 'Leg. Hist.', p. 24.

§ G.V., pp. 67, 72; see also S.V.D., verse 1238; Fausbøll, *Cat. Mand. MSS.*, p. 49.

|| Forchhammer, *Report, Pagan*, p. 2.

declared superior to any work of the kind written by Siñhalese scholars.*

Uttarājīva was accompanied by his pupil, the novice Chapata,† whose name was destined to eclipse, for a time at least, even that of Aggavaṇṣa. He received ordination from the Sangha in Ceylon, and lived in its midst for some years, ardently studying the doctrine as handed down in the Mahāvihāra, and, we may suppose, mastering many ancient texts of high authority which had not yet found their way to Burma. His talents and forcible personality were just the other elements needed to make his stay in the sacred island important for the literary history of Burma.

The works usually ascribed to Saddhammajotipāla, otherwise Chapata, are:

The Suttaniddesa, or Kaccāyanasuttaniddesa, a grammatical treatise explaining the sūtras of Kaccāyana.‡ Forchhammer§ mentions the work so called as one originally ascribed to Kaccāyana, and introduced by Chapata into Burma. The Sāsanavaṇṣa, Gandhavaṇṣa, and Sāsana-vaṇṣadīpa give Chapata as the author, and say that he wrote at Arimaddana (Pagān).|| The Gandhavaṇṣa adds that it was composed at the request of his pupil Dhammācāri.

The same with his other well-known work, the Sankhepavaṇṇanā. According to Forchhammer's sources,¶ Chapata introduced the Sankhepavaṇṇanā from Ceylon, and transcribed it from the Siñhalese into the Burmese-Talaing alphabet, but the Sāsanavaṇṣa, Sāsana-vaṇṣadīpa,

* Sās., p. 74.

† Or Chapada, so called after the village where he was born, near Bassein (Kusimanagara). In religion his name was Saddhammajotipāla (Sās., p. 74).

‡ For Kaccāyana, see the edition of E. Senart, Paris, 1871; for MSS., Fausbøll's Catalogue of Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library, pp. 45, 46, 47, 48; Forchhammer, List, pp. xx, xxi.

§ Essay, p. 34.

|| Sās., p. 74; Gandhavaṇṣa (ed. Minayeff), *J.P.T.S.*, 1886, pp. 64, 74; Sāsana-vaṇṣadīpa, verses 1247-48; cf. *Piṭakatthamain*, p. 66.

¶ See Essay, p. 35.

and Gandhavaṇṣa say that he composed it; according to the Gandhavaṇṣa, it was the only one of his eight works that was written in Ceylon.*

His *Sīmālakara*, or *Sīmālakaraṭṭikā*, a treatise on boundaries and sites for religious ceremonies, is a commentary on a work by the Siṅhalese *thera* Vācissara.†

Another work on monastic topics is the *Vinayasamuttāṇadīpanī*, written, as the favourite formula has it, at the request of Chapāṭa's preceptor.‡

The *Vinayagūḷhatthadīpanī*, again, is an explanation of difficult passages in the *Vinayapīṭaka*.

The *Nāmacāradīpanī*, on ethics, may be of Chapāṭa's composition. It was, at all events, introduced by him into Burma.§ The *Gandhisāra*|| is evidently an anthology or manual for study condensed from important texts. The remaining works¶ ascribed to Chapāṭa, the *Mātikatthadīpanī* and *Paṭṭhānagaṇānaya*, treat of *Abhidhamma* subjects.

It would be rash to say, without careful comparison of texts of the same epoch, that even at that early period the Burmese Sangha showed a deeper interest in the *Abhidhamma* than the Siṅhalese, as was certainly the case

* As to the basis of this work, it appears from the title given in the MSS. to be a commentary on the *Abhidhammatthasangaha* of Anuruddha. In arrangement it follows the *Abhidhammatthasangaha*, being divided into nine *paricchedas*, or sections. Oldenberg, Catalogue of Pali MSS. in the India Office, *J.P.T.S.*, 1882, p. 85; Fausbøll, Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. at the India Office, *J.P.T.S.*, 1896. The *Piṭakatthamain* only says that *Sankhepa vaṇṇanā* and *Sīmālakāra* were written by *Saddhammajotipāla* of Pagan P.th., pp. 49, 50.

† *Gandhavaṇṣa*, p. 62; *Sāsanavaṇṣadīpa*, verses 12, 13.

‡ *Gandhavaṇṣa*, pp. 64, 74.

§ Forchhammer, Essay, p. 35. The *Piṭakatthamain* gives *Nāmacaradīpaka* (under the heading *Abhidhamma*) as *Saddhammajotipāla*'s work (P.th., p. 45).

|| *Gandhisāra*, *Gandhavaṇṣa*, p. 74.

¶ The *Piṭakatthamain* mentions another, the *Visuddhimaggagaṇṭhi* (on different passages in *Buddhaghosa*'s *Visuddhimagga*) (P.th., p. 37).

later.* In Chapata's day, the school or sect he founded, which was known as the Sihālasangha of Burma, was probably absorbed by monastic questions. For Chapata had returned to Pagan a missionary of Siṅhalese orthodoxy. Deeply imbued with the belief that the Mahāvihāra alone had kept the legitimate 'line of descent'† unbroken from teacher to teacher, and that valid ordination could only be received in Ceylon, he wished to confer the upasampadā on the Pagan brethren still outside the pale. To fulfil all conditions required by the Vinaya, he brought with him four companions‡ qualified like himself. The little group was to be the nucleus of the new Order, the rightful heirs of the one tradition.

But this claim was stoutly opposed in some of the monasteries of Pagan. The traditions of the South Country and Anorahta's great Talaing teacher were still flourishing. Arahanta, they claimed, had been in the 'direct line' from the ancient missionaries Sona and Uttara; his disciples had been qualified to receive and hand on the Upasampadā, and the Mahāvihāra itself could confer no better title. The older community, therefore, declined to be drawn into Chapata's fold, and he, having the then reigning King on his side, was powerful enough to make them appear the seceders, while his followers refused all association with them in ceremonies.§

But King Narapatisithu was a Buddhist of the old magnificent school, and though he believed devoutly in Mahāvihāra orthodoxy, he neither persecuted nor neglected the communities that denied it. The ruins of old

* An observation to this effect is made by Mr. Nevill, whose information was supplied, for the most part, by Siṅhalese monks, well versed in the Pali literature of their country.

† This line is established by the reception of right doctrine from a duly ordained teacher, who has been the pupil of another, and so on in direct ascent to one of the fathers of the Buddhist Church.

‡ Rāhula, Ānanda, Sivali, and Tamalinda (Sās., p. 65). Five was the smallest number of which a chapter for Acts of the Sangha could consist, according to the Vinaya.

§ See 'Kalyāṇi Inscriptions,' *Indian Antiquary*, xxii., p. 80

Pagān still witness to his bounty towards the different Sanghas,* of which the Arahanta sect (called the Mramma or Burma Sangha) was the most important.

Narapati was the greatest, or most fortunate, patron of Buddhist learning in Burma from Anorahta's time till the fourteenth century; but one of his predecessors, Kyan-sitthā,† a son of Anorahta, had made his name memorable by building the celebrated Ānanda temple and vihāra at Pagān. At this monastery Dhammasenāpati‡ wrote the Kārikā—a grammatical work of far less importance than the Saddanīti, but interesting as preceding Aggavaṇṣa's work by nearly a century—if, indeed, we can accept this early date, as the Piṭakatthamain does, which places the Kārikā at A.D. 1064.

Like the Saddanīti, the Kārikā—a modest little metrical treatise—has lived bravely through some eight centuries, and was last republished a few years ago.

Dhammasenāpati composed two other works, the Etimāsamidīpanī (or Etimāsamidīpikā) and the Mandhāra.§ Beyond the bare mention of the titles and of the fact that the author wrote the Kārikā at the request of the monk Nānagambhira and the two others on his own

* 'Fraternities from Ceylon, from the conquered Haṇṣāvatī, from Siam, Camboja, and probably Nepal and China, sojourned in Pagān' (Forchhammer, Report, Pagān, p. 2).

† Kyansitthā's religious foundations are dated A.D. 1059 (*B.E.F.E.O.*, tome iii., p. 676). His Pali name is Chattaḡuhinda (*Sās.*, p. 75; Forbes' 'Leg. Hist.', p. 23; Phayre's 'History of Burma,' pp. 89, 281). M. Duroiselle expresses some doubt as to the exactness of Phayre's dates for the eleventh and twelfth centuries, since the Burmese chroniclers themselves are not in agreement on chronological points (*B.E.F.E.O.*, tome v., p. 150; cf. Piṭakatthamain, p. 68).

‡ Dhammasenāpati is called an ācariya in Gandhavaṇṣa (pp. 63, 73), but in Forchhammer's List the author of Kārikā and Kārikā Ṭikā is put down as a Burmese nobleman of Pagān bearing the honorary title of Dhammasenāpati. It is likely that he was known as a man of rank and importance before he entered the Order, and perhaps he threw himself into serious studies while still a layman. We shall find such cases later.

§ G.V., pp. 64, 73. The Gandhavaṇṣa is my only authority here.

initiative, the Gandhavaṅsa leaves us without information. Nāṇagambhīra, of Pagān, appears in the Piṭakatthamain as the author of the Tathāgatupatti.

Other names of grammarians follow close on one another in this period. Schisms had indeed arisen, but the time had not yet come for works of *polemik*, and the good monks of Pagān were busy laying the foundations of learning in the country. In the work of Saddhammasiri, the author of the grammatical treatise Saddatthabhedacintā,* we catch a glimpse of a culture that recalls Aggavaṅsa. Saddhammasiri's grammar is based partly on Kaccāyana and partly on Sanskrit authorities. The Sāsanavaṅsa tells us that Saddhammasiri also translated the Brihaja(?) into the Burmese language.† He was, probably, one of the first to use Burmese as a literary instrument.‡ If this was the Brihajjātaka, an astrological work, it could not put a great strain on the resources of the Burmese idiom, even before the immense body of Pali words, probably added later, had come to its aid; so the feat is not a surprising one. But the thera's knowledge of Sanskrit is an interesting point. It is curious, too, to find him busied with one of the Brahmanic works known as 'Vedas' in Burma. Another grammatical work of some importance is the commentary generally known as Nyāsa, but sometimes as Mukhamattadīpanī, on the Kaccāyanayoga. The author was Vimalabuddhi,§ who is claimed by the Sāsanavaṅsa as a thera of

* G.V., pp. 62, 72; Fausböll, Cat. Mand. MSS., pp. 47, 48; Forchhammer, List, p. xix.

† Sās., p. 75. So yeva thera Brihajam nama Vedasattham pi Marammabhāsāya parivattasi (cf. Piṭakatthamain, p. 68).

‡ M. Duroiselle mentions inscriptions in Burmese of the tenth and eleventh centuries, containing words of Sanskrit derivation, and he expresses the belief that Sanskrit was known in Burma before Pali, which then, so shortly after its importation from Thatōn, 'n'était connu que de l'élite des moines' (B.E.F.E.O., v., p. 154.)

§ Mahā - Vimalabuddhi, to distinguish him from a later writer (cf. Piṭakatthamain, p. 63).

Pagān,* but is said by some authorities to be of Ceylon.† A *ṭikā* on the *Nyāsa* was written by the author himself,‡ to whom a *ṭikā* on the *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha* is also ascribed.§

The *Nyāsa* was glossed by another commentator in the reign of Narapatisithu. The scholiast this time was a man of high rank, who addressed himself to the task for love of one of the King's daughters. At least, the story as related by the *Sāsanavaṇṣa* is that Narapati, knowing this nobleman to be violently in love with one of the princesses, promised him her hand on condition that he should produce a work of profound learning.||

He undertook a scholium on the *Nyāsa*. The *Sāsanavaṇṣa* does not make it clear whether he was an official at the Court first, and entered the Order on purpose to write his book, or whether he was of the Order when he fell in love. We are only told that when he 'returned to the lay life' the King conferred on him the title of *rajjuggāhāmacca*. The Burmese title under which his work is sometimes met is *Thanbyin*.¶

A treatise, entitled *Lokuppatti*, by *Aggapaṇḍita*,** was written at Pagān. The author was a native of Burma.

* *Sās.*, p. 75.

† Mentioned *Sās.*, p. 75. *Vimalabuddhi* is Siṅhalese in Forchhammer's List, p. xxiii. There is nothing in the India Office MS. apparently to settle the question. *Vide* Fausböll, Cat. Mand. MSS., p. 47.

‡ G.V. i., pp. 63, 73.

§ See S.V.D., verse 1223.

|| *Sās.*, p. 75. There is a *ṭikā* called *Nyāsappadīpa* (incomplete) at the India Office. The author's name is missing (see Fausböll, Cat. Mand. MSS., p. 48. It seems that the King's request was not out of the way, for the nobleman was a learned grammarian, according to the S.V.D. (verse 1240), where it is said that the *Nyāsappadīpa ṭikā* was written 'ekena amaccena sadattha nayaññunā (*cf.* *Piṭakatthamain*, p. 64).

¶ *Sās.*, p. 75; Forchhammer, List, p. xxiii. *Thanbyin* was a title given to revenue officers, nearly corresponding to the *thugyī* of modern times (see 'Inscriptions of Pagān, Pinyā, and Ava,' p. 128, note.

** G.V., pp. 64, 67; *Sās.*, p. 74. Nevill mentions the *Lokuppatti* as a work not easy to find in Ceylon (*Piṭayatthamain*, p. 60).

The Gandhavaṅsa mentions a grammar, *Lingatthavivarāṇa* by Subhūtacandana, who was followed by Nāpa-sāgara with *Lingatthavivarāṇapakāśaka** and Uttama with *Lingatthavivarāṇaṭīkā*. These three doctors were all of Pagān.† A *Lingatthavivarāṇa-
vinicchaya*‡ by an author whose name is not mentioned, is apparently based on Subhūtacandana's treatise, or explains difficult passages in it. Uttama,§ the author of the *Lingatthavivarāṇaṭīkā*, also wrote a scholium on *Bālāvatāra*, the well-known grammar by Vacissara,|| of Ceylon.

Another of the Pagān grammarians, whose work has been studied for centuries and republished in recent times, was Dhammadassi, a novice (*sāmaṇera*) in the Order (according to the *Sāsanavaṅsa*),¶ when he composed his well-known treatise *Vācavācaka*, or *Vaccavācaka*. A commentary on it was written by Saddhammanandi.**

From the *Saddatthabhedacintā* sprang a number of commentaries, of which the best known is the *Mahāṭīkā*†† by the thera Abhaya, of Pagān. Abhaya's name

* G.V., pp. 63, 72, 73.

† G.V., p. 67. The *Piṭakatthamain*, p. 72, ascribes *Lingatthavivarāṇa* and *Ṭīkā* to Saddhammakitti of Sagaing.

‡ G.V., pp. 65, 75.

§ See G.V., pp. 63, 67; Forchhammer, Report, Pagān, p. 2; Forchhammer, List, p. xxiii; *Piṭakatthamain*, p. 70.

|| *Dhammakitti* in Forchhammer's List.

¶ *Sās.*, p. 75.

** See Fausböll, Cat. Mand. MSS., p. 50, for commentary, and *ṭīkā*s on *Vaccavācaka*. They are entitled *Vaccavācakaṇṇanā*, *Vaccavācakaṭīkā*, and *Vaccavācakaḍḍipāṇī*. Saddhammanandi is the only author mentioned. In Forchhammer's List (p. xxii) these works appear without names of authors. Cf. *Piṭakatthamain*, p. 71, according to which the *Vaccavācaka* was written at Pagān by a thera, 'name unknown,' and the *Ṭīkā* by Saddhammanandi.

†† G.V., pp. 63, 73; Forchhammer, Report (Pagān), p. 2; List, p. xix. The commentary in the Mandalay Collection at the India Office is called *Saddatthabhedacintāḍḍipāṇī* (Fausböll, Cat. Mand. MSS., p. 50).

reappears as the author of the *Sambandhacintaṭīkā*,* a commentary on the *Sambandhacintā* of Saṅgharakkhita.

Forchhammer places both Saddhammasiri and Abhaya in the fourteenth century.†

Unfortunately, the *Sāsanavaṇṣa* and *Gandhavaṇṣa*, usually careful to give us the birthplace or residence of our authors, rarely give us any guide to their exact date. Without a comparison of the texts one with another, or a minute study of the chronicles of monasteries, we must be content with conjectures as to the order in which the scholars of Pagān succeeded each other. But we may, I think, venture to place most of those just mentioned in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. Before passing on to the later period of Pali literature at Pagān, it will be well to look for a moment at the state of the Burmese Saṅgha, or rather Saṅghas.

Narapati's impartial benevolence had secured a peaceful life and means of study for all those who sought them, but it could not prevent discord between the communities; and when Chapata died, his school—the *Sihaḷasangha*—split into four factions, each following one of the four theras who had come with Chapata from Ceylon.

The dissensions (for they can hardly be called schisms in the usual sense of the word) that arose within the *Sihaḷasangha*, once stronger and more united than the other sects in Pagān, were not, it seems, caused by questions of dogma. At all events, the *Sāsanavaṇṣa* tells us only of the personal reasons for which Rāhula separated himself first from his colleagues, and they in their turn parted company.

Rāhula's defection was the gravest matter. The story is that he fell desperately in love with an actress at one of

* Fausböll, *Cat. Mand. MSS.*, p. 50; Forchhammer, *List*, p. xxi.; *Piṭakatthamain*, pp. 69, 71. The *Sambandhacintā*, on syntactical relation, is probably of the twelfth century. The author was a scholar of Ceylon.

† Forchhammer, *Essay*, p. 36.

the festivals given by King Narapati. His brother-theras entreated and reasoned with him in vain. Finally, they prayed him to leave the country, and spare his community the scandal of his 'return to the lower life.' He then took ship and went to 'Malayadīpa,'* and in that country became preceptor to the King, who wished to be instructed in the Vinaya. The end of Rāhula's story is curious. Under him the King studied the Khuddasikkhā,† and the *ṭikā* on the same; afterwards, with the largesse that his grateful pupil bestowed on him, the *thera* abandoned the Order and lived as a layman.

This little history is no doubt told for edification more than for its human interest, like the story of Ānanda, whose transgression, less dramatic than Rāhula's, was also against monastic discipline. Narapati had presented the three *theras*, Sivali, Tāmalinda, and Ānanda, each with an elephant. Ānanda, wishing to give his to his relations in Kañcipura, was preparing to ship it from Bassein (Kusimanagara), when the others remonstrated with him, pointing out that they, in a spirit more becoming to followers of the Buddha, had turned their elephants loose in the forest. Ānanda argued that kindness to kinsfolk was also preached by the Master. Neither side would be persuaded, and Ānanda was cut off from the community.

Sivali and Tāmalinda afterwards disagreed on another question of conduct. Tāmalinda had recommended his disciples to the pious laity for gifts and other marks of

* Sās., p. 66. The reading chosen by Minayeff in his transcript of the text, and, after some hesitation, by the present writer in editing the *Sāsanavaṇṇa*, was 'Mallarudīpa.' The MS. corrects to Malayadīpa. The episode is interesting. The reading Malayadīpa is confirmed by the Kalyāṇi inscriptions. See Taw Sein Ko, 'Remarks on the Kalyāṇi Inscriptions,' *Ind. Ant.*, xxiv., p. 301.

† A compendium of the Vinaya written in Ceylon, edited by Professor E. Müller (*J.P.T.S.*, 1883) *Ṭikās* on this text were composed by Revata and Saṅgharakkhita, both of Ceylon (*vide* *Piṭakatthamain*, p. 48).

consideration, an action of which the Buddha had strongly disapproved.* After some useless admonishing, Sivali refused to have any further intercourse with Tāmalinda, and formed a sect of his own. This very simple account of the origin of the four factions in the Sīhalasangha is not quite satisfying, but as an example of monastic traditions in Burma, it has a certain interest. Besides, even such fragments of the personal history of theras sometimes give us a glimpse into the course of studies and scholarship in their day.

In the meantime, as our list of authors shows, literary work went on at Pagān. After Narapati, the next keen patron of learning was Kyocvā.† The works produced under his auspices were chiefly grammatical, but the *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha* was also one of the principal subjects of study.‡ We should expect to hear that the students of Pali grammar were chiefly monks, eager not only to understand the ancient texts thoroughly, but to master the classic language, in order to compose in it themselves. But grammatical knowledge was by no means limited to the monasteries. We have already heard of the learning of Narapati's minister. In the time of Kyocvā, too, there were grammarians at the King's court.§ Indeed, Kyocvā is said to have insisted on general diligence

* Sās., p. 67. It is here called by a technical name, *Vacīvinātti*. For pronouncements in the Vinaya on this subject, see Vinaya v., p. 125 (Oldenberg's edition), and compare iii., p. 227; iii., p. 256, etc.

† Succeeded Jeyyasinkha A.D. 1227 (Phayre), or A.D. 1234 (Barnett). Pagān is described in a florid thirteenth-century poem, the *Manavulu-Sandesaya*, written in Ceylon, ed. L. D. Barnett (*J.R.A.S.*, April, 1905, p. 265).

‡ For an example of studies, see the pathetic little story of the monk *Disāpāṃokkha*, who pursued knowledge so fervently in his old age (beginning with *Kaccāyana* and the *Abhidhammatthasaṅgaha*) that in time he astonished the chief theras by his learning, and was chosen by the King to be his *ṭācariya* (Sās., p. 77).

§ Pali grammar was a popular study at that time even among women and young girls. A quaint and interesting passage in the

around him, while he himself set the example by writing the *Saddabindu* and *Paramatthabindu*, both grammatical works.* A little work on Pali cases, entitled *Vibhattyattha*, is ascribed to his daughter.†

The *Mukhamattasāra*,‡ another grammatical work of this epoch, was written by Sāgara, called Guṇasāgara in the *Gandhavaṇṣa*,§ which states that Sāgara wrote a *ṭikā* on his own work, at the request of the Saṅgharājā (Head of the whole Order), who was King Kyocvā's preceptor.

A *Vibhattyattha* was written, probably at Pagan, by the *thera* *Saddhammañāṇa* early in the fourteenth century.¶ *Saddhammañāṇa* was the author of a more important work on metrics, the *Chandosāratthavikāsinī*¶ (or *Vuttodayapañcika*, being a commentary on *Vuttodaya*),** and the *Chapaccayadīpanī*, also on prosody.†† *Saddhammañāṇa* was not only a Palist, but a Sanskrit

Sāsanaṇṣa, reproduced by Minayeff in the 'Recherches' (*Sās.*, p. 78; 'Recherches', p. 69), describes how busy mothers of families in *Arimaddana* (Pagan) snatched time to learn.

* *Saddabindu* is ascribed to Kyocvā, and dated 1234 in the *Piṭakatthamain*, pp. 45 and 70. See also G.V., pp. 64, 73; *Sās.*, p. 76. *Saddabindu* has been ascribed to Kyocvā's preceptor. A commentary entitled *Līnatthavisodhanī* was written by Nāṇavilāsa of Pagan (Nevill). The *ṭikā* on *Saddabindu*, called *Saddabinduvinicchaya*, in the India Office, is by Sirisaddhammakittima-hāphussadeva (*vide* Fausböll, *Cat. Mand. MSS.*, p. 50). A *ṭikā* on *Paramatthabindu* was written at Pagan by the *thera* Mahākassapa (*Piṭakatthamain*, p. 51).

† *Sās.*, p. 77 (see Preface to Subhūti's edition of the *Abhidhānapadīpikā*, 2nd ed., Colombo, 1883).

‡ *Sās.*, p. 76; G.V., pp. 63, 67, 73.

§ Guṇasara in Forchhammer's List, p. xxiii.

¶ Forchhammer, *Essay*, p. 36; Fausböll, *Cat. Mand. MSS* p. 50.

¶ Forchhammer, *Report*, Pagan, p. 2; *Essay*, p. 36; Fausböll, *Cat. Mand. MSS.*, pp. 51, 52; Forchhammer, *List*, p. xxiii; *Piṭakatthamain*, p. 74.

** *Vuttodaya*, a twelfth-century work by Saṅgharakkhita, written in Ceylon; published by Fryer in *J.A.S.*, Bengal, 1877.

†† Forchhammer, *Essay*, p. 36.

cholar, and translated the Sanskrit grammar *Kātantra Kalāpa*) into Pali.

The *Gandhatthi*, by Maṅgala, is a grammatical work, probably of the fourteenth century, and written at Pagān. At somewhat later period, but also at Pagān, Sirisaddhammavilāsa composed a *Kaccāyana Ṭikā*, entitled *Saddhammanāsini*.*

So far, the production of learned works in the communities of Burma seems to have gone on steadily, in spite of sectarian differences, which, after all, would affect grammarians less than experts in the Vinaya. But a change had come over the fortunes of the Order in the thirteenth century. The Pagān dynasty fell in 1285† under the assaults of Mongol invaders from the north, while nearly at the same time a successful revolt in the south completed the overthrow of the Burmese power. Shān rulers established their capital at Myinzaing (*Khandhapura* in Pali), and the glory of Pagān, where the very temples had been torn down to fortify the city against the enemy, was never restored. Later authors wrote afterwards, in or near the old famous monasteries, but a chapter of the literature of Upper Burma closes here. With the downfall of the dynasty that had protected scholarship for so many generations, the first period, the period of the grammarians, comes to an end.

* Forchhammer, Report, Pagān, p. 2, and List, p. xx. The MS. of Sirisaddhammavilāsa's work in the Mandalay collection is called *Kaccāyanasāra Ṭikā* (Fausböll, Cat. Mand. MSS., p. 48). The *Kaccāyanasāra* was composed in the Talaing country.

† Forbes, Leg. Hist., p. 25; Phayre, Hist. Bur., pp. 51, 53, 54; Colonel Burney's translations from Rājavaṇṣa, *J.A.S.*, Bengal, vol. iv., pp. 400 ff.

ABBREVIATIONS

1. *B.E.F.E.O.*—*Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient.* Hanoi.
2. FAUSBÖLL, CAT. MAND. MSS.—Fausböll (V.), Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library. *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1896.
3. FORBES, LEG. HIST.—Forbes (C. J. F. S.), 'Legendary History of Burma and Arakan.' Rangoon, 1882.
4. FORCHHAMMER, ESSAY.—Forchhammer (E.), Essay for the Jardine Prize. Rangoon, 1885.
5. FORCHHAMMER, NOTES.—Forchhammer (E.), 'Notes on the Early History of Geography of British Burma.' Rangoon, 1883.
6. FORCHHAMMER, REPORT.—Forchhammer (E.), Report on the Literary Work performed on behalf of Government during the year 1879-80. Rangoon, 1882.
7. FORCHHAMMER, LIST.—Forchhammer (E.), Appendix K to Report on Literary Work. List of MSS. in the Rangoon High School Pali Library.
8. FORCHHAMMER, REPORT (PAGÂN).—Forchhammer (E.), Archæological Reports. Pagân.
9. G.V.—Gandhavaṇṣa. Ed. Minayeff. *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1886.
10. IND. ANT.—*Indian Antiquary*.
11. *J.P.T.S.*—*Journal of the Pali Text Society*.
12. MAN. IND. BUDDH.—Kern (H.), 'Manual of Indian Buddhism.' Grundriss, vol. iii., part viii.
13. OLD. CAT. PALI MSS.—Oldenberg (H.), Pali MSS. in the India Office Library. *Journal of the Pali Text Society*, 1882.
14. P.TH.—Piṭakatthamain. Rangoon, 1905.
15. SĀS.—Sāsanavaṇṣa. Ed. Bode. 1897.
16. S.V.D.—'Sāsanavaṇṣadīpo; or, History of the Buddhist Church in Pali Verse,' by Ācariya Vimalasāra Thera. Colombo, 1880.
17. BUDDHISTISCHE KUNST.—Grünwedel (A.), *Buddhistische Kunst in Indien*. Berlin, 1893.

CRITICAL AND PHILOLOGICAL NOTES
TO THE
FIRST CHAPTER (BĀHIRAKATHĀ)
OF THE MILINDA-PAÑHA

By V. TRENCKNER

REVISED AND EDITED, TOGETHER WITH AN INDEX OF WORDS
AND SUBJECTS,

By DINES ANDERSEN

[INTRODUCTORY REMARKS.—The following ‘Notes’ and ‘Supplementary Notes’ were issued in 1879 by the late V. Trenckner as an appendix to his ‘Pali Miscellany’ (Part I.; London: Williams and Norgate), after portions of them had been communicated to a few Pali scholars. A careful inspection will show that these notes contain a series of very ingenious remarks on the most important questions within Pali philology. They were, in fact, based on a very extensive knowledge of Pali manuscripts and of parallel passages in the Piṭaka texts and commentaries; it is the more to be regretted that they seem to have been comparatively little used by later Pali scholars when editing the Pali texts. I think that this is due mainly to two circumstances, viz., the want of an index, and Trenckner’s way of making references to books and chapters in his own manuscripts, so that the passages quoted in a great many cases can be found only with difficulty. Thus it will be easily understood why, in many passages of

the printed texts, we find no reference to Trenckner's Notes, although a better reading could have been introduced by means of them. Examples of this are numerous; I need only to name the word *pettāpiya* (Notes, p. 62); cf. Hardy's edition of the *Aṅguttara-Nikāya*, III., p. 348⁴ and V., p. 138⁶; *abbeti* (p. 64); cf. *Jāt.* III., p. 34, and VI., p. 17; *opiya* (p. 78), cf. *Th.* v. 119 and *SN.*, I., p. 199, etc.; not to speak of the edition of *Majjhima-N.*, Vol. II.-III., where even Trenckner's MS. itself was at the editor's disposal; see, for instance, *atatha* (p. 67), *MN.*, II., p. 256, *se vante* (p. 75), *ibid.*, II., p. 254²⁵. Of course, it ought also to be said that Trenckner's critical remarks to several passages in the *Suttā-nipāta*, *Jātaka*, and *Dīgha-Nikāya* have been taken duly into consideration (*DN.*, II., p. 337 and II., p. 15; but cf. *MN.*, III., p. 123). I think I have said enough in order to justify this undertaking of mine to give a new edition of the 'Notes,' which I had planned already years ago. It was, therefore, a great satisfaction to me that the editor of this *Journal* himself proposed to me to publish them together with an index. This I have striven to make as complete as possible, and I have availed myself of the opportunity of inserting also references to some of Trenckner's notes in his editions of *Milinda-pañha* and *Majjhima-Nikāya*, vol. i. Thus the numbers between 55 and 83 refer to the following text, which is printed quite as it stands in *Pali Misc.*, pp. 55-83, after the corrections and additions from p. 84 have been inserted in their places; whilst the numbers 525-573 refer to *Majjhima*, vol. i., and 420-430 to the complete edition of *Milinda*, the text of which was already printed before Trenckner issued his *Pali Misc.* Of course, it was necessary to revise the most part of the quotations, and give references to the texts now printed; these references are added within parentheses, whilst a few additions of my own are put within brackets. Trenckner's abbreviations are the same as those known to us from his edition of *Milinda-pañha*; Dh. refers to the edition of *Dhammapada*, 1855, and Mhw. to Tournour's edition of *Mahāvamsa*, 1837.]

NOTES.

[55] Mil. 1¹. The name of Milinda has been happily identified with the Greek Menandros. In Pali the liquids *n* and *l* are easily interchanged, more especially either by assimilation or dissimilation; as, *muḷāla* S. *mṛṇāla*, *nangala* S. *lāngala*, *nangula* S. *lāngula*, *nalāṭa* S. *lalāṭa*, *veḷu* S. *veṇu* (proceeding from the oblique cases), *pilandhati* 'to ornament,' from *pilandha*¹ S. *pinaddha* (comp. *onandhati*, *pariyonandhati*), *vijjotalanta*, pres. part. of a denominative from S. *vidyotana*. The latter part of the name is made to contain the Pali word *inda*; or else assimilation of vowels may have taken place, as in *nilicchita*, S. *nirashṭa* from AKSH (the Burmese write *nilacchita*), *nisinna* S. *nishaṇṇa*, *piṭṭhi* S. *prshṭha*,² etc.

Mil. 1¹¹. *Tam̐yathā 'nusūyate* is a phrase well known from Sanskrit, especially Buddhist Sanskrit, comp. Five Jāt., p. 59; in Pali I have only found it in this place.

Mil. 1¹⁴. *Rāmaṇeyyaka*, S. *rāmaṇiyaka*, seems always to be used as a substantive; comp. *Abhijanāsi no (i.e., nu) tvaṃ rājañña divāseyyaṃ upagato supinakaṃ passitā, āramarāmaṇeyyakaṃ vanarāmaṇeyyakaṃ bhūmirāmaṇeyyakaṃ pokkhara-nīrāmaṇeyyakaṃ* (DN. 24); *iccheyyāsi no*

¹ *Pilandha* is used in Mil. and in comments; I have not found it in any Pitaka text. But *pilandhita* seems to be unused.

² An interesting case, showing the transition from the neuter *piṭṭham* to the fem. *piṭṭhi*, occurs in each of the four Nikāyas: *Piṭṭhim-me* (so MN. and SN.; *piṭṭhi me* DN. and AN.) *agilāyati* (*āgilāyati* SN.), *tam-aham āyamissāmi*, 'my back pains me a little, I wish to stretch it.' Comp. Jāt. I., p. 491 (at l. 3 read, *paṭibhātu taṃ bhikkhūnaṃ dhammī kathā*). The assimilation has taken place, but the nasal is retained, and the word probably still remains neuter. The case is different from *nidhin-nikhāto* (S. *-ir ni-*), Jāt. 307, v. 4 (vol. iii., p. 27).

tvam [56] mārisa Moggallāna Vejāyantassa pāsā-dassa rāmaṇeyyakam daṭṭhum (MN. 37, vol. i., p. 253¹¹). At Dh. v. 98 bhumimrāmaṇeyyakam is a compound with m inserted for metrical reasons³; the parallel verse SN. XI, 15 (vol. i., p. 233⁴) has the same reading.

Mil. 1¹⁸. Caccara is S. catvara; v and r after a dental being sometimes changed into y, and thus together with the dental mostly forming a palatal, as gijjha S. gr̥dhra, ekacca⁴ S. ekatara (after contraction into *ekatra).

Mil. 2¹. Dānagga is no doubt a contraction of dānā-gāra, by elision of the penultimate vowel; for in the sense of house -agga is used in several compounds, as bhattagga (Dh., p. 104; Mhw., p. 88), salākagga, vassagga (a shed, Jāt. I, p. 123), uposathagga (also uposathā-gāra). The like contraction occurs in ekacca, referred to in the preceding note. Also in pitucchā, mātucchā, S. pitṛshvasar, mātṛshvasar: sasar, which is otherwise unused in Pali, being contracted to -ssar, will, according to a well-known Sanskrit rule, form -tsar, which in

³ Exactly as at v. 153 sandhāvissam with a double for a single s, to prevent the verse from ending in three iambs. This reading is, however, scarcely original, but so old that it came to be considered the correct form, and -isam is used only at the end of a hemistich. The examples are very numerous, and when Kuhn (Beitr. z. Pali-Gr., p. 111) characterized the form as 'äusserst selten,' he forgot that his knowledge of Pitaka texts was very limited.

⁴ At first view ekacca (also ekatiya, Th., v. 1009, if the reading is right) has the appearance of containing the suffix tya, and, like Kuhn and Senart, I formerly thought that such was the case. But that obsolete termination was no longer available for the formation of new words, and it never produced derivatives declined like ekacca, pl. ekacce. Compare also mahacca=mahattara, in mahaccarājānubhāvena, DN. 2 (vol. i., p. 49); MN. 84, 89 (vol. ii., pp. 83, 118); AN., V., v. 10 (vol. iii., p. 59) [and Vin. iii., p. 327]; and matyā or mātīyā, petyā, S. mātṛā, pitṛā, Jāt. 527, vv. 3, 5 (vol. v., p. 214); 538, v. 29 (vol. vi., p. 16). At Khud-dakap. 9, v. 1=Sn. 8, v. 1 (v. 143), I consider abhisamecca the instrumental of -etar in the sense of a future, with irregular shortening of the final; perhaps an old clerical error.

Pali makes -cchar, and for final -ar, as in some other cases, -ā is substituted. Jñu in composition for jānu, offers a Sanskrit analogy.

Mil. 2⁷. Kodumbaraka, the reading of M, is also that of the Vessantara-Jātaka, where the commentary explains it 'Kodumbararaṭṭhe uppannāni (Jāt. VI., p. 501²⁵).

Mil. 2¹⁴. Leyya is S. lehya; sāyaniya from sāyati 'to taste,' S. svādate. A single consonant between vowels is [57] rather frequently elided, and to avoid the hiatus, which unlike the practice in Prakrit, is never allowed to remain, either a semivowel is inserted, or contraction takes place. Sāyati more immediately proceeds from the part. sāyita, like ta-y-idam, khāyita from khādati, in which verb, however, the elision is confined to the participle. Sāyati is so frequently accompanied by ghāyati, 'to smell,' that the rhyme may have contributed to the change.

Mil. 3²¹. Moggaliputta - Tissatthero was the principal actor in the third sangīti⁵ or redaction of the Buddhist canon, 218 years after Buddha. His history, as related in Mhw., has many points of coincidence with our text.

Mil. 3²¹. Dissati. Of the three Sanskrit preterites, the perfect has left but very few vestiges, and the imperfect and aorist are commonly blended into one form, partaking of the character of both. Thus the old system has been entirely overthrown, and has had to be replaced by a new one. The aorist is expressed by the new Pali aorist formed from the Sanskrit imperfect, the terminations being on the whole borrowed from the Sanskrit aorist; the perfect by means of the past participle, so that the construction of the sentence commonly becomes passive (as, evam-me sutam, thus I have heard). The imperfect takes the form of the present tense, and on this analogy the future

⁵ Burnouf, and Childers on his authority, render sangīti by 'synod,' but I have met with the word in no context where the meaning 'redaction' is not either necessary or admissible. Nor does the verb sangāyati ever mean 'to convoke,' but invariably 'to make a collection or redaction of texts.'

may be used in the sense of an imperfect of the future. Hoti (= was), accompanied by a past participle, forms a pluperfect. The scheme is, however, partly infringed, in so far as the p. p., especially in an active sense, is often used instead of an aorist; and so is, in the text above, the present, of which licence there are, I believe, few other examples. This system of preterite tenses differs not much from that used in more recent Sanskrit; the use of the present for the imperfect in epic Sanskrit has been noticed by Rückert in *Zeitschr. d. d. morg. Gesellsch.*, 1859, p. 110, but according to his statement is more limited than in Pali.

Mil. 3²⁵. Niggumba from gumba, S. gulma, by metathesis [58]; gumbla being the intermediate stage. (Comp. simballi, S. çalmali.)

Mil. 4¹. The nineteen sciences are intended to represent the Yonaka cyclopædia, the difference of which from the Indian must have been well known to the author. Hence the number was fixed at nineteen, to mark them out as distinct from the 'eighteen' Indian sciences. But this was all he knew about the matter, and so his specification of them turned out a mere farrago of Indian words, the exact meaning of which no one would probably have been more puzzled to explain than himself. He first thought of çruti and smṛti, of sāṅkhya, yoga, nyāya, vaiçeshika. For smṛti and nyāya were substituted sammuti (S. sammati, perhaps in the sense of 'what is universally agreed on') and nīti; the regular equivalents, sati and ñāya, being objectionable, because these are among the technical terms of Buddhism (ñāyo = ariyo atṭhangiko maggo), and might have rendered Milinda suspect of Buddhist attainments previous to his conversion. The rest of the names are chosen rather at random, and mostly disguised as feminines ending in -ā, in order to look less like Indian.

Mil. 4¹⁷. Pūraṇo is the correct name, though written in all our copies, and often elsewhere, Purāṇo. He was born, according to Buddhaghosa, after ninety-nine other slaves, thus 'filling up' the number of a hundred. In the

following names the forms Nāta- and Nāthaputto, Belatṭha- and Belatṭhiputto are written indifferently wherever they occur. The latter, however, is said by Buddhaghosa to mean Belatṭhassa putto. But on the whole metonymies alternate with corresponding patronymies so frequently, that it is often difficult to fix the right reading.

Mil. 4¹⁹. The forms Pakudho and Kakudho are used with nearly equal frequency. The transition from Kakudha, supposing this to be the original form, to Pakudha, belongs to a class of phonetical changes which offers one of the greatest difficulties in indentifying Pali words with Sanskrit. The mutes sometimes merge from one organic class into another, but I refer more especially to the change of a non-labial into a labial, or of a guttural into a dental, or *vice versâ*.⁶ Sometimes the cause [59] is evidently dissimilation, as in kipillika, -laka, S. pipīlikā (in Spiegel's Kammav. incorrectly written kimiṇṇaka); gaddūhana, S. dadrūghna;⁷ takkola,

⁶ Khāṇu, which Vararuci, I suppose rightly, refers to S. sthāṇu, belongs to the class of etymologizing corruptions, alluding to khaṇati. Comp. su-nakha, su-pāṇa (the Burmese write suvāṇa), both from ṣvan; atraja, q. d. 'born in this house'; rathesabha (janesabha, janesuta) perhaps = ratheṣubh; purindada = purandara; balasata and palāsāda for palasata (commonly written phal-, like most words beginning with pal-), 'a rhinoceros,' properly an adjective, possibly from S. parasvant, which in the Pet. Dict. is rendered conjecturally and perhaps wrongly 'a wild ass.' In luddaka for luddhaka, 'a hunter,' a confusion of luddha = lubdha and ludda = rudra has taken place. Khāṇu goes far to prove khaṇati to be the right reading; in Dhātumañjūsā (v. 44), to be sure, it is written with the dental, but its authority is in this case scarcely conclusive, as some grammatical sutta or other will easily account for the lingual, with which it is written invariably in all good Singh. MSS., and partly also by the Birmans.

⁷ It is used to denote a very small measure or space of time: Yo antamaso gaddūhanamattam-pi mettāṃ cittāṃ bhaveyya SN. XIX. 4 (vol. ii., p. 264²³); AN. IX. ii. 9 (vol. iv., p. 395). Nābhijānāmi ābādhāṃ uppannapubbaṃ antamaso gaddūhanamattam-pi MN. 124 (vol. iii., p. 127). Na

Abhidh., v. 304, corresponds to kakkola in the parallel verse of Amarakosha; in Mil. (p. 359) also name of a country, perhaps S. Karkoṭa; jalūpikā or jalopikā for jalokikā (Mil., p. 407). The latter instance may, and some others must, be referred to labialism, induced by an accompanying u or o: khajjopanaka, S. khadyota (Dh., p. 338);⁸ nirumbhati, sannirumbhati (to hush, to silence; also to be hushed, to stand immovable), probably from RUDH;⁹ sampuṭita [60] 'shrunk, shrivelled' (seyyathā pi tittakālābu āmakacchinno vātātapena sampuṭito hoti sammilāto, MN., 12, 36, 85, 100 (vol. i., p. 80²², etc.), no doubt from KUT or KUC, since sankuṭita and sankucita also occur; kaḷopi (kalopi, also kha-) is possibly identical with karoṭi.¹⁰ The influence of a following labial consonant¹¹

kiñci apuññam āpajjeyya antamaso gaddūhana-mattam-pi Mil., p. 110. The traditional explanation is very different and most absurd: Gaddūhanamattam-pi gāviṃ thane gahetvā ekakhīrabindudūhanakālamattam-pi (Ps.). Gandhūhanamattam-pi gandhavahanamattam dvīh angulihi gandhapiṇḍam gahetvā upasinghanamattam; apare gaddūhanamattant-pi pālim vatvā: gāviyā ekavāram thanam añjanamattant-pi attham vadanti (Mp.). In the latter passage, for añjana- I read āviñjana-, from āviñjati, 'to pull'—it is used in all the Nikāyas, and also in later writings—perhaps from PIÑJ, for which root that meaning seems admissible on account of S. piñjana.

⁸ Also khajjūpanaka, khajjūpa, khajjūpaka; more rarely khajjota, -aka.

⁹ Fausböll and Childers consider -rumhati equally admissible. In Singhalese MSS. mh and mbh are difficult to distinguish, but as an aspirate after a consonant in no other case passes into h, and as the Dhātumañjūsā (v. 91) reads rumbh, there can be no doubt that -rumbhāti is the only correct reading; and so it is spelled, I believe, by the Birmans, who are not in the habit of confounding h and bh.

¹⁰ Ālupa for āluka, Jāt. 446, v. l. (vol. iv., p. 46). It is possible on this analogy to identify sippi with cukti, the labializing u (*suppi) having afterwards been assimilated by the following vowel.

¹¹ Similarly mm for nv in Dhammantari (in Mil. name of a physician, dāḥadhammo (dhanuggaḥo) 'having a strong bow,' from dhanvan. So Buddhaghosa, no doubt correctly.

is evident in *bā-* for *dvā-* (*bārasa*, *bāvīsati*, *bat-tiṃsa*), *ubbhaṃ* in certain cases for *uddhaṃ* (*ubbha-tṭhako* *hoti āsanapaṭikkhitto*, 'always standing erect, rejecting a seat,' DN. 8, 25 (vol. i., p. 167, etc.; MN. 12 (vol. i., p. 78), 14, 40, etc.; *ubbhamukha*, 'with one's mouth upwards,' SN. XXVII., 10 (vol. iii., p. 238); *ubbhaṃ yojanam-uggatā*, Jāt. 530, v. 53 (vol. v., p. 269); *ubbham-uppatita-lomo*, DN. 30); Prakrit *appa*, Hindostanee *āp*, from *ātman*, is a well-known instance. The opposite transition from the labial into some other class is unfrequent; the principal example is the root *SARP*, which by dissimilation—for most of the prepositions contain a *p*—forms *-sakkati*; as *apasakkati*, 'to go away'; *osakkati* (S. *apasarpati*), *paccosakkati*, 'to retreat' (only once I have found *osappati*); *ussakkati*, *abbhussakkati* (or with assimilated vowels *-ssukkatī*), 'to ascend' (*ādicco nabhaṃ abbhussakkamāno*, DN., MN., S.N., AN., mostly written *-sukk-*); *nissakkati*, 'to go out' (whence *nissakkavacanam*, Buddhaghosa's appellation for the ablative¹²); *parisakkati*, 'to plan for' (*parisappanti*, Dh., v. 342, 343, in a different sense); *pasakkiya* = *prasrpya*.¹³

Mil. 5²¹. As it seems, the author's original plan was to invent knotty questions and answers to correspond for each of the six teachers. But very likely he found the [61] task too difficult, and abandoned his design. So there is scarcely any reason to suppose a lacuna in our text.

¹² The names by which cases are denoted by Buddhaghosa and other scholiasts are partly peculiar, and never used either in Sanskrit or by Pali grammarians—what Childers at *kāraṇam* says to the contrary I believe to be an error—except in so far as Vanaratana, the author of *Payogasiddhi*, winds up his *Kāraṇaṇḍo* with the following memorial stanza, which Alwis, Cat. I., p. 68, quotes from *Suttaniddesa*: *Paccattam-upayogañ-ca karaṇam sampadāniyam | nissakka-sāmi vacanam bhummam-ālaṇa' aṭṭhamam*.

¹³ Also *anuparisakkati* *paṭisakkati*, *anusakkati*; but after *ā*, *vi*, *sam*, *p* is retained. *Upasappati* is used by Vanaratana in a grammatical example.

Mil. 6³. *Acchati* is in comments explained by *nisīdati* or *vasati*; by grammarians it is rightly referred to *ĀS*, from which it proceeds through the aorist *acchi*, *S. *ātsīt*.¹⁴ Hence the Bengalee verb substantive *āch*°.

Mil. 6¹⁶. *Devaputta* may be considered the sing. of

¹⁴ *Dicchati*, 'to give,' derives from *adikshat*. *Vanaratana* rightly refers it to '*disa atisajjane*.' It occurs at SN. I., 32, v. 5=33, v. 2 (vol. i., p. 18²⁷=20¹⁰)=Jāt. 450, v. 7 (vol. iv., p. 65²¹): *Appasm' eke paveccanti, bahunā eke na dicchare* (=dadanti, Jāt. Com.). In the same Jāt. v. 1: *Apacanto* (not cooking) *pi dicchanti santo laddhāna bhojanam*, the scholiast paraphrases it by *dātum icchanti*, but it is unnecessary to suppose it to be the desiderative of *DĀ*, and it can scarcely be different from the word employed at v. 7. The verb *dicchati*, from '*disa pekkhane*,' mentioned by grammarians, might derive from *adr̥kshata*, but it is possibly a mistake, owing its origin to a confusion with the former word. '*Paveccati*,' 'to give,' is traditionally explained by *paveseti* (as *ifcaus.*) or *deti*, and looks like a derivative from *avikshat*, but neither *VIÇ* nor *VISH* make good sense. In meaning it agrees with *S. prayacchati*, but the identification presents some phonetical difficulty. *Pāhetha*, above p. 12² (Mil. 8²), from *pāhesi*, is not found elsewhere. *Uggañchitvāna*, Mil., p. 376 (in a verse quoted from an unknown source), from *uggañchi*. *Rudati* from *arudat*, as '*ruhati* (in verse) from *aruhāt*. From *DARÇ* a base *dakkh*° seems to be in use, which may have sprung from *addakkhi*, but more likely from the forms I shall mention directly. Some of the examples are deceptive: *dakkhisati* is a future with double termination (comp. *sakkhissati*, *modathavho*, etc.), *dakkhetha*, *dakkhema*, -*emu* are optatives of the future, *dakkhitāye*, SN. I., 37, v. 1 (vol. i., p. 26) = DN. 20, v. 1 (vol. ii., p. 254; Grimblot, *Sept Suttas*, p. 280), is perhaps, an infinitive of the future (other examples of the infinitive termination -*tāye* exist), likewise *dakkhitum*, Vin. I., p. 179¹¹ (also used occasionally in comments, as well as *dakkhitabba*). More unmistakable are *atiradakkhinī nāvā*, DN. 11 (vol. i., p. 222); AN. VI., v. 2 (vol. iii., p. 368) (but in the same suttas *tiradassī sakuṇo*, synonymous with *disākāko*, which was rightly explained by Minayeff, *Mél. As.* VI., p. 597), and *dakkhāpita*, Mil., p. 119³. *Pahamsitvā*, Five Jāt., p. 2, if it meant 'striking,' might be referred to a possible aor. **pahamsi*=*pahāsi*; but it signifies 'rubbing, whetting, polishing,' and belongs to *GHARSH*; comp. Jāt. I., p. 278⁵, etc. Comp. Childers in Kuhn's *Beitr.* VII., pp. 450-3.

deva, which in the sense of 'god' is rarely used in the singular.

Mil. 6¹⁹. The particle *pātu*, in *pātubhavati*, *pātukaroti*, from S. *prādur*, is an instance of a sonant being exchanged for a surd. By Prakrit grammarians this sort of change is said to be peculiar to a particular dialect—an invention, perhaps, purporting to account for this irregular euphonism. In Pali the true reason is in most cases [62] assimilation,¹⁵ the transformed sonant having been influenced by one or two neighbouring surds; or by *l*, which in contra-distinction to *ḷ = ḍ* is in this respect on a par with surds. Some of the principal instances are the following:¹⁶ *Akilāsu* from *a-glāsnu*; *pāceti* Dh. v. 135, not from PAC but AJ, like *pācana* S. *prājana*; *pithīyati*¹⁷ from

¹⁵ The term 'assimilation' may, perhaps, be excepted against, because it is commonly used in a somewhat different sense. But the process by which, *e.g.*, *dharma*, *agni* became *dhamma*, *aggi*, is, in my opinion, elision, not assimilation. We ought to remember that the pronunciation was *dharṃma*, *agṃni*.

¹⁶ I shall add some more: *chakala* S. *chagala*; *akalu* for *agalu*; *paloka* from *palujjati* (RUJ); *upaka* for *upaga* in *kulupaka*, etc.; *Upaku*, in *Payogasiddhi*, for *Upagu*, Kacc. 348 (Senart, p. 187); *Payāka* for *-ga*, Jāt. 543, v. 111 (vol. vi., p. 198); *vilāka* for *vilagga*, *ib.* 527, v. 10 (vol. v., p. 215); *thaketi* from *STHAG*; *lakanaka*, 'an anchor,' (Mil., p. 377), from *laketi*=*lageti*; *palikha* rarely for *paligha*, Jāt. 545, v. 64 (vol. vi., p. 276³); *Ceti*, S. *Cedi*; rarely *ketāra* for *kedāra*, Jāt. 381, v. 2 (vol. iii., p. 255); *patara* for *padara*, *ib.* 444, v. 3 (vol. iv., p. 32); *upathēyya* (DHĀ), 'a cushion,' *ib.* 547, vv. 34, 237 (vol. vi., pp. 490¹³, 515²³); *lāpa*, S. *lāba*; *lāpu*, *alāpu* for *-bu*; *pajāpatī*, 'wife,' from *prajāvatī* (perhaps also *nelapatī*, *puttapatī* for *-vatī*); *pettāpiya*, AN. VI., v. 2 (vol. iii., p. 348⁴); X. viii. 5 (vol. v., p. 188⁶), from *pitṛvya*; *tippa* for *tibba* in a certain formula of frequent use, especially in MN. *Chakaṇa* is S. *chagaṇa*, but as it derives from *çakṛt*, *çakan*, like *yakana* from *yakṛt*, *yakan*, the Pali form is the older of the two. *Upacikā* is connected, through *upatikā*, with S. *upadikā*, *upādika*, *utpādikā*; but as it offers an easy and natural etymology from *upa*- CI, it is probably the original of those corrupt forms.

¹⁷ *Pithīyati* was known to Childers only from Dh., v. 173, but it is of frequent use. Weber's obvious explanation did not meet with the

DHĀ, [63] for which explanation we are indebted to Weber, *Zeitschr. d. d. morg. Ges.* 1860, p. 56; chāpa, from çāva; palāpa, 'chaff' (more commonly in an adjectival sense, 'chaff-like, void'), from palāva; from LŪ lāpayati, Mhw. p. 61⁷, if the reading is correct; from PLU opilāpeti, 'to make to sink,' etc.; from VAR apāpurati or avāpurati, 'to open,' for *apāvarati¹⁸ with labialized vowel, apāpuraṇa or avāpuraṇa, 'a key,' and the well-known pāpuraṇa (sometimes pārupana, which is properly the noun of action), S. prāvaraṇa, for which the Burmese write pāvuraṇa, the corresponding verb being, by metathesis originating, perhaps, in the p. p. pāruta

reception to which it was entitled, for Childers and Kuhn repeated the old error; so difficult it is for truth to prevail. The fact is that pithiyati may be suspected of being a Singhalese blunder for pidhiyati, for so the Burmese write invariably. Since I wrote the above remarks, an increased knowledge of Birman MSS. has proved to me that a certain proportion of the words in question are there written with the sonant we are justified in expecting. This statement applies to bhinkāra (perhaps chakala), Upaku, mutinga, pithiyati, pāpuraṇa, supāṇa, and probably several others, the Birman form of which is still unknown to me. The Singhalese form of these words is likely to be posterior to the introduction of Buddhism and Pali literature into Transgangetic India. It continues an open question whether the rest are genuine, or were likewise corrupted in Ceylon, in the idiom of which assimilation, I think, forms a leading feature. On the other hand, it need not be said that the Burmese abound in errors of their own of this as well as other kinds; e.g., hupeyya (Vin. I., p. 8) for huveyya, which is the reading of genuine Singh. MSS. (the Upaka legend is found twice in MN.). Comp. Alwis, *Introd. to Kachch*, p. 48.

¹⁸ Childers, though otherwise adopting my explanation, considered avāpurati to contain ava, not apa; but he was mistaken. For, first, ava does not account for the change of the radical v to p. Next, apa is scarcely ever substituted for ava; but apāpurati and apāpuraṇa are in use, and the p. p. apāruta, S. apāvṛta, which Childers wrongly dissolved into a-pāruta, is constantly written with p. Finally, ava-VAR would mean 'to cover over,' and could only by a Prakritism signify 'to open' (comp. ava-CHAD). Weber rightly saw this (*Zeitschr. d. d. morg. Ges.*, 1876, p. 179).

S. prāvṛta, pārupati¹⁹ (which the Burmese [64] corrupt into pārumpeti). In a few other cases a final surd has remained unchanged in comp. before a vowel, as Yamataggi from Yamad-agni.²⁰

¹⁹ Pāpurati instead of parupati is mentioned by Childers, but I am afraid it is a mere lapse of memory; in Sn., at least, no form of that verb occurs except pāruta, and I have met with it nowhere. Weber (*loc. cit.*) was inclined to doubt the proposed etymology, and raised a twofold objection. First, because VAR appears in its due form in pavāra, pāvāra; next, on account of the conjugation of the verb. I must here remark, in the first place, that nothing is more common than for a root or Sanskrit word to appear in a variety of Pali shapes; e.g., kusīta and kosajja; pidaḥati, pithīyati, and pidhāna; ludra, rudda, ludda (Fausböll and Childers failed in explaining this word), and rūḷa (Mil., p. 275); tikicchā, vicikicchā; byāpāra, byāvaṭa (whence veyyāvacca; from PAR, as Böhlingk suspected); pāruta, vivaṭa, saṃvuta; apāpurati, ovaraka (S. apavaraka; at Jāt I., p. 391, read jāto-varake); niyyāteti, -deti; pājeti, pāceti (AJ); gilāna, akilāsu (GLĀ); aḍḍha, āḷhiya (S. āḍhya); and a great many more. Secondly, the regular Pali conjugation of VAR is varati, see āvarati, vivarati, saṃvarati. Forms corresponding to S. vṛṇoti, vṛṇāti are rare (vaṇimhase, Jāt. II., p. 187; apāpuṇanti amatassa dvāraṃ, It. 84, v. 2 (p. 80⁵); vaṇomi, Jāt. 513, v. 14 (vol. v., p. 27²⁵), if I conjecture rightly, the MSS. have apāmuṇanti and, against metre, vaṇṇemi), and partly questionable. Saṃvuṇoti is known only from grammarians, and so is āvuṇoti, -āti, if it means 'to cover.' But perhaps the same verb is intended which in our best MSS. is written āvunāti, 'to pierce, to impale, to string.' If so, we cannot with Childers derive it from VAR. It is a new present formed—like *vināti, vinati, 'to weave' (Jāt. II., p. 302⁵, and elsewhere), from vita, vīta, S. uta, ūta— from the p. p. āvuta (the regular equivalent of S. ota), on the analogy of luta lunāti (or suta suṇāti). The old present abbeti, S. āvayati, was almost superseded; I have only found it twice: coram gahetvā rājāno gāme kibbisakārakam abbenti nimbasūlasim, Jāt. 311, v. 3 (vol. iii., p. 34); ekam sūlasim abbetha, ib. 538, v. 37 (vol. vi., p. 17).

²⁰ Mutinga, or mudinga, from mṛd-anga; by false analogy, it seems, -tagga from -daggha. The latter part of bhinkāra for bhingāra, vākārā (the Burmese write vākurā) for vāgūrā, the rare ajakara for ajagara, Jāt. 427, v. 2 (vol. iii., p. 484), was mistaken for -kāra, -kara. From the phrase anabhāvam gameti, 'to annihilate,' it may be suspected that anabhāvakata

Mil. 8²⁶. Uḷunka is S. udanka. It means the ladle of the rice boiler, usually made of a cocoanut shell (see Mhw., p. 164).

Mil. 8²⁷. Sāmīci is to be derived from saṃyañc, with the abstract termination -ī or -i, formed, no doubt, from -ya, as in pāripūri from paripūra, pārisuddhi from parisuddha, kolaputti from kulaputta, pāramī from parama. Sāmīci consequently means 'completeness, perfection,' and seems to denote such minor offices as form a supplement to the strictly incumbent duties. As regards

—so the Singhalese and Burmese agree in writing—is a similar error for -gata, if it is not due to the vicinity of tālāvatthakata, which always precedes it (anabhāva from anu-abhāva, if Buddhaghosa is right; but in my opinion from bhāva, with the negative prefix doubled for emphasis' sake, like anamatagga; erroneous formations which would naturally intrude themselves from the apparent analogy of an-avajja being actually the reverse of vajja, anaññāta, S. anājñāta, coinciding in sense with aññāta, S. ajñāta. It is difficult to say why t takes the place of d in several derivatives of SAD: kusita, Pokkharasāti or -sādi, the locatives saṃsati, Jāt. 429, v. 5=430, v. 5 (vol. iii, pp. 493-95), and the frequent parisati-m (whence the synonymous sabhatim from sabhā, mentioned by grammarians); perhaps this irregularity may somehow be connected with the fact that sāteti (also sāteti, sādeti; paṇṇasaṭa=parṇaṣada), S. iṣṭāyati, is the actual causative of ḤAD. Pabbaja, which occurs occasionally for babbaja, is either a mere thoughtless confusion with pabbajati, or else an etymologizing corruption alluding to *parvaja, like supaṇa for suvāna, etc. (see above, p. [59]); for initials seem to be exempt from this sort of change, except under peculiar circumstances. Tuvam tuvam or tvam tvam, 'quarrel,' is undoubtedly S. dvandva; but it was made to look like the doubled pronoun tvam, and Buddhaghosa accordingly mistook it to mean 'theeing and thousing.' The same remark holds good, I think, as regards the reverse substitution of a sonant for a surd, for which reason I do not agree with those who derive jhāyati from KSHĀ. Dandha, 'slow', which is commonly referred to S. tandra, I am inclined to identify with dṛḍha, because daḍḍhi (in kāyadaḍḍhibahula, a word much used by scholiasts, but not found in the Nikāyas), S. dārḍhya, means 'sloth, inertness.' In the Sanskrit, or rather Prakrit, dhandha, the assimilation of the first and last consonants progressed one step farther.

the relation of the laity to the priesthood, the term implies, I believe, [65] such attentions as washing the priest's feet, presenting him a fan, and the like.

Mil. 8²⁹. 'Aticchatha bhante' is the phrase by which a mendicant priest is refused alms in a civil way (comp. Dh., pp. 241, 242). A *ṭikā* explains it thus: Atikkamitvā icchatha, idha bhikkhā na labbhati, ito aññattha gantvā bhikkham pariyesathāti adhippāyo.

Mil. 10¹³. The attainments of a learned brahman are in the suttas invariably described in these words. The Nighaṇḍu is, of course, the Nighaṇṭu.²¹ Keṭubha seems to mean the Kalpa; it is thus explained by Buddhaghosa: 'The science which assists the officiating priests (?) by laying down rules for the rites, or leaving them to their choice' (keṭubhan-ti kiriyākappavikappo, kavīnam upakārāya sattham). The Akkharappabheda, according to the same authority, means Çikshā and Nirukti (saha-akkharappabhedena 'sākkharappabhedānam'; akkharappabhedo ti sikkhā ca nirutti ca). In making the Itihāsas the fifth part of the doctrine, the Vedāngas seem to be reckoned as a whole; the scholiasts, however, think of Atharvaveda as the fourth part, though not mentioned. For the thirty-two mahāpurisalakkhaṇas, specified in several suttas, see Burnouf's Lotus. Anavaya is never used except in this phrase;²² I [66] take it to stand for an-avayava,²³ with elision of v, 'in whom there is nothing fragmentary.'

²¹ Buddhaghosa says Nighaṇḍūti nāmanighaṇḍu, *ukkhādīnam vevacanappakāsakam sattham.

²² When I wrote this I was unacquainted with AN; it occurs there, at V., xiv., 5 (vol. iii., p. 152), in a different phrase: tattha sikkhito hoti anavayo. Mp. renders it by samatto paripuṇṇo.

²³ Like upajjham for -āam, -āyam; ettam for -aam, -akam (at Dh., v. 196, the construction of the latter hemistich has been mistaken; several prose parallels prove the meaning to be, '... cannot be counted by anyone (so as to state), This is so much'). Traditionally anavaya is no doubt derived from VĀ (vayati); the comments say, Anavayo ti imesu lokāyata-mahāpurisalakkhaṇesu anūno paripūrakārī; avayo na hotiti vuttam

Mil. 11⁴. Pāpakānaṃ malānaṃ pabbājetuṃ seems to be inadmissible; it is probably an error for pāpakāni malāni.

Mil. 11⁶. Palibodha is, perhaps, an amalgamation of parirodha and paribādh; comp. sukhumāla (sukhuma, sukumāra).

Mil. 11²⁹. Onītapattapāṇi is thus explained in Payogasiddhi: Onīto pattato pāṇi yena, so onītapattapāṇi. Onīta consequently means apanīta.²⁴

Mil. 13⁷. All the canonical writings, and in an eminent degree the Abhidhamma, abound in repetitions, which in the MSS. are often omitted, being marked by the abbreviation 'pe.' The not omitting these repetitions is what is meant by 'vitthārena osāressāmi.' The sign of abridgment, pe, or, as it is written in Burmese copies, pa,²⁵ we are informed by Alwis (Introd., p. 93), means peyyāla, which is not, however, as he asserts, an imperative 'insert, fill up the gap,' but a substantive, peyyālo or peyyālaṃ, signifying a phrase to be repeated over and over again. I consider it a popular corruption of the synonymous pari-yāya, passing through *payyāya,²⁶ with -eyy- for -ayy-, like seyyā, S. çayyā.²⁷

hoti; avayo nāma yo tāni atthato ca ganthato ca santānetuṃ na sakkoti. Lokāyataṃ is explained by vitāṇḍavādasattham.

²⁴ Buddhaghosa says: Onītapattapāṇin-ti pattato onītapāṇim, apanītaḥatthanti vuttaṃ hoti. He mentions another reading, which is not in our MSS.: onītapattapāṇim, 'having washed his bowl and his hands,' from NIJ. The best Singh. MSS. write the word with n, not ṇ, as Childers has it, and for which there seems to be some Burmese authority. The MS. marked M, however, has it only in one place.

²⁵ Also la and gha; the latter I am unable to account for, unless it be a contraction of la-pa—to which Burmese gha bears some likeness—instead of pa-la.

²⁶ This form, perhaps, occurs in the Bhabra inscription. Burnouf reads payāya for Wilson's paliyāya (see Lotus, p. 724).

²⁷ And like -teyya for -tāyya, -tāya, S. -tavya. (Of the various changes which the suffix -tavya undergoes, apart from -tabba, only one example is found in printed texts, and it has

Mil. 17¹³. The phrase 'bhuttāviṃ onītapatta-pāṇiṃ . . . ekamantaṃ nisīdi' is very frequent in the suttas, and no [67] absolutive is ever added, like *disvā* in M, or *viditvā* farther down in all our MSS. Scholiasts supply *ñātvā* or *upagantvā*. Some such verb, it is true, must be understood, unless we are to consider 'bhuttāviṃ onītapattapāṇiṃ' as an accusative absolute, of which, however, scarcely another instance exists.²⁸

escaped the notice of our Pali scholars. At Dh., v. 316, we must read with the scholiast, *Alajjitāye lajjanti, lajjitāye na lajjare*, because *lajjita* cannot mean 'what one ought to be ashamed of'; in other texts *-tayya*, *-teyya*, *-tāya* are not unfrequent.)

²⁸ This is no doubt an error. I have subsequently met with several cases much like the one above, from which I select the following as the least doubtful: *Etad-attani sambhūtaṃ brahmayānaṃ anuttaraṃ niyanti dhīrā lokamhā aññadatthuṃ* (only, exclusively) *jayā jayaṃ*, SN. XLIV., 4, v. 4 (vol. v., p. 6). *Yathā pi camarī, vālaṃ kismiñca* (or *-ci*) *paṭilaggitaṃ, upeti maraṇaṃ tattha, na vikopeti vāladhim*, Bv., v. 202 (II., v. 124)=Jāt. I., p. 20. *Evam-pi maṃ tvaṃ khali-taṃ, sapañña, paṇāmanantassa punappasīda*, Jāt. 474, v. 10 (vol. iv., p. 206). *Tā, chandarāgaṃ purisesu uggataṃ, hiriyaṃ nivārenti sacittam-attano*, *ib.*, 535, v. 92 (vol. v., p. 410¹⁵). The comment in these two cases supplies 'viditvā.' *Santaṃ yeva kho pana paraṃ lokam: natthi paro loko ti 'ssa diṭṭhi hoti . . . ti sankappeti, . . . ti vācam bhā-sati, . . . ti āha; . . . santaṃ yeva kho pana kiriyam: natthi kiriyā ti 'ssa diṭṭhi hoti, . . . ti āha*, MN. 60 (vol. i., p. 402). *Evammanī assa, atathaṃ samānaṃ*, MN. 105 (vol. ii., p. 256). Ps. makes no remark on the subject. *Yo bhikkhave evaṃ vadeyya: Yathā yathā 'yaṃ puriso kammaṃ karoti tathā tathā naṃ paṭisaṃvediyatīti, evaṃ santaṃ bhikkhave brahmacariyavāso na hoti, okāso na paññāyati sammā dukkhassa antakiriyāya; yo ca kho bhikkhave evaṃ vadeyya: Yathā yathā vedanīyaṃ ayaṃ puriso kammaṃ karoti tathā tathā 'ssa vipākaṃ paṭisaṃvediyatīti, evaṃ santaṃ bhikkhave brahmacariyavāso hoti, okāso paññāyati s. d. antakiriyāya*, AN. III., x., 9 (vol. i., p. 249); *evaṃ santanti evaṃ sante*, Mp. In more recent Pali I do not consider this use of the accusative admissible. Hence in Mil., at p. 143, for *hatthagataṃ janapadaṃ* I adopted the locative on the

Mil. 18¹⁰. The canonical texts of Buddhism are principally divided into three piṭakas, or baskets. We are at first view naturally inclined to think of three baskets of manuscripts. But such cannot be the Buddhist sense of the word, since the whole of the Buddhavacana, according to tradition, was in existence, together with its divisions and subdivisions, long before the texts were written down. 'A basket of oral tradition' is certainly a strange expression, but it may perhaps be accounted for in the following manner. Buddha occasionally impugns the authority of his antagonists on the ground of their doctrine being traditional, and tradition is uncertain because memory is often [68] unfaithful:²⁹ Puna ca param Sandaka idh' ekacco satthā anussaviko hoti anussava-sacco, so anussavena itihītihaparamparāya piṭakasampadāya dhammaṃ deseti; anussavikassa kho pana Sandaka satthuno anussava-saccassa sussatam-pi hoti dussatam-pi hoti, tathā pi hoti aññathā pi hoti. 'And again, Sandaka, suppose a teacher to be a traditionist, one who knows only the truths he has heard from others; he preaches his doctrine from tradition, through a series of teachers who received it one from another, basket-wise;³⁰ now,

authority of M (probably a conjecture, but a good one, for -am and -e are often confounded), and at p. 290, for dve tayo divase vīti-vatte I now think that I ought to have substituted d. t. d. vīti-vattetvā, -tvā being not unfrequently omitted or added at random. Nīte dārake (p. 275) is no doubt the loc. sing.

²⁹ This might seem to bespeak great improvidence on Buddha's part, since after his death the stricture would apply no less to his own teaching; but then his dhammo was 'ehipassiko opanayiko paccattam veditabbo viññūhi'; it was not a thing to be learned by rote. However, these sayings are not likely to have been invented after his death, and they are probably as genuine as any word of Buddha's.

³⁰ In thus translating 'piṭakasampadāya,' I thought more especially of the compound adjective evaṃsāmpada, syn. with idisa; but I should now prefer deriving sampadā in this context from DĀ, because I have found in a similar passage the word sam-

such a teacher will remember some things well and some things badly. He may be right or he may be wrong,' MN. 76, (vol. i., p. 520), Comp. also Yam-idam bho Gotama brāhmaṇānaṃ porāṇaṃ mantapadaṃ itihītihaparamparāya piṭakasampadāya (āgataṃ should be added, I suppose; ib. 95, vol. ii., p. 169). Working people are represented as accoutred with kuddāla-piṭakaṃ,³¹ 'hoe and basket.' It appears that baskets travelling from hand to hand were used instead of wheelbarrows, as fire-buckets are occasionally in our day. The term piṭaka consequently refers to the fact of oral tradition, and so do undoubtedly several other names of the Buddhist canon or parts of it. [69] Pāḷi,³² in my opinion,

padāna used as its substitute: *Etha tumhe Kālāmā mā anussavena, mā paramparāya, ma itikirāya, mā piṭakasampadānena, mā takkahetu, mā nayahetu, mā ākāraparivitakkena, mā diṭṭhinijjhānakhantiyā, mā bhabbarūpatāya, mā: samaṇo no garūti; yadā tumhe K. attanā va jāneyyātha, etc.* ('in the manner baskets are handed about,' AN. III., vii. 5 (vol. i., p. 189); comp. vii. 6 (p. 193); IV., xx. 3 (vol. ii., p. 191). Traditionally piṭaka in these texts is understood in the technical sense of 'section of a book.' *Piṭakasampadāyāti vaggapaṇṇāsakāya piṭakabandhanasampattiya* (Ps.); *mā piṭakasampadānenāti amhākam piṭakatantiyā saddhim samentīti mā gaṇhittha* (Mp). It is far more probable that this sense originated in texts such as those I have quoted.

³¹ *E.g.*, *Seyyathā pi bhikkhave Gangānadī pācīnannā pācīnapoṇā pācīnapabbhārā, atha mahā janakāyo āgaccheyya kuddālapīṭakam ādāya: mayam imam Gangānadīm pacchāninnaṃ karissāma pacchāpoṇam pacchāpabbhāran-ti*, SN. XXXIV., 242 (vol. iv., p. 191), etc. Comp. *Jāt. I.*, p. 336²⁹.

³² The word pāḷi, which is wanting in the best Singh. MSS. available to me, is spelled thus almost constantly in those of second or third rate, and the Burmese agree with them, so far as my experience goes. Comp. *paṭipāṭi* and *S. pāṭi*. With the spelling pāli it occurs in Asoka's inscriptions in the sense of 'precept,' which proves that the word is much older than it would appear from Buddhist literature, and also that it then bore a more general sense than the one to which it was afterwards limited. The name of the *suttadharas*, who

properly signifies the 'row' or 'series' of teachers by whom the text was handed down; or, in Mohammadan terms, it is first the 'isnād,' next the hadīth' resting on its authority.³³ Tanti, used as a synonym for pāṇi, originally means 'string, chord.' As a third synonym I consider the much-discussed 'sutta;' literally the 'thread' of tradition.³⁴ In the like manner paveni, 'race, lineage, the traditional law for secular matters,' lit. signifies 'a long (pa-) braid.' Vaṃsa, 'pedigree, list of teachers,' is often used for 'traditional doctrine or custom,' e.g., Five Jāt, p. 52; comp. Aliyava(m)sāni in the Bhabra inscription.³⁵

Mil. 19¹⁷. Bhadanta, though only known as an honorific appellation of a Buddhist, seems to have been originally invented as a nickname to signify one who addresses Buddha by the word bhadante, which is the emphatic form corresponding to bhante; just as bhovādin (Dh., v. 396, and the parallel verse of the Vāsetṭhasutta, MN. 98, v. 27 = Sn. 35, v. 27; Jāt. 543, v. 158, vol. vi., p. 211) is used by way of retaliation by the Buddhists for those who style Buddha 'bho Gotoma.'³⁶ (For a somewhat different explanation by Weber, see his note to the verse.) Bhante [70] and bho Gotama are, in fact, the

formed a sort of tribunal (Alwis, Introd., p. 100; Lassen, Ind. Alt. II., p. 80), shows that also sutta was not confined to religious or scientific tradition.

³³ A few Buddhistic isnāds are still preserved in comments; they are at least sufficiently genuine to prove that such lists were once in existence.

³⁴ He who receives a sutta from his teacher, for the time being holds, as it were, 'the end of the thread,' suttanta. Compare also such phrases as suttam bandhati, 'to fasten a thread;' suttam osāreti, 'to let down a thread,' which are used for composing or reciting a sutta; suttanikkhepa, 'throwing down a thread,' for sutta composition.

³⁵ Comp. Atimadhuraṃ Buddhavacanāṃ mā nassatu, tantim dhāressāmi, vaṃsaṃ ṭhapessāmi, pavenim pālessāmi (Ps. 22). A ṭikā says, Pavenīti dhammasan-tati, dhammassa avicchedena pavattiti attho.

³⁶ Comp. Childers in *Journ. R. A. S.*, vol. v., p. 230.

two distinctive styles of address used in the suttas respectively by Buddhist and non-Buddhist interlocutors. Though *bhante* would seem to be a contraction of *bhadante*, the vocative of *bhadanta*, this is perhaps an error. I incline to consider *bhante* a contraction either of *bhavant* or *bhagavant*, and *bhadanta* to proceed from the elided form **bha-anta*, with insertion of an inorganic *d*, like *attadattha*, *sadattha*, *anva-d-eva* for *anva(g)-eva*, *samma-d-eva* for *samma(g)-eva*.

Mil. 21¹⁷. *Pāramī* was explained in a preceding note [64]. We may add that the word sometimes takes the pleonastic suffix *-tā*, before which the final is shortened, thus forming *pāramitā*.³⁷ This form is used in Buddhist Sanskrit, and has been differently explained by Burnouf and Böhtlingk (see the Petersburg Dictionary).

Mil. 22¹⁷. *Katheti* is probably a passive form for *kathīyati*; a rare contraction certainly, of which no other undoubted instance is known to me except *paṭisaṃvedeti*, used indifferently with *-diyati*. I take it, like the synonymous *akkhāyati* in the frequent phrase *aggamakkhāyati*, in the sense of 'appearing, proving to be,' or simply 'being.'

Mil. 22¹⁸. *Devamantiya* is evidently one of the 500 *Yonakas*, as well as *Anantakāya*, mentioned farther down (Mil., p. 29). Both names, in spite of their Indian garb, are void of meaning ('counsellor of the gods,' 'having an infinite body'), and are, no doubt, corrupted from the Greek names *Demetrius* and *Antiochus*. It is not clear whether the same remark applies to the name of *Mankura* (*Hermagoras*?). At all events the author's list of

³⁷ The suffix *-tā* is occasionally added to abstracts in *-ti*, as *san-tuṭṭhitā*; very often to those in *-ya*, as *kāruṇṇātā*, *kamyatā*, *sahavyatā*, *pāṭikulyatā*, *pāguṇṇātā*, *dovacassatā*, etc., or in *-ana*, especially in later writings, as *anivattanātā*, *anosakkanātā* (*tāṇātā*, Dh., v. 288), etc. Transcribers frequently corrupt these forms, comp. Dh., p. 383, l. 16 [read *patthanātāya*], 18; Mil., p. 132, etc.) Also *-na* is superadded, as *jāratana*, *purisattana*, etc.

Yonaka names was at an end here, for Sabbadinna is S. Carvadatta.

Mil. 22²⁸. Chambhita from STABH, with transposition of the sibilant, like cheva (also theva) 'a drop' from STIP, and in inverse order tharu from tsaru.

SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES.

[71] The specimen above, apart from the foot-notes, was written in 1868 and communicated to a few Pali scholars, the late lamented R. C. Childers among the rest, who in the preface to his Dictionary mentioned my performance in terms, I am afraid, too flattering. Various circumstances have retarded its publication, and I am aware that the matter it contains is partly a great deal better known now than it would have been at the time of its compilation. I cannot help thinking, however, that in its present shape it still offers some interest to Pali scholars, to whose judgment I further submit some additional notes, mostly intended to give a few supplements to our Pali grammars.

Mil. 1². Upagañchi is the reading of the four Singhalese MSS., and it is doubtlessly correct. At some unknown period, either on the continent of India or in Ceylon, the aorist -gacchi was all but displaced by -gañchi. I have for years made this form the subject of particular inquiry, and judging from nearly 300 examples I find that the Singhalese write -gañchi in about four cases out of five. Whenever several MSS. or parallel passages are available, the reading almost always proves to be -gañchi, with the exceptions I shall mention presently. Gacchati, gaccheyya, etc., of which there are thousands of examples, are never once written with a nasal, and, if the form were not right, no reason appears that could have induced transcribers to write -gañchi, whereas -gacchi being regular was likely enough to be substituted by copyists who had a smattering of scholarship. At Kacc. 517 (Senart, p. 263) the reading

āgacchum cannot possibly be correct, since the sutta refers to mere anomalies. But the error is not surprising if we consider what seems to be a fact—Turnour's statement that the grammar was not extant in Ceylon in 1837 is not disproved by Alwis' finding a Singhalese copy in 1855—that all the copies of Kaccāyana, if not Transgangesic, descend from one or more Burmese sources. For by the Burmese -gañchi is used so rarely that I once thought they ignored it altogether. And this [72] may be connected with the fact that Kaccāyana, whose precepts they seem to follow more closely than the Singhalese usually do, allows the formation of -gacchi at 476 (Senart, p. 247).¹ He is no doubt right, if we understand him rightly: in the compound adhigacchati the aorist does not take the nasal (excepting -gañchum and ajjhagañchi), and in the plural, before -imsu, -ittha, -imha, -gañchi is very rarely used.²

The form in question has not been overlooked by native grammarians. I pointed out just now that Kaccāyana, or at least his scholiast, takes notice of it. And Moggallāna says expressly, 'Daṃsassa ca ñchañ,' which the sanna and Payogasiddhi agree in understanding thus: 'DAMÇ, and as implied by ca also GAM, optionally form

¹ It is rather surprising that Kaccāyana should have restricted to gacch° an observation which applies with equal truth to most other irregular bases of conjugation; unless, indeed, this is intended for a polemical remark against previous grammarians, who possibly excluded the aorist -gacchi; perhaps also the future gacchissati, which, in fact, is very rarely used in old prose, and, to my knowledge, never in old verse (Mil., p. 412?), certainly not in Dh., Sn., Jāt., nor the Nikāyas.

² I have found but one example from the old language: upagañchiṃsu, SN. XLI., 13 (vol. iv., p. 348), and only two more in other texts. In the first and second persons of the plural, both -gañchi and -gacchi seem to be all but unused; I have noticed only upagañchittha, Mhw., p. 28). Gacchiṃsu, on the contrary, is frequent, but examples from canonical writings are still wanting. It would seem that a certain tendency prevailed to avoid nasals after two consecutive vowels: gacchiṃsu is to gañchi as -mhi to -smiṃ, or -iṃsu (= -aṃsu = S. -an + su) to -isuṃ.

the aorist by means of the suffix *ñchan*,³ or by substituting *ñch* for the final of the root.³

I have said enough, I hope, to show that Childers did not do well in passing judgment upon the form. Nor is it so difficult as he thinks to say how it arose. The original aorist *-gacchi* was mistaken to be on a par with *acchi*, *akkocchi*, etc., and to derive directly from GAM with the imaginary termination *-cchi*, abstracted from these and the like aorists. It was consequently by a would-be correction changed to *-gañchi*, very much in the same manner as *gatvā* was amended to and supplanted by [73] *gantvā*; and as the latter is of undoubted antiquity, it is not easy to be seen why *-gañchi* should not likewise belong to the stage of genuine continental Pali.

That such is the origin of the form I am discussing is strongly corroborated by the existence of a future of similar formation, *gañchatī* or *gañchīti*, which is far from unfrequent, though grammarians, as far as I know, have left it unnoticed. Compare the following examples: *Ehi tvam rājakumāra, samaṇassa Gotamassa vādam āropehi; evam te kalyāṇo kittisaddo abbhuggañchīti*:¹ *Abhayena rājakumārena samaṇassa Gotamassa vādo āropito ti* (MN. 58 (vol. i., p. 392); the passage is repeated farther down in the same sutta). *Bahūni ca duccaritāni caritvā gañchisi kho papatam cirarattam* (Sn. 36, v. 9 (v. 665); the metre is *Dodhaka*). *Evañ-ce mam viharantaṃ pāpimā upagañchisi*,² *tathā maccu karissāmi na me maggam-pi dakkhisi* (SN. VIII., 1, v. 5; vol. i., p. 186³).

³ The aorist *adañchi*, S. *adānkshīti*, is found, I believe, at Jāt. 444, v. 3 (vol. iv., p. 32; written '*aḍanthi*' in the Cop. MS.); ib. 490, v. 5 (vol. iv., p. 330, '*aḍachi*'); Cp., v. 338 ('*atamsi*' in the London Phayre MS. ['*aḍamsi*' in the edition of Morris p. 100, v. 8]).

¹ At SN. XLI., 9 (vol. iv., p. 323), this phrase recurs with the reading *abbhuggacchati*, which no doubt should be *abbhuggaṇchati*.

² The parallel stanza, Th., v. 1213, has *upagacchasi* in a Burmese MS.

Mātuc-ca³ me rodantya jettḥassa ca bhātuno akāmassa hatthe pi te gahessaṃ, na hi gañchisi no akāmānaṃ (Jāt. 525, v. 19; vol. v., p. 183). Mettaṃ cittaṃ bhāvētha appamāṇaṃ divā ca ratto ca, atha gañchitha devapuraṃ, āvāsaṃ puññakammānaṃ (*ib.*, v. 51 (p. 191); written 'gañchitha' against the metre, thoughtless scribes mistaking it for an aorist). Sā 'jja lohitasañchannā gañchisi Yamasādhanaṃ (*ib.*, 531, v. 47 (vol. v., p. 304); the metre recommends gañchisi). Pūjitā ñāṭisanghehi na gacchisi (*sic*) Yamakkhayaṃ (*ib.*, v. 49). Ekarrattiṃ vasitvāna pāto gacchasi (read gañchasi or gañchisi) brāhmaṇa, nānāpupphehi sañchanne nānāgandhavibhūsite nānāmūlaphalākiṇṇe (viz., dārake) gacchissādāya (read gañchis' ādāya) brāhmaṇa (*ib.*, 547, v. 453; vol. vi., p. 543). I have noticed more than a score of instances, but the rest would require some discussion as to the right reading, for ignorant copyists too often trouble us with their gacchati instead of gañchati, and the evidence [74] here given will suffice to prove that such a form is in use. It comes very opportunely to our assistance in explaining -gañchi, for it is not like that aorist without analogies. From HAN sprung up in the same manner the futures paṭihankhāmi (in the formula 'iti purāṇaṇ-ca vedanaṃ paṭihankhāmi navaṇ-ca vedanaṃ na uppādessāmi'), hañchati Jāt. 457, v. 6 (vol. iv., p. 102), hañchema, Jāt. II., p. 418 (an optative of the future; the form was noticed by Mogallāna and Vanaratana), and, I believe,

³ The metre requires mātuc-ca, which is most uncommon in Piṭaka texts; for even in prose I have otherwise found mātuc-ca, pituc-ca, bhātuc-ca, in exclusive use. Comp. kaccic-ca, Jāt. 547, v. 738 (the reading C^k not referred to, vol. vi., p. 585¹⁶); munic-ca, MN. 91, v. 2 (vol. ii., p. 144); perhaps maccuc-ca, Dh., vv. 135, 150; socic-ca paridevic-ca, madic-ca pamādic-ca, AN. VIII., vii., 1; viii. 7 (vol. iv., 294, 326) (in prose). Cases like these account for the false cca instead of ca in ādiyati-cca, Sn. 41, v. 6 (v. 785); jātu-cca, Jāt. 539, vv. 134, 137 (vol. vi., pp. 59-60).

āhañcham.¹ All these were formed in seeming accordance with vakkhati, dakkhati, or dakkhīti, lacchati, pacchati or pacchīti (S. prāpsyati; AN. IX., i., 4; vol. iv., p. 362¹⁰), etc. Comp. Prakrit soccham from ÇRU.

Mil. 1⁴. Thānāthāna. Compounds like bhavābhava, kiccākicca are by scholiasts considered to contain the prefix a, to which they arbitrarily ascribe the signification of vuddhi, 'increase,' so that such words are generally said to mean 'small and large things.' This is positively disproved by thānāthāna, unless we write it with the Burmese thānaṭṭhāna. Fausböll, at Dasaratha-Jāt., p. 26, explained the case on the analogy of rajāpatha for rajapatha, etc. But as that elongation is limited to a few very old words, I am inclined to trace this sort of dvandva to a drawing together of phrases like gāmā gāmaṃ, dumā dumaṃ. It is occasionally not very easy to tell whether the text means to give us a compound or two words. There are certain dvandvas consisting of the same word repeated with a preposition, as angapaccanga, buddhānubuddha, mañcātimañca, etc.; but the compounds in question can scarcely contain the prep. ā. Nor can they be considered to be analogous to calācala, keṇākeṇi, etc.

Mil. 1⁷. Suttajālasamatthita, i. q., samatthita-suttajāla. Samatthita I take to mean 'reconciled' (comp. samarthana in Wilson).

[75] Mil. 1¹¹. Taṃyathā. The author, in availing himself of this Sanskritizing form, shows that he did not per-

¹ This is a conjecture of mine in a passage where the copies vary extremely. I refer to a stanza which enters into the Upaka legend, Mn. 26 (vol. I., p. 171) = 85 = Vin. I., p. 8. My MSS. exhibit āhaccam, āhañña (Burm.), agajum; Alwis (Buddh. Nirv., p. 133) quotes āhañcum; Oldenberg gives āhañci, āhañhi, ahañhi, ahamhi. From these elements I construed a new reading, āhañcham, and I think it is confirmed by Buddhaghosa, who explains the word in question by paharissāmi, and no doubt had that reading before him 'Āgaccham (sic) amata Dundubhin-ti dhammacakkapaṭilābhāya amatabherim paharissāmiti gacchāmi.

ceive the identity of S. *tad* *yathā* with the Pali, or rather *Māgadhi*, *seyyathā*. In *Māgadhi* the masc. in -e was, for a great part at least, substituted for the neuter. There is double evidence that more especially *se* superseded *tad*. First, the Bhabra inscription professes, 'E keci bhaṁte bhagavatā budhena bhāsīte save se subhāsīte vā,' = 'yaṁ kiñci . . . bhāsitaṁ sabbaṁ taṁ subhāsitaṁ yeva.' Secondly, in a *Māgadizing* passage of MN. 105 (vol. ii., p. 254²⁵), it is said, 'Āṇaṇḍādhimuttassa purisapuggalassa ye (= yaṁ) lokāmisasaññojane (= -naṁ) se vante (= taṁ vantaṁ),' etc. In Jaina *Māgadhi* *se* = *tad* is frequent as a particle, and *se yahā* occurs there, too (see Weber's *Bhagavati*). Compare also *yebhuyyena* from **yadbhūyas*.

Mil. 3⁴. *Majjhantika* apparently derives from **majjhanta*, like *pubbanta*, *aparanta*, q. d. 'the middle end!' No doubt a vulgar corruption of **majjhanhika*, or rather S. *madhyandina*, *mādhyandina*.

Mil. 4⁴. *Sūriya* from *sūra* occurs at SN. XLVII., 51 (vol. v., p. 228³); Jāt. I., p. 282.

Mil. 4²⁶. *Sārāṇiya* is the spelling of the Singh. *Nikāya* MSS., with scarcely an exception. It is formed with double *Vridhhi*, like *sāmāyika*, *pettāpiya* (or *pettāviya*, from *pitṛvya*; see p. [62]), *poroseyya* (MN. 54 (vol. i., p. 366¹), explained by *purisānucchavika*), *āvenika* (not -ṇ-, no doubt from *a-vinā*, lit. 'sine quo non'), and perhaps others. A phenomenon allied to this is the occasional substitution of *a* for penultimate *i* and *u*: *Koṇḍañña* (S. *Kaundinya*), *sākhalya* (*sakhila*), *kolañña* (*kulina*), *kosajja* (*kusita*), *āṇaṇja* ('immovableness,' from **aniṇja*), *porohacca* (or *-hicca*), *bāhusacca* (*bahussuta*; doubling induced by composition is dropped in case of *Vridhhi*, except after *catu*).

Mil. 5¹². *Pukkusa*, S. *pukkasa*. Assimilation is one of the most common causes of vowel change in Pali. Instances of *i* assimilating *a* were given above, p. [55]. *i* acts upon *u* in *vijigucchati*, *parijigucchati* (whence *jigucchati*), *khīpita*, 'sneezing' (for **khupita*,

*khuvita, KSHU),¹ perhaps in sippi, from çukti (p. [60]). But on the whole i—i is a sequence of sounds not much in favour; on the contrary, i before or after i is not rarely assimilated by a neighbouring a: tadaminā, paṭhavī, pokkharanī, gharanī, dhajanī (or -inī), kāhasi kāhati, karahaci, timingala (or -gila), perhaps icchasaṃ,² etc., and so is occasionally a [76] single i: koṭṭhaka (Five Jāt., p. 36), ñātaka, upapajjare and similar forms from the Vedic termination of -ire. The vowel a likewise influences u: pana, āyasmant, kappara (S. kūrpara), kahaṃ (S. kuha), tavaṃ for tuvaṃ, bāhā for bāhu, Sutanā (Jāt. 501; vol. iv., p. 413¹³), perhaps for -tanu, sakkhalī (S. çashkulī), accharā and accharikā of the same origin with S. ācchurita (Dasaratha-Jāt., p. 22). Oftener, however, u assimilates a and i: uḷunka, kurunga, kunkuṭṭha (Burmese kan-, S. kankushṭha), puthujjana (partly confounded with puthu), anutthunaṃ, Dh., v. 156, and elsewhere, usūyā;¹ ucchu, usu, susu, kukku, etc. The transformations of the vowel ṛ are partly to be accounted for in the same manner, as gaha, gihin, anaṇa (iṇa), uju, utu. Singhalese transcribers are rather prone to this sort of euphonism, and errors like payurupāsati, vinubbhujati, nuṭṭhura, kaṭucchu,

¹ Not from KSHIV, which has a different sense, and forms chubhati, whence chuddha, Dh., v. 41, etc. (comp. Mil., pp. 130, 187-8).

² Yehi jātehi nandissaṃ (aor.) yesañ-ca bhavam-icchasaṃ, SN. VII., 14, vv. 1, 6 (vol. i., p. 176). The commentary on Dh., v. 324, quotes this stanza with the reading icchisaṃ, and an imitation of it has, Yena jātena nandissaṃ yassa ca bhavam-icchisaṃ, Jāt. 432, v. 9 (vol. iii., p. 513). Icchasaṃ, if correct, may, however, have been formed by adding, -saṃ to the A-terminations, like pamāḍassaṃ, MN. 130 (vol. iii., p. 179); AN. III., iv. 6 (vol. i., p. 139¹).

¹ In anasūyaka the preceding a sometimes preserves the primitive sound, and at Five Jāt., p. 13⁷ = Jāt. II., p. 192, this is likely to be the right reading. Payogasiddhi quotes 'kā asūyā avijānataṃ, but at SN. IV., 25, v. 8 (vol. i., p. 127), the reading is usūyā, and so it is quoted at Kacc. 277 (Senart, p. 125).

etc., are not uncommon; so some caution is necessary. It may be doubted that all the forms of this description are genuine, even if the MSS. do not vary. *Niṭṭhubhati* is about as frequent as *nutṭh-*, which renders the authority of the latter questionable. *Abbhussukkati* (p. [60]) is not written so uniformly. *Kapaṇiddhika*, as the word is written almost constantly in Singh. MSS., is perhaps an error for *-addhika*. Long vowels are not exempt from this sort of change: *seḷeti* (Sn. 37, v. 4 (v. 682), etc.) from *ḤĀḬ*, *oṇojeti* from *NIJ*, *vedheti* from **vyāthayati* (comp. *byādhayissati*, SN. VIII., 1, v. 3 (vol. i., p. 185) = Th., v. 1211; Th., v. 46), *ereti*² perhaps for *ireti* (comp., however, the Pet. Dict.), *khepeti* probably from *kshāpayati* (KSHI). The modifying vowel is often a short one: *masāraka*, S. *masūraka*, a point to which I shall have occasion to revert farther down.

Mil. 5²⁶. *Dosina* or *-nā*, S. *jyautsna*, *jyotsnā*, was rightly explained by Weber, see *Bhagavatī*. The same [77] phrase is found in the introduction to DN. 2 (vol. i., p. 47), of which our text is in part an imitation; and the word is also used at MN. 32 (vol. i., p. 212); Th., vv. 306, 1119; Jāt. 544, v. 19 (vol. vi., p. 223). *Buddhaghosa's* explanation is a striking instance of his occasional errors: 'Dosinā ti dosāpagatā, abbha-mahika-dhūma-rajo-rāhūti imehi upakkilesehi virahitā ti attho.'

Mil. 7⁹. I ought, no doubt, to have written *uparūpa-rūpapattiko*; the Singhalese are extremely apt to substitute *uppajjati*, *uppatti* for *upapajjati*, *upapatti*.

Mil. 7²⁰. *Paggaṇhitvā dehi*. The Burmese corrector did not know or was unwilling to acknowledge this phrase. But the use of *deti* in connection with an absolute to signify 'doing something for the benefit of some one' is very common: *Rukkhe . . . tacchentānaṃ parivat-tetvā deti* (turned the logs for them), Ten Jāt., p. 25. *Dārūni āharitvā aggaṃ katvā dassati*, Five Jāt.

² At Dh., v. 134, read *n' eresi*.

p. 2 (in this place Fausböll rightly rendered it 'will make a fire for thee'); Dh., p. 186 (not 'made a fire and gave it them,' Childers at samayo); Jāt. I., p. 296. Esa no bhājetvā dassati, *ib.* I., p. 265. Pettikaṃ me rajjaṃ gaṇhitvā dehi, Dh., p. 157; Ten Jāt., p. 29; Five Jāt., p. 3. Cīvaraṃ no katvā detha, Jāt. I., p. 220. Pallankaṃ attharitvā adāsi, *ib.* I., p. 129. Gītassa atthaṃ kathetvā detha, Jāt. 415 (vol. iii., p. 410⁸), etc., etc. I also think that gaṇhāti is similarly used, though less frequently, in the reverse meaning of 'doing something in one's own behalf.' Examples from old Pali are wanting, and, as in Singhalese, the corresponding verbs 'denavā' and 'gannavā' are largely used in the same manner (see Ferguson's 'Singhalese Made Easy,' Colombo, 1878, p. 61), there can be little doubt that this phraseology sprung up in Ceylon.

Mil. 9²⁰. Tadūpiya is, perhaps, properly a Vinaya word; at least it is rare in the texts with which I am acquainted: Nālikodanaparamaṃ bhuñjāmi tadūpiyañ-ca sūpeyyaṃ, SN. XXI., 96 (vol. iii., p. 146²⁸). Pañcamattāni taṇḍulavāhasatāni paṇḍumuṭṭikassa (or -ṭṭi-) sālino tadūpiyañ-ca sūpeyyaṃ, MN. 81 (vol. ii., p. 54). In Ps. it is explained 'tadanurūpa-telaphāṇitādīni' (comp. Minayeff's Pātim., p. 81). In a ṭikā I have found 'Bhaṇḍāgāriko alankāra-bhaṇḍaṃ paṭisāmetvā pasāḍkanakāle tadūpiyaṃ alankārabhaṇḍaṃ rañño upanāmetvā taṃ alankaroti.' I think that this is a wrong use of the word, and that it has no such general signification. At Jāt. II., p. 160, 'na ca paññā tadūpiyā' may perhaps be [78] intended for a jest, 'there is no corresponding seasoning of wit.' If it really means, as the scholiast renders it, nothing more than anucchavika, the passage would prove that the etymology and proper meaning of the word were forgotten at an early age, for in my opinion tadūpiya can be nothing but S. tadopya. The Pet. Dict. at ā-VAP refers us to that compound, but it is wanting in its place, and I am ignorant in what sort of phrases it is used

in Sanskrit. It is true that analogy would seem to require in Pali not *opiya*, but *āvupiya* (comp. *vutta* S. *ukta*, *upta*; *āvuta* S. *ota*, etc.). But that participle was probably derived directly from the present *opati*, *opeti*; for in this verb, in the sense of 'putting into,' *āva* is contracted to *o* : *Rukkhamūlagahanam pasakkiya* (see p. [60]) *nibbānam hadayasmim opiya jhāya* *Gotama mā ca pamādo, kin-te bilibilikā karisati*, SN. IX., 5, v. 1 (vol. i., p. 199) = Th., v. 119. *Na tesam koṭṭhe openti, na kumbhī (= kumbhyā, loc.), na kaḷopiya*, SN. XI., 20, v. 4 (vol. i., p. 236) = Jāt. 529, v. 12 (vol. v., p. 252) = Therīg., v. 283. It is also used several times in the Jātaka commentary. The nearly synonymous *osāpeti* was formed in the same manner from *ā-VIṢ*; it occurs in comments in phrases like '*pat-tam dhovitvā vodakam (dry, vi-odaka) katvā thavikāya osāpetvā*' (comp. also Jāt. I., p. 25).

If I am right in identifying *tadūpiya* with *tadopya*, it is not difficult to account for the *ū* substituted for *o*. It is due to the following *i*. The vowel *i* occasionally by assimilation changes *e* into *ī*, and by half-assimilation *o* into *ū*: *pāṭihīra* = -hera = -hāriya, *parihīrati* (Sn. 11, v. 13, v. 205) for *-herati, -hariyati (hence *saṃhīrati*, the passive of *saṃharati* or *sangharati*), *abhiijhana* (Jāt. 546, v. 49; vol. vi., p. 373¹⁶ = *viriyakaraṇa*) from *JEH*¹; *abhirūhati*, *virūhati* (whence the syn. *rūhati*; comp. *ārohati*,² *orohati*), *visūka* from *viçoka* (Childers' Dict.), *mittadūbhin* from -drohin, *sītūdaka*, *nirūdaka* from -odaka (for in

¹ *VEN*, *VEN* appears in the shape of *apavīṇati*, MN. 48 (vol. i., p. 324); Jāt. 533, v. 1 (vol. v., p. 339); *pavīṇati*, Jāt. 409, v. 4 (vol. iii., p. 387). Compounds with *anu* and *vi*, which were probably in use, as they are in Sanskrit, account for the vowel change.

² In later writings *ārūhi*, -*itvā* are found occasionally; it is, perhaps, fortuitous that *ārūhati*, etc., are wanting. The form may be explained from the syn. *abhirūhati*, but it is of doubtful authority. *Āruhati*, which is not unfrequent in verse, was explained above from the aorist *aruhat*.

comp. [79] odaka is generally used for udaka).¹ So likewise u affects a neighbouring e, changing it to i: anu-hīramāna, DN. 14 (vol. ii., p. 15), MN. 123 (vol. iii., p. 123), for *-hera-, -hariya-; dvīhi, dvīsu for *duvehi, *duvesu. It might be anticipated that u would assimilate o into ū, but such within my experience is scarcely ever the case,² so true it is that the Rule of Three by no means universally applies to matter of language.³ And yet o—u and u—o formed a sequence of vowels which at one time must have grated particularly upon the Indian ear, for it is in many cases avoided. But the expedient resorted to is dissimilation; either u is changed to i, or e takes the place of o: bhiyyo (comp. yebhuyyena), mātito, pitito for -uto (in old Pali māti, piti are not otherwise used as bases), vito, vīto for *vuto, *vūto (see p. [64]); ahesuṃ (comp. ahosi), antepura for antopura, pure for *puro, suve (sve) for *svo, duve (dve), *duvehi, *duvesu (assimilated to -ī-) for *dvo- (comp. ubho, -ohi, -osu), hetuye, Bv., v. 89 (ii., v. 10, p. 7) = Jāt. I., p. 4, for *hotuye

¹ The ū of khajjūpanaka, ārūgya, MN. 66 (vol. i., pp. 450-51), may be due to the latent i of dy, gy.

² Ukkūsa, S. utkroṣa, seems to form an exception, for ū is required by the metre at Jāt. 486, v. 2 (vol. iv., p. 291); but it is constantly written ukkusa.

³ I once had occasion to make this remark to Childers, who, in order to prove gacchi to be correct, from certain analogies was tempted to assert that the Singh. character in question should be read cch, not ñch. If we expect to find u o v dealt with on the analogy of i e y, or *vice versa*, we are often disappointed. Y is doubled after e (except in keyūra), not v after o (except yobbana, yobbāñña). From dussīla derives dussīlya, but pāṭikulya-tā from patikkūla seems to require short u. After a consonant va goes into u, v suffering elision (as anudeva, catuha, annukāri, etc.); but ya, yā make ī (with a few exceptions, as kujjhisi, abbhībhāsi, Jāt. 524, v. 21 (vol. v., p. 169), pattiya S. pratyaya, whence pattiyaṇi, 'to believe,' Jāt. I., p. 426¹⁰, etc.; comp. pattiyaṇi, Weber's Bhag., 1866, p. 272). Aya makes e, as ava does o, and this looks like symmetry; but if we are to go by analogy, the former must have passed through aī with ī for ya, the latter through a u, with the second vowel labialized and v elided.

(*hotuve, hotave; comp. gaṇetuye, Bv., v. 371 (iv., v. 28, p. 22).⁴

[80] Mil. 10¹³. Ettaka is of somewhat doubtful origin, but as tattaka, yattaka, kittaka are formed from tāvant, etc., in the same manner as S. iyattaka from iyant, ettaka is either this very word, or else contracted from *etāvattaka. The latter is, perhaps, the more likely derivation, since *kiyattaka or *kivattaka forms kittaka, not kettaka (comp. also edisa = etādisa).

Mil. 10²¹. Anuyogaṃ datvā. In my rendering of this phrase, 'having applied himself zealously,' I left to anuyoga the signification in which it is generally used in Pali. I am now convinced that I committed an error, and I regret to see it repeated by Childers. The phrase must have quite a different sense. It occurs at Mil., p. 348, in another but equally obscure context, and in the Jātaka comment it is often employed exactly as above. But I have not succeeded in finding out any very probable sense, and I prefer confessing that I do not know what it means.

Mil. 11¹³. Urattāḷim, which is of frequent use in the suttas in the above phrase, is S. uras-tāḍaṃ, with -im for -aṃ, like uttarim, saddhim, kuhiṃ (for kuhaṃ, S. kuha). Absolutives in -aṃ are not much in use, and there is, perhaps, no second example of -im. Forms in -akaṃ, on the contrary, are frequent, as paripphosakaṃ (PRUSH), samparivattakaṃ, ālumpakārakaṃ, sannidhikārakaṃ, dantullehakaṃ, phenuddehakaṃ, udarāvadehakaṃ, etc.

Mil. 13¹⁵. Pubbanha is so written not only in B, but

⁴ Some of the nominatives in -e may be accounted for on this principle: Vanappagumbe yathā phussitagge, Khud-dakap., 6, v. 12 = Sn. 13, v. 12 (v. 233); ito so ekanavute kappe yaṃ Vipassī bhagavā loke udapādi, DN. 14 (vol. ii, p. 2), (comp. in the same sutta ito so ekatimsokappo); sukhe dukkhe, DN. 2 (vol. i, p. 56²⁴); MN. 76 (vol. i, p. 517²³); SN. XXIII, 8 (vol. iii, p. 211¹¹), for sukho dukkho (i.e., sukhaṃ dukkhaṃ), etc.

also, together with sāyanha, throughout in SN., which, in point of distinguishing the two nasals is by far the best MS. in the Copenhagen collection. Vanaratana¹ [81] remarks that h may be joined to any one of the five nasals, and gives these examples: avañ-hoti, tañ-hi, taṇhā, pubbanho, amhe. We may reasonably conclude that nh is also the correct spelling of cinha, junhā, majjhanha, which are known only from MSS. of no authority. It is rather fortunate that pubbanha is so uncommonly well authenticated, for there is no perceptible law for the influence of a latent r upon n; it may or may not change it into ṇ (comp. tāṇa, pāṇa, tīni, etc., with ghāna, agghanaka, savana, etc.). The very rare aparañha most likely requires the lingual. The average of Singhalese as well as Burmese copies scarcely ever present nh, and the scribes evidently are prejudiced against it, probably from the frequency of words like taṇhā, gaṇhāti, etc. I once made some observations on the subject to Childers, who at anha repeated the substance of them. But he must afterwards have changed his mind, for he writes majjhanha in both ways, and at pubbanha he rejected

¹ As native grammarians are so very sparing of remarks on the correct use of the two nasals, I shall here add another of his rules: 'Ta-tha-na-rānaṃ ṭa-ṭha-ṇa-lā'—ta-tha-na-rānaṃ ṭa-ṭha-ṇa-lā hontiyathākkamaṃ: dukkataṃ dukkaṭaṃ, evaṃ sukataṃ sukaṭaṃ, paḥaṭo uddhaṭo viṣaṭo; aṭṭhaka-thā; paṇidhānaṃ paṇipāto paṇāmo paṇitaṃ pariṇato pariṇāmo suṇṇayo (meaning, I suppose, duṇṇayo) oṇato; paripañño palipañño (sic) evaṃ palibodho pallankaṃ taluṇo mahāsālo māluto sukhumālo. It is obvious that with 'paripañño palipañño' begins the examples of l for r, and we must read paripanno palipanno. The latter was received by Childers with some doubts, it seems (see his Dict.), but it is not unfrequent in the suttas: Sake muttakarise palipanno, DN. 14 (vol. ii., pp. 24-25), etc.; palipapalipanno or palipāpalipanno, MN. 8 (vol. i., p. 45), (palipa or -ā, 'mud,' Jāt. 378, v. 1 (vol. iii., p. 241); 509, vv. 9, 19 (vol. iv., pp. 480-86); Th., v. 89; Therīg., v. 291; a derivative from LIP, like the syn. palipatha, Dh., v. 414 = Sn. 34, v. 45 (v. 638) = MN. 98, v. 45; AN. VIII., vi. 6, v. 3 (vol. iv., p. 290).

the spelling for which there is incomparably the best authority.

Mil. 13¹⁵. Phāsu is perhaps the Veda S. prāṇu.

Mil. 15¹⁷. Comp. Jāt. III., p. 2⁵, where the reading ought, no doubt, to be asammattatṭhānaṃ or asammattatṭhānaṃ.

Mil. 20¹⁶. Na-tthi. Na never loses its vowel before a, but constantly, in case of sandhi, coalesces with it to ā, even before a saṃyoga. Napparūpa is no proof to the contrary,¹ for lacchasi napparūpaṃ, Ten Jāt., p. 115, is, I dare say, a mere erratum for lacchasi 'napparūpaṃ, as the scholiast explains it. Natthi, if written n' atthi, looks like an exception, which it scarcely is; it is rather additional proof how apt is the root AS to drop the initial. Hence I prefer writing na-tthi (and na-mhi). Also na [82] 'tthi would do, if it were not that na si, ca si, etc., cannot very well be written na 'si, etc., as the vowel a in prose—in verse the case is different—always coalesces, if sandhi takes place, with a following light a. At Ten Jāt., p. 28⁷ = Jāt. II., p. 21¹⁶, the context requires mahājanassa līnaṃ cittaṃ. There are, however, some exceptions, or what seems to be so. But in the cases that have come under my notice, the second word is almost always ahaṃ, and I consider it preferable to write 'haṃ; as tāva 'haṃ, eva 'haṃ (Mil., p. 219), tattha 'haṃ, and especially nāma 'haṃ (and nāma 'yaṃ). But also nāmāhaṃ (and nāmāyaṃ), etc., are found, and altogether the reading is not always, if ever, indubitable. Besides the Prakrit haṃ, there is other evidence that the initial of ahaṃ has a

¹ Nantaka (not nattaka), 'a shred, a rag,' is said to be so called because there is no (regular) end to them: 'Na-antakāni, antavirahitāni vatthakhaṇḍādīni'; or, as we might guess just as well, because 'no end' of them are required to make up a garment. In Sanskrit naktaka, because the naked cover their nudity with them; or laktaka, from being of various dyes. All these seem to be so many attempts at finding an Aryan etymology for a word which may have been borrowed from some aboriginal language.

tendency to vanish. The elision of an initial a after o and e is rare in Pali prose, and only applies to the initial of ahaṃ, ayaṃ, and the present of AS; after e (with the exception of re'yya, Mil., p. 124) only to ahaṃ, and even this is most unfrequent.¹

Mil. 21¹⁵. In my translation of vedagū, 'erudite in Veda lore,' I was no doubt mistaken; for though such is probably its original meaning, it is always used differently. It is one of those paradoxical or purposely ambiguous expressions in which Buddha appears to have delighted [83] (comp. Dh., vv. 97, 294-5, etc.). It is explained 'vedasankhātehi catuhi maggañānehi gato,' 'catumaggañānasankhātehi vedehehi akusalānaṃ dhammānaṃ vedagū, 'catuhi maggañāṇavedehehi kilese vijjhित्वा gatattā vedagū,' etc.

Mil. 21²⁰. Sāgaro viya akkhobbho—i.e., like the depth of the sea. Comp. Majjhe yathā samuddassa ūmi no jāyati, t̥hito hoti, Sn. 52, v. 6 (v. 920) (= mahāsamuddassa uparimahet̥ṭhimabhāgānaṃ vemajjhasankhāte majjhe, Pj.).

¹ This is, no doubt, a point on which the particular dialect of Sanskrit, from which Pali took rise more immediately, differed from the language of books. In the dialect in question final e and o must, generally speaking, have been treated uniformly before all vowels, not excepting a; and Pali follows the same sandhi law, only the hiatus very rarely remains, it being bridged over either by contraction or by the insertion of a euphonical consonant. Cases like sa cāhaṃ, etc., which I think should be dealt with on this principle, are well known. But the other sort of examples have not, it seems, struck the attention of grammarians, native any more than occidental, though they are very numerous, as ya-d-antagū = yo antagū, haṃsa-r-iva = haṃso iva, ta-d-āsu = te āsu, etc., and may be met with even in prose: ya-d-ariyo = ye ariyo, dantehi danta-m-ādhāya, etc., if these are not allusions to verse. At Dh., v. 412, and the parallel texts I propose to read, ubho sanga-m-upaccagā = ubho sange u., in accordance with ubh' anta-m-abhiññāya, Sn. 55, vv. 65, 67 (vv. 1040, 1042), which the comment justly explains ubho ante. For scholiasts are perfectly well acquainted with this sort of sandhi—I was going to say too well, for they sometimes have recourse to it where it is rather out of place.

Mil. 21²¹. Raṇaṇjaha is used at SN. II., 11, v. 2 (vol. i., p. 52), and It. 104, v. 2 (p. 108). In Abhidh. raṇa is rendered by pāpa, and in a-raṇa, sa-raṇa commentators explain it by rāga, raja, kilesa. But it is rather tempting to conjecture raṇaṇjaya, 'victorious in the battle (with Māra).'

Mil. 21³². Uppaḷāśenta I consider an error for upalāśenta, I suppose from RAS. Comp. sankhaṃ upalāśitvā (instead of -etvā), DN. 23 (vol. ii., p. 337). However, paḷāsa, 'conceit, pride,' from the same root, no doubt, is commonly spelled with ḷ; but examples from SN., which would be the best authority, are wanting.

Mil. 22⁵. Sudam̐ is a combination of su = sma with dam̐ or idam̐, and might also be written su dam̐ or su 'dam̐.

INDEX I.

SUBJECTS AND PROPER NAMES

- ABBREVIATION** (marking repetitions in the texts), 66.
Abhidhamma, 66.
Absolutives in -aṁ, -akaṁ, 80 (*cf.* Gerund).
Accusative absolute, 67.
Aorist, 57.
 as base for secondary verbal forms, 61.
 with a nasal inserted (gañchi, etc.), 71 *fol.*
 1 sg. in -aṁ, 429.
Asoka's inscriptions, 69, n. 32.
Assimilation of vowels (*cf.* half-assimilation), 55, 75, 76, 78.
 of consonants (*cf.* elision and dissimilation), 61, 62, n. 15, 17 (mediæ and tenues); 55 (liquids).
Barbarism, 430.
Bhabra inscription, 66, n. 26; 69, 75.
Buddhaghosa, 58, 60, n. 11-12; 64, n. 20; 65, 66, n. 24; 74, n. 1; 77.
Buddhist Sanskrit, 70.
Burmese readings, 62, n. 17; 63, 64, n. 20; 66, 69, n. 32; 71, 77, 81, 425, 429.
Cases, names, of, 60, n. 12.
 Clerical errors, 56, n. 4.
 Compounds, 74.
 Confusion (amalgamation, contamination), 59, n. 6; 66.
 Consonants, double for a single, 56, n. 3.
 euphonical, 81, n. 1.
 mutes merging into another class, 58.
 mediæ and tenues, 61, 62, n. 15, 17; 425; initials, 64, n. 20; final surds in comp., 64.
 sibilants, transposed, 70.
 semi-vowels, inserted, 57.
 Contraction (*cf.* elision), 56; to avoid hiatus, 57, 82, n. 1.
 Demonstratives, double, 424-426.
 Dentals, labialized, 60.
 Dialect, of a woman, 567.
 heretical, 572.
 Dissimilation of liquids, 55.
 of tenues and mediæ of different class, 59, 60.
 of vowels, 79.
 Dodhaka metre, 73.
 Double-forms of roots and words, 63, n. 19.
 Dvandva, 74 (*cf.* 64, n. 20).

- Elision, of consonants (assimilation), 62, n. 15.
 of a single consonant between vowels, 56, 57, 65, n. 23; 66.
 of a penultimate vowel, 56.
- Elongation of vowels, 74.
- Emphasis, 64, n. 20.
- Etymologizing corruptions, 58, n. 6; 64, n. 20.
- Euphonical consonants, 82, n. 1.
- Future, 73, 74; in the sense of an imperfect of the future, 57
- Gerund (absolutive), connected with *deti* or *gaṇhāti*, 77
 -tvā omitted or added, 67, n. 28.
 -itvā corruption of -itā, 422.
- Half-assimilation, 78, 79.
- Hiatus, 57, 82, n. 1.
- Imperative, in questions used like present, 421.
- Imperfect, 57.
- Isnāds, 69.
- Jātakas, quoted in *Mil.*, 426.
- Juxtaposition, 426.
- Kaccāyana, 71, 72.
- Labialism, 59, 60.
- Māgadhi, 75.
- Metathesis, 57, 58.
- Metre, influence from, 56.
- Metonymics, 58.
- Moggallāna, 72, 74.
- Nasals, avoided after two consecutive vowels, 72, n. 2.
 inserted in aorist-forms, 71-74; in gerunds and futures, 73.
 followed by *h*, 80, 81.
n and *ṇ*, 80, n. 1.
- Negative prefix, doubled, 64, n. 20.
- Neuter, in -e, 75.
- Nirvāṇa, 424.
- Nominatives in -e, 79, n. 4.
- Pali, 82, n. 1; continental, 73; Pali forms older than Sanskrit, 62, n. 16; Pali grammarians, 60, n. 12; 82, n. 1 (*cf.* index of words).
- Passive forms, contracted, 70.
- Past participle, 57.
- Patois, 567.
- Patronymics, 58.
- Payogasiddhi, 66, 72, 76, n. 1; 540.
- Perfect tense, 57.
- Phrases, drawn together into one word, 74
- Pluperfect, expressed by past part. with *hoti*, 57.
- Prākṛit grammarians, 61.
- Prākṛitism, 63, n. 18.
- Prepositions, containing a *p*, 60.
 inserted in *dvandva* compounds, 74.
- Present tense, 57, 421.
- Preterites, 57.
- Pronouns, demonstrative, 424, 426.

- Pronouns, relative, used for the conjunction *ya m*, 426.
- Questions left unanswered by Buddha, 424.
- Reminiscences from verses, 531, 532.
- Repetitions in the canonical writings, 66.
- Sandhi, 73, n. 3; 82, n. 1.
- Sanskritizing forms, 75.
- Scholiasts, 67, 82, n. 1.
- Sciences, the nineteen or eighteen, 58.
- Semivowels, inserted to avoid hiatus, 57.
- Sibilants, transposed, 70.
- Singhalese blunders, 62, n. 17; 76, 553.
- influence on Pali, 77
- Singhalese readings, 64, n. 20; 66, n. 24; 69, n. 32; 71, 77, 81, 425, 428, 528, 532.
- Solecism, 423.
- Suffixes, pleonastic, 70.
- Theragāthā, 429.
- Tradition, 67, 68.
- Vanaratana, 60, n. 12, 13; 61, n. 14; 80.
- Vinaya words, 77.
- Vowels, assimilation of, 75, 76.
- elision of, 56.
- elongation, 74.
- long or short before double cons., 79.
- labial and palatal classes of, 79, n. 3.
- Vriddhi, double, 75.
- Yonaka cyclopædia, 58.

INDEX II.

LETTERS, SUFFIXES, ETC.

- a, initial, rarely elided in Pali prose after o, e, 82; dropped in \sqrt{as} , 81.
- final, followed by a, 82.
- from i, 75; from u, 76.
- for i and u in case of vriddhi, 75.
- becomes ā, 74.
- becomes ī, 55.
- a-, an-, negative prefix, doubled, 64, n. 20.
- a m, confounded with -e, 67, n. 28.
- replaced by -e, in Mā-gadhī, 75.
- a m, ending of l. sg. aor. (impf.) very rare in Pali, 429.
- absolutives in, 80.
- a k a m, absolutives in, 80.
- a ya-, becomes e, 79, n. 3.
- a ya na, contracted to -ā na, 428.
- a re, medial ending from Vedic -ire, 76.
- a va-, becomes o, 79, n. 3.
- ā, from a, 70; from -ar, 56.
- ā na, contracted of -a ya na, 428.
- i, from a, 55; from u, 75, 79; i (or ī) from -ya, 64;

- causing assimilation of e to ī (o-ū), 78.
- im, ending of absolutives for -am, 80.
- itvā, corruption of -itā, 422.
- ī, from e, 78; from -ya, -yā, 64, 79, n. 3.
- u, from a or i, 75, 76; from va after a consonant, 79, n. 3; becomes a, 75, 76; becomes i, 75, 79; affecting neighbouring vowels (e-ī, o-ū), 79; the sequence u-o avoided, 79.
- ū, from o (due to a following i), 78; (due to a preceding u), 79, n. 3.
- ṛ (Sanskrit), 76.
- e, from -aya-, 79, n. 3; for o, 79; final, before vowels, 82, n. 1; -e confounded with -am, 67, n. 28; nominatives in -e, 75, 79, n. 4.
- o, from -ava-, 79, n. 3; from -āva-, 78; becomes ū, 78; is replaced by e, 79; final o before vowels, 82, n. 1; the sequence o-u avoided, 79.
- im, inserted for metrical reasons, 56.
- k, from p, 59; kk from pp, 60, n. 13; becomes t or p, 59; elided, 65, n. 23.
- kara, -kāra, false ending, 64, n. 20.
- g, from d, 59
- gha, abbreviation, 65, n. 25.
- c, -cca, in cases of Sandhi, 73, n. 3; -cca, from -tya or -tara, 56, n. 4.
- ṇ, confounded with n, 80-81; 80, n. 1; from n by influence of a latent r, 81; ṇṇ and ṇh, 525.
- t, from d, 64, n. 20; from k, 59.
- tabba, -tayya, -tāya, from -tavya, 66, n. 27.
- tara, becomes -cca, 56, n. 4.
- tā, pleonastic suffix, 70.
- teyya, from -tavya, 66, n. 27.
- tya, becomes -cca, 56, n. 4.
- tvā, omitted or added, 67, n. 28.
- d, becomes t, 64, n. 20; becomes g, 59; euphonical consonant, 82, n. 1; insertion of an inorganic d, 70; ddh becomes bbh, 60.
- dvā, becomes bā-, 60.
- n, confounded with ṇ, 80, 81; from l, 55; from r, 55, n. 2; nh, 81.
- na-, before ā, 81; -nā, pleonastic suffix, 70, n. 37.
- p, contained in prepositions, causing dissimilation, 60; becomes k, 59; pp becomes kk, 60, n. 13; pp for bb, 425.
- pa, pe, abbreviation, 66.
- ph, commonly written for p in words beginning with pal-, 59.
- b, bb, replaced by pp, 425; bbh from ddh, 60.
- bā-, from dvā-, 60.
- bh, confounded with h, 59, n. 9.
- m, euphonical consonant, 82, n. 1; mm from nv, 60, n. 11.
- y, from v or r after dentals, 56; elided, 65, n. 23;

- doubled after e, 79, n. 3; inserted to avoid hiatus, 56, 57.
- ya-, -yā-, becomes ī after a consonant, 79, n. 3; -ya, abstract termination, becomes ī or i, 64.
- r, euphonical consonant, 82, n. 1; latent r, changing n into ṇ, 81; r after dentals becomes y, 56.
- l, from n, 55; becomes n, 55; being on a par with surds, 62.
- l, from ḍ, always sonant, 62; from ṇ, 55.
- la, abbreviation, 66.
- v, not doubled after o (*cf.* y), 79, n. 3; elided, 66, 79, n. 3; becomes y after dentals, 56.
- va, becomes u after a consonant, 79, n. 3.
- s, double for single, 56, n. 3.
- sā, suffix, 430.
- h, joined to nasals, 81; con-founded with bh, 59, n. 9.

INDEX III.

PALI WORDS

- akalu, 62, n. 16.
- akilāsu, 62, 63, n. 19.
- akkharappabheda, 65.
- akkhāyati, 70.
- akkhobbha, 83.
- °-agga = āgāra, 56.
- agghanaka, 81.
- aṅgapaccaṅga, 74.
- acchati, 61.
- accharā, accharikā, 76.
- ajakara, 64, n. 20.
- ajaddhuka, 550.
- ajjhogāhitvā, 422.
- ajjhopanna, ajjhāpanna, 543.
- añchati, 532.
- aññadatthu(m), 67, n. 28; 424.
- adañchi, 72, n. 3.
- addha, 63, n. 19.
- atathaṃ samānaṃ, 67, n. 28.
- aticchatha bhante, 65.
- atiradakkhīni, 61, n. 14.
- attadattha, 70.
- atraya, 59, n. 6.
- adhigacchati, 72, 430.
- an-aññāta, 64, n. 20.
- an-aṇa, an-iṇa, 76.
- Anantakāya, 70.
- anabhāva, anabhāva-kata, 64, n. 20.
- anamataḥḥa, 64, n. 20.
- anavajja, 64, n. 20.
- anavaya, 65.
- anasūyaka, 76, n. 1.
- anivattanatā, 70, n. 37.
- anuttara, 427.
- anutthunam, 76.
- anudeva, 79, n. 3.
- anuparisakkati, 60, n. 13.
- anumajjati, 428.
- anuyoga, 80.
- anuvicca, anuvijja, 560, 562.
- anusakkati, 60, n. 13.

- anussava, anussavika, anu-
 ssavasacca, 68.
 anuhiramāna, 79.
 anomaḍaṇḍa, 427.
 anosakkanatā, 70, n. 37.
 antepura, 79.
 annukāri, 79, n. 3.
 anva-d-eva, 70.
 anha, 81.
 Apacara, 426.
 apanīta, 66, n. 24.
 aparāṇha, 81.
 apavīnati, 78, n. 1.
 apasakkati, 60.
 apāpuṇanti, 63, n. 19.
 apāpuraṇa, apāpurati, 63.
 apāruta, 63, n. 18.
 appaṭivibhattabhogin, 429.
 appesakkha, 422.
 aphaṇṇi kiriyāni, 425.
 abbeti, 64, n. 19.
 abbhībhāsi, 79, n. 3.
 abbhuggaṇḥhati, °gaṇḥhiti,
 73
 abbhussakkati, -sukkati, 60,
 76.
 abyābajjhaṃ, 538.
 abhijjhana, 78.
 abhirūhati, 78.
 abhivaddhayim, 430.
 abhisamecca, 56, n. 4.
 amhe, 81.
 arana, 83.
 alajjitāya, 66, n. 27.
 alāpu, 62, n. 16.
 aliyava(m)sāni, 69.
 ava, 79, n. 3.
 avaṇ-hoti, 81.
 ava-CHAD, ava-VAR, 63,
 n. 18.
 avasissatu, avasussatu, 569.
 avāpuraṇa, avāpurati, 63.
 asammatt(h)atthāna, 81.
 asūyā, 76, n. 1.
 ahaṃ, 82.
 ahu taṃ yeva, 551.
 ahesum, 79.
 ākurati, 425.
 ācamati, 425.
 āṇaṇja, 75.
 ātu māri, 567.
 ādānena, 425.
 ānantariyakamma, 421.
 āpātha, 428.
 āyasmant, 76.
 āruhati, ārūhati, 78, n. 2.
 ārūgya, 79, n. 1.
 ārohati, 78.
 ālimpana, alimpeti, 421.
 āluka, ālupa, 60, n. 10.
 ālumpakārakaṃ, 80.
 ālhiya, 63, n. 19.
 āvarati, 63, n. 19.
 āvinjana, āvinjati, 59, n. 7.
 āvuṇāti, āvuṇoti, 63, n. 19.
 āvuta, 64, n. 19.
 āveṭhana, āveṭhikā, 421.
 āvenika, 75.
 āsiyati, 422.
 *āhaṇḥhaṃ, 74, 545.
 āhārattaṃ, 425.
 ice-eva, 423.
 icchasaṃ, icchisaṃ, 75.
 itveva(m), 423.
 inda, 55.
 iva (va), 422.
 ukkūsa, 79, n. 2.
 uggaṇchi, uggaṇchitvāna, 61,
 n. 14.
 ucchu, 76.
 uju, 76.
 ujju, 531.
 utu, 76.
 uttarim, 80.
 uttittṭha, uttittṭhe, 426.
 udarāvadehakaṃ, 80.
 uddhaṃ, 60.

°upaka, 62, n. 16.
 Upaku, 62, n. 16.
 upagañchi, 71.
 upagañchimsu, 72, n. 2.
 Upacara, 426.
 upacikā, 62, n. 16.
 upacchubhati, 423.
 upajjhaṃ, 65, n. 23.
 upatheyya, 62, n. 16.
 upapajjati, upapatti, 77, 422, 528.
 uparūparūpapattika, 77.
 upalāseti, 83.
 upasappati, 60, n. 13.
 uposathagga, 56.
 uppajjati, uppatti, 77, 422, 528.
 ubbhaṃ, ubbhatthaka, ubbhamukha, 60.
 ubho, 79.
 ummi, 428, 429.
 urattālim, 80.
 uḷuṅkā, 64, 76.
 usu, 76.
 usūyā, 76.
 ussakkati, ussukkati, 60.
 ūmi, 428.
 ekacca, ekatiya, 56, n. 4.
 ekānika, 428.
 etaṃ, 426.
 ettaṃ, 65, n. 23.
 ettaka, 80.
 ettakā, ettikā, 427.
 edisa, 80.
 ereti, 76.
 evaṃsampada, 68, n. 30.
 ogāhitvā, 422.
 oṭṭhubhati, 424.
 onīta, 66, n. 24.
 oṇojeti, 76.
 odaka, 78, 79.
 onandhati, 55.

onīta (onitta), onītapatta-pāni, 66.
 opati, opeti, opiya, 78.
 opilāpeti, 63.
 orohati, 78.
 olubbha, 539.
 ovaraka, 63, n. 19.
 osakkati, 60.
 osāpeti, 78.
 Kakudha, 58.
 kajjopakkamaka, 423.
 kaṭucchu, 76.
 kaṭṭhattham pharati, 425.
 °kata, °gata, 64, n. 20.
 kathiyati, katheti, 70.
 kathetukamyatāpucchā, 531.
 kapaṇiddhika, 76.
 kappara, 76.
 kamyatā, 70, n. 37.
 °kara, 64, n. 20.
 karahaci, 75.
 kaḷopi (kalopi, khalopi, 60.
 kasata (sakata), 423.
 kahaṃ, 76.
 kākacchamāna, 422.
 kāyadaddhibahula, 65, n. 20.
 °kāra, 64, n. 20.
 kāraka, 60, n. 12.
 Kārambhiya, 426.
 kāruññatā, 70, n. 37.
 kāhati, 75.
 kiṅkato, kiṅkate, 430.
 kicca, kiccaya, 421.
 kiccākicca, 74.
 kittaka, 80.
 kipillika, 59.
 kukku, 76.
 kuṅkuṭṭha, 76.
 kujjhisi, 79, n. 3.
 kuddāla-piṭaka, 68.
 kumbhī, kumbhya, 78.
 kuruṅga, 76.
 kulūpaka, 62, n. 16.

- kusīta, 63, n. 19; 64, n. 20; 75.
 kuhiṃ, 80.
 keṭubha, 65.
 ketāra, kedāra, 62, n. 16.
 keyūra, 79, n. 3.
 koṭṭhaka, 76.
 Koṇḍañña, 75.
 Kodūmbaraka, 56.
 kolañña, 75.
 kolaputti, 64.
 kosajja, 63, n. 19; 75.

 khajjūpa, °ka, khajjūpanaka,
 khajjota(ka), khajjopa-
 naka, 59, n. 8; 79, n. 1.
 khaṇati, 59, n. 6.
 khalopi, 60.
 khānu, 58, n. 6.
 khādāti, khāyita, 57.
 khipita, 75.
 khepeti, 76.
 khemaṃ, 571.

 gacchati, 71 *fol.*; gacchi,
 gañchi, 71, 72, n. 1; gac-
 chimsu, 72, n. 2; gac-
 chissati, 72, n. 1; gañ-
 chati, gañchiti, 73.
 gaṇetuye, 79.
 gaṇhāti, 77.
 °gata (°kata), 64, n. 20.
 gaddūhana, 59.
 gadhita, 430.
 gantvā, 72, 73. .
 gaha, 76.
 gāmā gāmaṃ, 74.
 gāmika, 425.
 °gāminī paṭipadā, 530, 531.
 gijjha, 56.
 gimhāna, 428.
 gilāna, 63, n. 19.
 gihin, 76.
 gumba, 57, 58.

 ghatasahassa, 426.

 gharañī, 75.
 ghāna, 81.
 ghāyati, 57.

 caccara, 56.
 catuḥa, 79, n. 3.
 camati (vamati), 425.
 carasā, 567.
 carahi, 421.
 calācala, 74.
 cātuyāma, 561.
 cikkhassanta, 425.
 cinha, 81.
 Ceti, 62, n. 16.

 chakaṇa, 62, n. 16.
 chakala, 62, n. 16.
 chaṇaka, 429.
 chambita, 70.
 chāpa, 63.
 chuddha, 75, n. 1; 423, 424.
 chubhati, 75, n. 1.
 cheva (theva), 70.

 jalūpikā, jalopikā, 59.
 jātovaraka, 63, n. 19.
 jārattana, 70, n. 37.
 jigucchati, 73.
 junhā, 81.

 jhāyati, 65, n. 20.

 ñātaka, 76.
 ñāya, 58.

 ṭhānāṭhāna, 74.

 taṃ...taṃ, 424.
 taṃyathā, 75.
 taṃyathā 'nusūyate, 55.
 takkola, 59.
 °taggha, 64, n. 20.
 tajja, 422.
 tañ-hi, 81.
 taṇhā, 81.

- tattaka, 80.
 tathāgata, 424, 542.
 tadaminā, 75.
 tadūpiya, 77, 78.
 tanti, 69.
 ta-y-idaṃ, 57.
 tarahi, 421.
 tavaṃ (tuvam), 76.
 tāṇa, 81.
 tānatā, 70, n. 37.
 tāsaṃ, 424.
 ti (iti), 423.
 tikicchā, 63, n. 19.
 tippa, 62, n. 16; 425, 526.
 timiṅgala, 75.
 tiraccāna, 428.
 tīni, 81.
 tiradassī, 61, n. 14.
 tuvaṃ (tavam), 76.
 tuvaṃtuvaṃ, 64, n. 10; 539.
 tv-eva, 423.

 thaketi, 62, n. 16.
 tharu, 70.
 thāmasā, 430.
 theva (cheva), 70.

 dakkhissati, 61, n. 14.
 datṭhaviṣa, 425.
 dadḍhi, 65, n. 20.
 dantullehakam, 80.
 dandha, 65, n. 20.
 damasā, 430.
 dalhadhamma, 60, n. 11.
 dānagga, 56.
 dicchati, 61, n. 14.
 Dinna, 422.
 disākāka, 61, n. 14.
 dissati, 57.
 duddiṭṭha, 574.
 duve (dve), 79.
 dussila, dussilya, 79, n. 3.
 deti, 77.
 deva, devaputta, 61.
 Devamantiya, 70.

 desissāmi, desessāmi, 524.
 dovacassatā, 70, n. 37.
 dosinā, 76, 77.
 dvattiṃsākāra, 533.
 dvīsu, dvīhi, 79.
 dve, 79.

 dhajani, °-ini, 75.
 dhamma, 60, n. 11.
 Dhammantari, 60, n. 11.
 dhammī kathā, 543.

 naṅgala, 55.
 naṅgula, 55.
 nantaka, 81, n. 1.
 nandissam, 75, n. 2.
 napparūpa, 81.
 naḷāta, 55.
 Nātaputta, Nāhaputta, 58.
 nikkama, nikkamatha, nikkhamatha, 428.
 niggumba, 57.
 Nighaṇḍu, 65.
 nicchuddha, nicchubhati, 423.
 nitṭhubhati (nutṭhubhati), 76, 424.
 nidhin-nikhāto, 55, n. 2.
 nibbethana, nibbethikā, 421.
 nimantaka, 426.
 niyyātetī, °-deti, 63, n. 19.
 nirumbhati, 59.
 nirūdaka, 78.
 nilacchita, nilicchita, 55.
 nivātaka, 426.
 nisinna, 55.
 nissakkati, 60.
 nissakkavacana, 60.
 nīti, 58.
 nutṭhubhati, 76.
 nutṭhura, 76.
 nelepātī, 62, n. 16.

 Pakudha, 58.
 pakkha, 422.

- paggaṇhitvā dehi, 77
 paccācamati, °-vamati, 425.
 paccosakkati, 60.
 pajāpatī, 62, n. 16.
 paṭigacce' eva, 421.
 paṭipāṭi, 69, n. 32.
 paṭisaṁvedeti, 70.
 paṭisakkati, 60, n. 13.
 paṭihaṅkhāmi, 74.
 paṭhavi, 75.
 paṇaka, 421.
 paṇṇasata, 64, n. 20.
 patara, 62, n. 16.
 pattiya, pattiyaṁ, patti-
 yāyati, 79, n. 3.
 padasā, 430.
 pana, 76.
 pabbaja, 64, n. 20.
 pamādasam, 76, n. 2.
 Payāka, 62, n. 16.
 payurupāsati, 76
 parakkama, 428.
 parāmasā, 541.
 paritta, 425.
 parideva, pariddava, 532.
 paripanna, 80, n. 1.
 paripp hosakam, 80.
 pariya, 66.
 pariyoga, 423.
 pariyanandhati, 55.
 parisakkati, 60.
 parisatim, 424; 64, n. 20.
 parisappati, 60.
 parihirati, 78.
 palasata, palāsāda, 59, n. 6.
 palāpa, 63.
 palāsa, 83.
 palāsāda, *v.* palasata.
 palikha, paligha, 62, n. 16.
 palipā, palipatha, 80, n. 1.
 palipanna, palipanna, 80,
 n. 1.
 palibodha, 66.
 paloka, 62, n. 16.
 pavāra, pavāra, 63, n. 19.
 pavīnati, 78, n. 1.
 paveccati, 61, n. 14.
 paveni, 69.
 pasakkiya, 60.
 pahaṁsati, 61, n. 14.
 pāguṇṇatā, 70, n. 37.
 pācana, pāceti, pājeti, 62;
 63, n. 19.
 paṭikulyatā, 79, n. 3; 70,
 n. 37.
 paṭiyamāna, 425.
 paṭihira, 78.
 pāṇa, 81.
 pātu, pātu-karoti, °-bhavati,
 61.
 pāpuraṇa, 62, n. 17; 63.
 pāpurati, 63, n. 19.
 pāramitā, 70.
 pārami, 64, 70.
 pāripūri, 64.
 pārisuddhi, 64.
 pāruta, pārupati, 63.
 pārumpeti, 64.
 pāli, 69.
 pāvāra, 63, n. 19.
 pāvuraṇa, 63.
 pāhetha, pāhesi, 61, n. 14.
 piṭaka, 67, 68.
 piṭaka-sampadāya, 68.
 piṭṭham, piṭṭhi, 55.
 pitito, 79.
 pitucchā, 56.
 pithiyati, 62.
 pidahati, 63, n. 19.
 pidhāna, 63, n. 19.
 pidhiyati, 62, n. 16.
 pilandha, pilandhati, pilan-
 dhita, 55.
 piṣuṇā vācā, 530.
 pukkusa, 75.
 puṭṭha, 553.
 puttapati, 62, n. 16.
 puthu, puthujjana, 76.
 pubbanha, 80, 81.
 Puraṇa, 58.

- purindada, 59, n. 6.
 purisattana, 70, n. 37.
 pure, 79.
 Pūraṇa, 58.
 pettāpiya, 62, n. 16; (pettā-
 viya), 75.
 petyā, 56, n. 4.
 peyyāla, 66.
 pokkharani, 75.
 Pokkharasāti, °-sādi, 64,
 n. 20.
 poroseyya, 75.
 porohacca (°-hicca), 75.

 pharusā vacā, 530.
 phalasata, phalāsāda, 59,
 n. 6.
 phalāphala, 74.
 phāsu, 81.
 phāsū (phāsukā), 425.
 phuṭa, phuṭṭha, 553.
 phenuddehakaṃ, 80.

 battimāsa, 60.
 babbaja, 64, n. 20.
 balasata, 59, n. 6.
 balasā, 430.
 bārasa, 60.
 bāvīsati, 60.
 bāhā, bāhu, 76.
 bāhusacca, 75.
 bilaṅgathālika, 426.
 buddhānubuddha, 74.
 Belatṭha-, Belatṭhi-putta,
 58.
 byāpāra, 63, n. 19.
 byāvaṭa, 63, n. 19.

 bhattiputta, 426.
 bhattagga, 56.
 bhadanta, 69.
 bhaddiputta, bhaddhiputta,
 426.
 bhante, 69, 70.
 bhavābhava, 74.

 bhiṅkāra, bhiṅgāra, 62, n
 16; 64, n. 20.
 bhiyyo, 79.
 bhuttāviṃ onītapattapāṇiṃ,
 66, 67.
 bhummi, bhūmi, 429.
 bhūtahacca, bhūnahu (bhū-
 tahu), 428.
 bho, 70.
 bhovādin, 69.

 maṅkato, 430.
 Maṅkura, 70.
 majjhantika, 75.
 majjhanha, 81.
 mañcātimañca, 74.
 Maṭaja, 574.
 matyā, 56, n. 4.
 marumba, 426.
 masāraka, 76.
 mahacca, 56, n. 4.
 mahatimaha, 423.
 mahatī, 423.
 mahapurisalakkhaṇa, 65.
 mahesakkha, 422.
 mātito, 79.
 mātuccha, 56.
 mātṃyā, 56, n. 4.
 māno, mānavo, 422.
 māraṇantika, 421.
 māsaḷu, 428.
 mittadūbhin, 78.
 Milinda, 55.
 mutiṅga, mudiṅga, 64, n. 20.
 muḷala, 55.
 meṇḍaka-pañha, 422.
 Moggaliputta-Tissathera, 57.

 yaṃ, yassa (= yam-assa),
 426.
 yakana, 62, n. 16
 yattaka, 80.
 Yamataggi, 64.
 yādisikidisa, 423.
 ye (= yaṃ), 75.

- yebhuyyena, 75, 79.
 Yonaka, 58, 70.
 yobbana, yobañña, 79, n. 3.
 rajāpatha, 74.
 raṇa, 83.
 ranañjaha, 85.
 rathesabha, 59, n. 6.
 randha, 423.
 rāmaṇeyyaka, 55.
 Rāhulovāda, 429.
 rudati, 61, n. 14.
 rudda, 63, n. 19.
 rumbhati, rumhati, 59, n. 9.
 ruhati, 61, n. 14.
 rūla, 63, n. 19.
 rūhati, 78.
 lakanaka, laketi, 62, n. 16.
 lajjitāya, 66, n. 27.
 lañcaka, 424.
 lāpa, 62, n. 16.
 lāpayati, 63.
 lāpu, 62, n. 16.
 luta (luṇāti), 64, n. 19.
 ludda, ludra, 63, n. 19.
 luddaka, 59, n. 6.
 luddha, 59, n. 6.
 leyya, 56.
 lokāyata, 65, n. 23.
 va (iva), 422.
 vaṃsa, 69.
 vaṇomi (vaṇimhase), vaṇ-
 ñemi, 63, n. 19.
 vatapada, vattapada, 423.
 vabbhācita, 545.
 vamatī (camatī), 425.
 vayo, 553.
 varatī, 63, n. 19.
 varalañcaka, 424.
 vassagga, 56.
 vassāna, 428.
 vākara (vākura), 64, n. 20.
 vāhasā, 430.
 vicikicchā, 63, n. 19.
 vijjotananta, 55.
 vita (vīta), 64, n. 19; 79.
 Vītaṃsā, 423.
 vinatī, 63, n. 19.
 vinubbhujatī, 76.
 vibhādātī, 425.
 virūhatī, 78.
 vilaṅgaka, 547.
 vilāka (vilagga), 62, n. 16.
 vivata, vivaratī, 63, n. 19.
 visīvetī, 422.
 visūka, 78.
 vīnatī, 78, n. 1.
 vīta, 64, n. 19; 79.
 vinatī, 78, n. 1.
 Vītaṃsā, 423.
 vītivatte (vītivattetvā), 67,
 n. 28; 428.
 vutapada, 423.
 vegasā, 430.
 vedagū, 82.
 vedhetī, 76.
 veyyāvacca, 63, n. 19.
 veḷu, 55.
 vodaka, 78.
 vyaya, 553.
 vyāpāra, vyāvata. See byā-°.
 saṃvaratī, 63, n. 19; 425.
 saṃvuṇoti, saṃvuta, 63, n. 19.
 saṃsati, 64, n. 20.
 saṃhīratī, 78.
 sakata, 423.
 sakkatī, 60.
 sakkhalī, 76.
 sakkhissatī, 61, n. 14.
 saṅkucita, saṅkuṭita, 60.
 saṅgāyatī, saṅgītī, 57, n. 5.
 saṅcaratī, 425.
 sati, 58.
 sadattha, 70.
 saddhīm, 80.
 saṇikaṃ, sanikaṃ, 540.
 santutṭhitā, 70, n. 37.

- sandahati, 429.
 sandhāvissam, 56, n. 3.
 sannayhati, 429.
 sannidhikāraḥ, 80.
 sannirumbhati, 59.
 sapaḍāna, 428.
 sappati, 60, n. 13.
 Sabbadinna, 70.
 sabhaṭṭhā, 64, n. 20.
 samatthita, 74.
 samuttaram (-im), 429.
 samudāpikā, samupādikā
 (samupodikā), samedikā,
 427.
 sampadā, sampadāna, 68,
 n. 30.
 samparivattakaṃ, 80.
 samputita, 59, 60.
 sammatt(h)atthāna, 81.
 samma-d-eva, 70.
 sammiñjati, 533.
 sammuti, 58.
 sa-raṇa, 83.
 salākagga, 56.
 savana, 81.
 sassatisamaṃ, 423.
 sahavyatā, 70, n. 37.
 sākhalya, 75.
 sāṭeti, sāteti, sādeti, 64, n.
 20; 548.
 sāmāyika, 75.
 sāmici, 64.
 sāyati, sāyaniya, sāyita, 56,
 57.
 sāyanha, 80.
 sāramatino, 430.
 sārāṇiya, 75.
 sippi, 60, n. 10; 75.
 simbali, 58.
 sītūḍaka, 78.
 sukhumāla, 66.
 suṅkhasādhaka, °-sāyika,
 429.
 suṇāti, suta, 64, n. 19.
 Sutanā, 76.
 sutta, 69.
 suttajāla-samatthita, 74.
 suddhadhara, 69, n. 32.
 sutta-nikkhepa, 69, n. 34.
 suddanta, 69, n. 34.
 sudaṃ, 83.
 suditṭha, sudditṭha, 574.
 sunakha, 59, n. 6.
 supāṇa (suvāna), 59, n. 6;
 62, n. 17; 64, n. 20.
 subbaca, 574.
 Suraparicara, 426.
 suvāna. See supāṇa.
 suve, 79.
 susu, 76.
 susukālakesa, 543, 544.
 sūra, sūriya, 75.
 se, 75.
 'setṭho jane tasmim,' 425.
 senānigama, Senānigāma,
 544.
 seyyathā, 75.
 seḷeti, 76.
 sotthāna, 428.
 sovaṇṇaya, 421.
 sve. See suve.
 haṅkhāmi, hañchati, 74.
 hīnāy' āvattati, 428.
 hupeyya, huveyya, 62, n. 17.
 hetuye, 79.
 hemantāna, 428.
 hoti, 57.

IV.

INDEX

TO THE

PAṬISAMBHIDĀMAGGA

COMPILED BY

MABEL HUNT.

- Akappiyattho. *See* Akampiyaṇ.
Akampiyaṇ. °attho, I, 16, 17; 29; 89; II, 161.
°ābhisamayo, II, 216. °maggo, II, 84. °maṇḍo,
II, 87. °vimutti, II, 145. °virāgo, II, 143.
Akuppo (vimokkho), II, 40.
Akusalakammaṭṭhā, *the ten*, I, 130.
Aggi. aggī, *the ten*, I, 129. °kkhandho, I, 125.
Aggo. aggasuññaṇ, II, 179.
Ajjhattaṇ (cakkhu, &c.), I, 76. °vutthāno (vimokkho),
II, 36, 37. °suññaṇ, II, 181.
Ajjhupekkhati, I, 62; 64; 91; 168; 170; II, 24, 25.
Ajjhupekkhanattho, I, 16; II, 119.
Aññaṇaṇ, II, 49 *foll.*; 58 *foll.*; 73 *foll.*
Aññaṇaṇ. °cariyā, I, 80.
Atṭiyamāno, I, 159.
Atṭhamako, II, 193.
-Atṭho, I, 15; 88; 90, 91; 118; 173; 180; II, 108; 150;
194.
Atighamsitvā (*v. l.* atikkamitvā), II, 196.
Attavādo. °paṭisaṇṇyutto, I, 156-9.
Attā, I, 107; 143 *foll.*; 157; 159 *foll.*; II, 80. °anu-
ditṭhi, I, 143. °parinibbāpanaṇ, I, 175. Anattā,

- II, 106. anattānupassanā, II, 37; 45-47; 63; 241,
 242. anattatomanasikaroti, II, 48 *fol.*; 58 *fol.*; 101.
 Atthangamo, II, 4; 6, 7; 39.
 Attho. °paṭisambhidā, I, 132; II, 150; 157. °raso,
 II, 88. °sandassanaṃ, I, 105. yathatthā, *the ten*,
 I, 173, 174.
 Addhā, II, 19, 21.
 Adhiccasamupannikā, *the four*, I, 155
 Adhiṭṭhanaṃ, I, 108; 111; II, 21; 245. °balaṃ, II,
 171; 176. °iddhi, II, 174; 207. °suññaṃ, II, 183.
 Adhipateyyaṃ, II, 161. dhammādhipateyyo, II, 160.
 Adhimutti, I, 124.
 Anaññatho, II, 104; 124.
 Anativattanaṃ, I, 16; 21; 31, 32, 33; 74.
 Anabhissaro, I, 126.
 Anavajjo, II, 116, 117. °balaṃ, II, 170; 176.
 Anāgāmī, II, 194. °maggo. *See* Maggo, Cattāro
 Maggā.
 Anīṇjanaṃ, I, 15.
 Anīṭṭhangatā, I, 81.
 Anujotanaṃ, I, 18.
 Anuṭṭhiti, I, 18.
 Anuttariyāni, *the six*, I, 5.
 Anudhammo. °atā, I, 35, 36. dhammānudhammapa-
 ṭipatti, II, 189.
 Anunetā, II, 194.
 Anupassati, I, 57; 187.
 Anupassanā. anicc°, anatt°, dukkh°, &c., I, 10; 20;
 24; 32; 45; 47; 96; 98; II, 11, 12; 37; 41 *fol.*;
 56; 172; 185; 211. °ñāṇaṃ, *list of*, II, 67 *fol.*
 Anupassī. anicca°, I, 191. nirodha°, I, 192. virāga°,
 I, 192.
 Anupādā, II, 45, 46.
 Anupubbanirodhā, *the nine*, I, 35. °vihārā, *the nine*,
 I, 5.
 Anubujjanaṃ, I, 18.
 Anubrūhanā, I, 167.
 Anusayo, I, 81; 171; II, 93; *the seven*, I, 26; 130.

- In detail*, I, 70-73; 123; 195; II, 36; 84; 94; 141; 144. āsay°, II, 158. taṇhā°, I, 127.
- Anusāsani. °pāṭihāriyaṇ, II, 227, 228.
- Anussati. °tṭhānāni, *the six*, I, 28. *In detail*, I, 48; 95. upasama°, I, 95. upatṭhānānussati, I, 186.
- Anulomaṇ. vimokkhānulomaṇ, II, 67; 70.
- Antaggāhiko, I, 151 *fol.*; 158.
- Antavā. attā, I, 157. loko, I, 151 *fol.*; 157.
- Antānantikā, *the four*, I, 155.
- Antoparisoko, I, 38.
- Antosoko, I, 38.
- Apariyāpanno, I, 101. *See also* Bhūmi.
- Apāyagamaniyo, I, 94.
- Appamaññāyo, *the four*, I, 84.
- Appamaṇo, II, 126, 127.
- Abhijjamāno, II, 208.
- Abhiññā, II, 156; *the six*, I, 35. °ñāṇāni, *the six*, II, 189.
- Abhiṇataṇ, I, 165; 167.
- Abhitunna. assāsenā°, I, 164. dukkhābhitunno (? °tunṇo), I, 129 (*J.P.T.S.*, 1886, p. 135).
- Abhiniropanaṇ, I, 16; 21; 30; 69; 75; 79; 90.
- Abhinīhāro, I, 61 *fol.*; II, 121.
- Abhippamodayo, I, 95; 176; 190.
- Abhibhāyatanāni, *the eight*, I, 5.
- Abhiropanaṇ, II, 82; 93. °abhisamayo, II, 216. °cariyā, II, 20. °maggo, II, 84. °vimutti, II, 145. °virāgo, II, 142. buddhi-abhiropanaṇ, II, 115. (*Cf. Dh. S.*, § 7: abhiniropanā.)
- Abhisandanaṇ, I, 17.
- Abhisamayo, II, 215.
- Abhisambhavati, II, 193.
- Anabhisambhavanīyo, II, 193.
- Amarāvikkhepikā, *the four*, I, 155.
- Araññaṇ, I, 176.
- Arahaṇ, II, 3; 19; 194; 203; 207; 210; 225.
- Arahattamaggo. *See* Maggo (Cattāro Maggā).

- Ari, II, 197.
 Ariyo. ariyaṭṭhangiko. *See* Maggo. ariyā iddhi,
 II, 212. ariyapuggalo, I, 167. ariyavaṁsāni, *the*
 four, I, 84. ariyasaccaṇ. *See* Saccaṇ.
 Arūpāvacaro, I, 83, 84; 101. °samāpatti, I, 84, 85.
 Avadhānaṇ. *See* Sotāvadhānaṇ.
 Avikkhepo, II, 228. °parisuddhattaṇ, I, 94.
 Avijjā. *See* Vijjā.
 Avīcinirayo, I, 83.
 Avecca. °pasanno, I, 161.
 Avyākato, II, 108, 109.
 Avyāpādo. *See* Byāpādo.
 Asekho. asekkhabalaṇ, II, 176; *the ten*, II, 173.
 Asmimāno, I, 26.
 Assako (*v. l.* asako), I, 126.
 Assādo. assādadiṭṭhi, I, 139 *fol.*; 157.
 Assāso, I, 95; 164-166; 170 *fol.*; 177, 178; 180;
 182 *fol.* assāsādimajjhapiyosānaṇ, *etc.*, I, 164;
 165.
 Ākāsānañcāyatanāṇ, I, 36.
 Ākiñcaññāyatanāṇ, I, 36.
 Āgāraṇ, I, 176.
 Āghātavatthūni, *the nine, the ten*, I, 130.
 Ādiṇṇattaṇ, I, 49. an°, I, 49.
 Ādīnavo, I, 192-194; II, 9, 10.
 Ādevo, I, 38.
 Ādesanā. °pāṭihāriyaṇ, II, 227.
 Ānāpānakathā, I, 162.
 Ānāpānasati, I, 166; 172. °samādhi, I, 185, 186.
 Āneñjaṇ, II, 206.
 Ābhujati. (pallankaṇ), I, 176.
 Āmasati, II, 209.
 Āmisāṇ. mārāmisato, II, 238. sāmiso vimokkho, II,
 41. nirāmisato, I, 59. nir° vimokkho, II, 41.
 Āyatanāṇ. āyatanāni, *the twelve*, I, 101; 122; II, 230.
 in detail, I, 7; 137. ajjhattikāni, *the six*, I, 22;
 122; II, 181. bāhirāni, *the six*, II, 181; ajjhatti-

- kabāhirāṇi, *the six*, II, 19; 225. āyatanatṭho, I, 192; II, 121. āyatanaloko, I, 122. kasināyatanāni, *the ten*, I, 28. saḷ°. *See that title.*
 Āyuhanā, I, 10-15; 32; 52; II, 218. an°, I, 11-15; II, 218. āyuhanatṭhiti, I, 50.
 Āraddhaviriyo, I, 171.
 Ārammaṇaṇ, I, 57, 58; 180; II, 97; 118; 150. ārammaṇāni, *the four*, I, 84. an°, I, 170. vimuttārammaṇo, II, 143. virāgārammaṇo, II, 141.
 Āloko. udapādi, II, 150 *fol.*; 159; 162.
 Āvacarā, *the three, in detail*, II, 72; 74.
 Āvajjanaṇ, II, 5, 6, 7; 120.
 Āvajjitattaṇ, II, 27, 28, 29.
 Āvaraṇaṇ, I, 131-134. an°, I, 131-134; II, 158.
 Āsavo. *the four*, I, 94; 117. khīṇāsavo, II, 173; 176. an° II, 99; 117; 176. an° vimokkho, II, 40.
 Āsayo, I, 123. āsayānusayo, I, 133.
 Āsevatī. maggaṇ, II, 93.
 Āhāro, I, 55; 57; 76; 78. *the four*, I, 22; 122. āhāratṭhitiko, I, 5; 122.

 Ijjhanaṇ, I, 17; 19; 74; 111; 181; II, 125; 143; 145; 161; 174.
 Iñjana. aniñjanatṭho, II, 118.
 Iddhi, *the ten*, II, 205. °balāni, *the ten*, II, 174. °pātihāriyaṇ, II, 227. °vidho, I, 111; II, 207; puññavato, II, 213.
 Iddhipādo, I, 17; 21; 74; II, 85; 90; 120; 161. *the four*, I, 84; II, 56; 86; 166; 174; *in detail*, I, 111 *fol.*; II, 154, 155; 164; 205. iddhipādārammaṇā, II, 164. iddhipādavatthukā, II, 164.
 Indriyaṇ, I, 17; 113. *the three, in relation to Cattāro Maggā*, I, 115; II, 30. *the five*, II, 56; 86; 166; 174. *in detail*, I, 16; 21; 28; 88; 180; II, 1 *fol.*; 13; 21; 31; 84; 88; 119; 132; 137; 143; 145; 160; 223. *the nineteen*, I, 137. *the twenty-two*, I, 7. indriyaparopariyattaṇ, I, 121, 122; 133, 134; II, 158; 175. indriyāṇaṇ pañca

- vivekā, virāgā, &c., II, 223. man°, I, 190. paññ°, II, 49 *fol.* saddhindriyaṇ, II, 49; 51 *fol.* samādh°, II, 49; 51 *fol.*
- Iriyāpathā, *the four*, II, 225.
- Issariyaṇ. issariyabalaṇ, II, 171; 176.
- Ucchedo. ucchedaditṭhi, I, 150; 158.
- Uṭṭhito. an°, I, 172.
- Udakadhārā, I, 125.
- Udayo, I, 54. udayabbayo, I, 54.
- Uddhaccaṇ, II, 9; 87; 97 *fol.*; 119; 142; 145; 169; 176. ni-uddhaccaṇ, I, 83.
- Udhacco. sa-uddhacco, I, 81. °sahagatakilesa, II, 98, 99.
- Udrayaṇ. sukh°, dukkh°, I, 80.
- Upakkilesā, *the eighteen*, I, 164.
- Upakkhittako, II, 196.
- Upago. ākāśānañcāyatana°, I, 84. nevasaññānāsaññāyatana°, I, 84.
- Upaṭṭhānaṇ. upaṭṭhānakusalo, II, 28, 29. an°, I, 101; II, 7, 8, 9. ekatt°, II, 5. anupaṭṭhānatāpaññā, II, 230.
- Upapatti. an°, I, 11-15.
- Upavādako. an°, I, 115.
- Upavicāro, I, 17.
- Upādānaṇ, I, 51, 52; 54; 193; II, 46; 113. upādānāni, *the four*, I, 129; II, 46, 47. nidānaṇ, &c., II, 111.
- Upādānakkhandhā, *the five*, II, 109, 110; 147.
- Upādiseso. an°, I, 101.
- Upāyāso, anupāyāso, I, 11-15.
- Upekkhā, I, 8; 177. sankhār°, I, 60-64. °anubrūhanā, I, 167. °sukhaṇ, I, 36.
- Uppādo, anuppādo, I, 59-61; 66, 67.
- Ussineti, II, 167.
- Ekaggatā, I, 48; 97; 177.
- Ekaccasassatikā, *the four*, I, 155.

Ekattaṇ, I, 108; 163; 167; II, 7, 8; 105, 121.
ekattavimokkha, II, 41. ekattasuññaṇ, II, 183.

Eko. ekakkhaṇe, II, 65. ekaraso, I, 15; 17; 21; 28,
29; 33; 74; 87; 168; 170; 172, 173; II, 24, 25;
49 foll.; 58 foll. ekasangahatā, I, 105.

Ekodi, I, 17, 18.

Esanā, II, 111, 112. °suññaṇ, II, 182.

Okappati, II, 19; 21.

Oghā, the four, I, 26.

Ottappaṇ. ottappabalaṇ, II, 169; 176.

Ottappati, II, 169; 176.

Odhiso. an°, II, 130.

Obhāso, I, 114; II, 100; 150 foll.; 159; 162. paññā°,
I, 119.

Oliyanā (? Oliyana). °abhiniveso, I, 157.

Kankhā, II, 62.

Kampati. vi° I, 164, 165; II, 102.

Kammaṇ, I, 55, 56, 57; 76; 78; 80; II, 78. kamma-
vipāko, II, 78. °vipākajā iddhi, II, 174; 213.
kāyā°, mano°, vacī, II, 195. kusala°, II, 72 foll.;
78. °samādānaṇ, II, 174.

Kamyatā. muñcitu°, I, 60; 65.

Karuṇā, I, 8. mahā°, I, 126. mahākaruṇāsamā-
patti, I, 133.

Kasato, II, 87 foll.

Kasiṇā, the ten, I, 6; 95; 136; the eight, I, 49; 143-
144; 149-151. °samāpatti, II, 208. °āyatanāni,
the ten, I, 28.

Kāmāvacaro. (bhūmi), I, 83. (dhammo), I, 84, 85;
101.

Kāmo. See Āsavo, the four. anusayā, the four, in
detail. kāmaguṇā, the five, I, 129. kāmac-
chando, I, 103; 108; II, 22, 23; 26; 44; 169.

Kāyo. anupassanā, I, 178; 184; II, 152, 153; 163;
232. ujuṇ kāyaṇ paṇidhāya, I, 175, 176. kāyā,
the two, I, 183. °sankhāro, I, 184; 186.

Kilesa, I, 33; II, 217. °vatthūni, *the ten*, I, 130.
tad-anuvattakakilesa, I, 69-72; II, 10; 36, 37;
140.

Kuppo. (vimokkho), II, 40.

Kusalo. (kammaṇ), II, 72 *foll.*; 78. (dhammo), I,
101; 132; II, 15, 230. (saccaṇ), II, 108.

Kusalakammāpathā, *the ten*, I, 85. a°, I, 85.

Khaṇo. nikantikkhaṇo, II, 72 *foll.* paṭisandhikkhaṇo,
II, 72 *foll.* phalakkhaṇo, I, 26. sotāpattimag-
gakkhaṇo, &c., II, 3.

Khanti, I, 176. anulomika, II, 236, *foll.*; °balaṇ, II,
171; 176. °suññaṇ, II, 183.

Khandho. khandhā, *the five*, I, 54; 101; II, 72; 74;
76; 230; 238. *In detail*, I, 5; 8; 23; 35; 55.
arūpino, II, 73, *foll.* upādānakkhandhā, I, 22;
37; 39; 122. diṭṭhiṭṭhānaṇ, I, 138. °dhātu, I,
83. khandhānaṇ khandhaṭṭho, I, 17; 132; II,
121; 157. dhammākkhandhā, *the five*, I, 34.
khandhaloko, I, 122. khandhānaṇ nirodho, II,
238.

Khayo. khayadhammā, I, 53; 76; 78.

Khīṇāsavo. khīṇāsavabalāni, *the seven*, I, 35; *the ten*,
II, 173; 176.

Khīyati, I, 94; 96; II, 31.

Khemaṇ, I, 59. *See also* Yogo.

Gati. °sampatti, II, 72 *foll.*

Ganthā, *the four*, I, 129.

Gambhīro. °paññā, II, 192. (ṭhānaṇ), II, 19, 21.

Garu. °upanissito, II, 202.

Garuḷo, II, 196.

Gocaro, I, 180; II, 97; 150 *foll.*

Gotrabhū. I, 66-68. °dhammā, I, 67; II, 64.

Cakkaṇ. *the four*, I, 84. dhamma°, II, 159 *foll.*

Cakkhu, I, 8; 22; 76; 96; 104; 106; 135; II, 67;
102. °karaṇi, II, 147. (dibbaṇ), I, 114; II, 175.

- °samphasso, I, 5; 40; 136. °samphassajo, I, 6; 40; 136. acakkhuto, I, 129. Buddha°, II, 33. samanta°, II, 31. °ssa aniccatṭhaṇ, I, 132. udapādi, II, 150 *fol.*; 159; 162.
- Candimā. abbhā mutto va, I, 175.
- Cammakhando, I, 176.
- Caritan (sattānaṇ), I, 124.
- Cariyā, II, 17; 245; *the three*, I, 79 *fol.*; *the eight*, II, 19, 20; 225. adhimokkha°, II, 8. upatṭhāna°, II, 8; 20. gambhīrañña°, II, 1. dassana°, II, 9; 20. ñāṇa°, I, 82; 99. paggaha°, II, 8; 20. samādhi°, I, 99.
- Cittan, I, 17; 19; 111; 113; 189-191; II, 121. adhi°, II, 243. anupādā cittassa vimokkho, II, 45. cittānupassanā, II, 152, 153; 163. cittānupassī, II, 233. cittacetāsiko, I, 84. cittavipallāso, II, 80. cittavivaṭṭo, II, 70. cittasankhāro, I, 95; 188.
- Cetāsiko. citta°, I, 84.
- Ceto. cetasā, II, 39. °vivaṭṭo, I, 108; 110; II, 70.
- Chando, I, 19; 107; II, 5, 6, 7; 23 *fol.*; 123; 182. chandarāgaṇirodho, I, 9.
- Chinnamanupassanaṇ, I, 72.
- Jarā, I, 11-15; 59; 60; 65; 67; 128; II, 147. a°, I, 11-15. °maraṇaṇ, I, 50-54; 85; 96; 98; 105, 106; II, 67; 102; 111; 113. jarāmarāṇassa aniccatṭho, I, 132. jarāmarāṇanimittaṇ, I, 93. °maraṇaṇ nirujjhati, I, 193, 194.
- Javanaṇ, I, 80.
- Javano. javanapaññā, II, 185, 186, 187; 200.
- Jāti, I, 11-15; 54; 59, 60; 65-7; 114; 128; II, 111; 113; 147; 175. a° I, 11-15. nirujjhati, I, 193.
- Jīvitāṇ, II, 245. *See also* Indriya (*the nineteen, the twenty-two*).
- Jotanaṇ. anu°, paṭi°, sañ°, II, 122.
- Jhānaṇ. jhānāni, *the four*, I, 8; 20; 24; 31; 35, 36; 41; 45; 47; 64; 67; 84; 95; 97 *fol.*; 138; II,

10; 12; 14; 16; 18; 19; 36, 37; 40, 41; 55; 70; 169 *fol.*; 172; 205; 225. ādi, majjhe, pariyosānaṃ, I, 167-169. jhānavimokkho, II, 245.

Nāṇaṃ, I, 60, 61; 64; 69, 70; 88; 102 *fol.*; 118 *fol.*; 162; 175; 194-196; II, 32; 189; 191, 192; 195; 244. anupassanā°, *list of*, II, 67 *fol.* anupassane ñāṇāni, I, 186. appaṭihataṃ, II, 195. udapādi, II, 150 *fol.*; 159; 162. khanti°, I, 106. dibba-cakkhu°, I, 114. dhammatṭhiti°, I, 50. ñāṇa-cariyā, I, 82. ñāṇavimokkho, II, 36; 42. ñāṇavippārā (iddhi), II, 211. ñāṇavivaṭṭo, I, 109, 110; II, 70. nibbidā°, I, 195. Buddha°, I, 133; II, 31; 195. sabbaññuta°, I, 131-134. sammā°, II, 173. sotadhātuvisuddhi°, I, 112.

Thānaṃ (vijjati), II, 236, 237.

Thiti, I, 50. dhammatṭhitiñāṇaṃ, I, 50, 51, 52.

Taṭṭiko, I, 176.

Taṇhā, I, 50, 51, 52; 55-57; 76-78; 102; 127, 128; 136; II, 113; *the three*, I, 26. *In detail*, I, 39; II, 147; *the six, in detail*, I, 6. kiṃ-nidānā, &c., II, 111. nirujjhati, I, 193. °kāyā, *the six*, I, 26; 130. °papañco, I, 130. °mūlakā, *the nine*, I, 26; 130.

Tatuttaraṭṭho, I, 22; 75, 76; 182; II, 143; 146; 162.

Tathaṃ, II, 104, 105, 106. avi°, II, 104, 105.

Tathaṭṭho, I, 17; 20, 21; II, 85; 104 *fol.*; 143; 145.

Tathāgato, I, 43; 121 *fol.*; 151; 154, 155; 160;

II, 3; 19; 31; 33; 194; 203; 225. Tathāgatabalāni, *the ten*, II, 174.

Tadangaṃ. tadangasuññaṃ, II, 180.

Taraṇaṭṭho, I, 15; II, 99; 119.

Tikkha. °paññā, II, 200.

Tikkhindriyo, I, 121; II, 195.

Titthiyo, I, 160.

Timi. timitimingalaṃ, II, 196.

Tīranattho, I, 17; 87; II, 120.

Tīrayitvā, II, 200. tīrito, I, 23.

Tūlayitvā, II, 200.

Tejo, I, 103.

Thīnamiddhaṇ, I, 31; 45, 46; 100, 101; 108; 123;
162, 163; II, 12; 23; 45; 169; 179, 180; 228;
230.

Dakkhiṇo, I, 125.

Dakkhuṇ (*v. l. cakkhuṇ*), II, 81.

Dassanaṇ, II, 244. °attho, II, 150. °cariyā, II, 9; 20.
sammā°, II, 62.

Diṭṭhi, I, 80, 81; 135 *fol.* antaggāhikā, I, 151.
°tthānāni, *the eight*, I, 138. °ppatto, II, 51-53;
55-57; 61. bhava°, I, 123; 157. micchādiṭṭhi,
sakkāyadiṭṭhi. *See s. vv.* sammādiṭṭhi. *See*
Maggo. °vipallāso, II, 80. vibhava°, I, 123; 157,
158. sadiṭṭhi, I, 81. °gataṇ, I, 155; *the two*, I,
129; *the six*, I, 130; *the sixty-two*, I, 130;
161. diṭṭhekattho, I, 33; II, 13; 23. nidiṭṭhi,
I, 83.

Dhammapadāni, *the four*, I, 84.

Dhuvo. a°, I, 76, 77; 126.

Dibbo. cakkhu, I, 114; II, 175.

Disā, I, 112; II, 39; *the four, in detail*, II, 131; 136,
137. anu°, I, 112; II, 131; 136, 137. uparimā,
I, 112; II, 131; 136, 137. hetṭhimā, I, 112; II,
131; 136, 137.

Dukkhaṇ, I, 11, 12; 37, 38; 59; 70; 86; 110; II,
106; 123; 147. dukkhassa dukkhattho, I, 132;
134; II, 31; 106. dukkhuḍrayaṇ kammaṇ, I, 80;
82, 83; II, 79. dukkhavipāko, I, 80; 82, 83
II, 79. dukkhato manasikaroti, II, 48 *fol.*; 58;
101. dukkhānupassanā, II, 37, 43; 45, 46, 47;
241. dukkhābhitunno, I, 129. *See also* Saccāṇ
(ariya).

Duccaritāni, *the three*, I, 129. *In detail*, I, 115.

Dubhato. °vutṭhānavivattaṇe paññā, I, 69. °vutṭhāno vimokkho, II, 35 *fol.* °suññā, II, 181.

Devo, I, 83, 84. *list of*, II, 149.

Doso, I, 80, 81; 102. sa°, I, 81; 113. vīta°, I, 113. nidoso, I, 80, 82.

Dhammo, I, 34; 78; 131, 132; 181; II, 150; 159 *fol.*; 237. dhammā, *lists of*, I, 5; 22; 26; 28; 34. dhammatṭhitiñāṇaṇ, I, 50; 52. dhammānupassanā, II, 152; 154; 163; 234. dhammānussati, I, 48. dhammapaṭisambhidā, II, 150; 157. °raso, II, 88. °saññā, &c., I, 40. kaṇhasukka°, II, 217. kāmāvacarā, rūpā-, arūpāvacarā, I, 101; 132; II, 230. nānādharmā, I, 104. sabba°, I, 101. apariyāpannā, I, 101; 132; II, 230. abyākatā, I, 101; 132; II, 230. kusalā, akusalā, I, 101; 132; II, 15; 230. khaya°, vaya°, virāga°, nirodha°, I, 53; 76; 78. asekhā dhammā, *the ten*, I, 35. dhammā lokuttarā, II, 166. dhammuddhaccaviggahitaṇ, II, 100-102. taṇhāmūlakā, I, 130. pāmojjamūlakā, *the nine*, I, 85. manasikāramūlakā dhammā, *the nine*, I, 86.

Dhātu. dhātuyo, *the two*, I, 5; *the three*, I, 5; 137; *the six*, I, 6; 136; *the eighteen*, I, 7; 101; 137; II, 230. dhātūnaṇ dhātutṭho, I, 132; II, 121; 157. nibbāna°, I, 101. °loko, I, 122. sotadhātu-visuddhiñāṇaṇ, I, 112.

Nandhaṇ. *See* Yuga.

Nānattaṇ, I, 63, 64; 88 *fol.* nānattā, *the nine*, I, 87. nānattekattaṇ, I, 103. °saññā, II, 172. °vimokkho, II, 41. vihāra°, I, 91. samāpatti°, I, 91.

Nāmakāyo, I, 183.

Nāmarūpaṇ, I, 22; 50, 51; 56, 57; 122; 138; II, 72; 113. kiṇ-nidānaṇ, &c., II, 112. nirujjhati, I, 193.

Nikanti, II, 101, 102. °kkhaṇe, II, 72 *fol.*

Niggahatṭho. *See* Viniggaho.

Nicco, II, 80. aniccānupassanā, II, 37; 43; 45-47;

- 241, 242. *aniccaṇ*, I, 191; II, 28, 29; 80; 106.
aniccato manasikaroti, II, 48 *fol.*; 58; 100.
- Nicchāto*, II, 243.
- Nijjaravatthūni*, I, 5.
- Nijjhanti*. °*balāṇ*, II, 171; 176.
- Nitthā*. *nitthāṇ* gato, I, 161 (A. v., 119; *cf.* A. ii. 144).
- Nidānāni*, *the nine*, I, 8.
- Niddasavatthūni*, *the seven*, I, 5.
- Ninnetā*, II, 194.
- Ninno*. tan°, II, 197.
- Nipannako*, II, 209.
- Nibbānaṇ*, I, 60; 66, 67; 75; 91; II, 40; 140; 142, 143; 165; 237. °*ārammaṇatā*, II, 140, 143. °*dhātu*, I, 101.
- Nibbidā*. °*ñāṇāni*, I, 195. °*ānupassanā*, II, 43; 45-47.
- Nibbedhiko*. *nibbedhikapāññā*, II, 201.
- Nimittaṇ*, I, 60; 66; 91, 92; 164; 170; II, 39; 64; *with pavattaṇ*, II, 62, 63. *animittaṇ*, I, 60; 66; 91; II, 99. *animittānupassanā*, II, 44-47. *animitto vimokkho*, II, 36; 59-62; 65 *fol.* *jarāmarāṇa*°, I, 93. *nānattekattarūpa*°, I, 114. *nānattekattasadda*°, I, 112. *bahiddhāsankhārā*°, I, 66; 68. *rūpa*°, I, 92. *vedanā*°, I, 93. *sadda*°, I, 112.
- Niyāmo*. *sammatta*° *okkamati*, II, 236 *fol.*
- Niyyānaṇ*, I, 163. °*aṭṭho*, I, 176.
- Nirayo*. *Avicinirayo*, I, 83.
- Nirutti*, I, 88 *fol.*; II, 150. °*paṭisambhidā*, II, 150.
- Nirodho*, I, 66, 67; 70; 91; 101, 102; 118; II, 230. *nirodhānupassī*, I, 192. *nirodhānupassanā*, II, 44-47. *nirodhassa nirodhaṭṭho*, I, 132; 134; II, 32. *nirodhasamāpatti*, I, 97; 100. *bhava*°, I, 159. *sammādiṭṭhiyā*, *&c.*, *pañca nirodhā*, II, 221. (*indriyāṇaṇ*), II, 223.
- Nissaṭo*, II, 10-13. *su*°, II, 13.
- Nissayo*. °*paccayo*, II, 49 *fol.*; 58 *fol.*; 73 *fol.* (*indriyāṇaṇ*), II, 223. *sammādiṭṭhiyā*, *&c.* *nissayā*, II, 220.

- Nissaraṇaṇ, II, 244. °suññaṇ, II, 180.
- Nivaraṇaṇ, I, 31; 163. nīvaraṇāni, *the five*, I, 26; 129.
- Nekkhammaṇ, I, 20; 23; 31; 33, 34; 94; 100, 101; 107 *fol.*; II, 12; 22; 26; 55; 93; 116; 169 *fol.*; 179, 180; 228; 230; 244. nekkhammābhīrato, II, 173.
- Nevasaññānāsaññāyatanāṇ, I, 36.
- Pakati, II, 208.
- Pakāsaṇaṇ. dhammapakāsanatā, I, 104.
- Paggaho, II, 8, 20.
- Paccaniko. vimokkha°, II, 67; 69.
- Paccayo, II, 116, 117.
- Pajahati. pahīno, I, 63; II, 244.
- Paññatti. °balaṇ, II, 171; 176.
- Paññā, I, 53; 59; 64-66; 72, 73; 87 *fol.*; 102 *fol.*; 119; II, 162; 185 *fol.* adhi°, I, 20; 25-33; 45-47; 58; 169; II, 11; 13; 243. udapādi, II, 150 *fol.* paṭipassaddhip°, I, 71. °paṭilābho, II, 189.
- Paṭikkūlo. a°, II, 212.
- Paṭigho. See Saññā, paṭigha°.
- Paṭiccasamuppanno, I, 51, 52; 76; 78.
- Paṭiccasamuppādo, *statement of*, I, 50 *fol.*; 114.
- Paṭijotanaṇ, I, 18.
- Paṭinissaggo. *the two*, I, 194. paṭinissaggānupassanā, II, 44-47.
- Paṭipatti. dhammānudhamma°, II, 15, 17.
- Paṭipadā, I, 86; *the four*, I, 84. majjhimā, II, 147.
- Paṭippassaddhi. vimokkha°, II, 71. °visuddhi, II, 3. °suññaṇ, II, 180.
- Paṭipassaddho. sup°. II, 2, 3.
- Paṭibandho, I, 172. kāya°, I, 184.
- Paṭibhānaṇ. °paṭisambhidā, II, 150; 157.
- Paṭilābho. paññā°, II, 189. paṭilābhasuññaṇ, II, 182.
- Paṭividito, I, 188.
- Paṭivijjhati, I; 180 *fol.* paṭividdho, II, 19, 20.

- Paṭivedho, I, 105 ; II, 50 ; 59 ; 111, 112. paṭivedhā-divisodhanaṇ, II, 168. paṭivedhasuññaṇ, II, 182. sacca°, II, 57 ; 61. cattāri saccāṇi ekapaṭivedhāni, II, 105 *fol.*
- Paṭisankhā, I, 33 ; 45 ; 57 ; 60 ; 62 ; 64. ap°, I, 33 ; 45. Paṭisankhāṇ. paṭisankhānabalaṇ, II, 169 ; 176.
- Paṭisandhi, I, 11-15 ; 52 ; 59, 60 ; 62. ap°, I, 11-15. °kkhaṇe, II, 72 *fol.*
- Paṭisaṇvedi, I, 95 ; 186 *fol.* evaṇsukhadukkha°, I, 114. sabbakāya°, I, 184.
- Paṭisambhidā, *the four*, I, 84 ; II, 56 ; 116, 117. *In detail*, I, 88 ; 119 ; 133 ; II, 150 ; 157 ; 185 ; 193. °ñāṇāni, *the four*, II, 189. paṭisambhidāya paṭisambhidaṭṭho, I, 132 ; 134 ; II, 32. paṭisambhidaṭṭhā, II, 202.
- Paṭihāriyaṇ. iddhi°, ādesanā°, anusāsani°, II, 227.
- Paṭihiraṇ. yamaka°, I, 125 ; 133 ; II, 158.
- Paṇamati. paṇato, a°, I, 165 ; 167.
- Paṇihito. (vimokkho), II, 41. appaṇihito, II, 100. (vimokkho), II, 36 ; 41 ; 59-62 ; 65. appaṇihitānupassanā, II, 43-47.
- Paṇḍiccaṇ, II, 185.
- Padahanaṇ, I, 17 ; 21 ; 181.
- Padhāniyaṇ. pārisuddhipadhāniyaṇāni, *the nine*, I, 28.
- Padhāṇaṇ. sammappadhāṇaṇ, II, 1 ; 85 ; 90 ; 161 ; *the four*, I, 84 ; II, 14 *fol.* ; 56 ; 86 ; 166 ; 174.
- Pabhangato, II, 288.
- Pabhāseti, I, 174.
- Pamādo, II, 8, 9 ; 169 ; 176 ; 197.
- Pamuṭṭho. a°, I, 173.
- Payogo. sammāpayogapaccayā iddhi, II, 213.
- Paramatṭho. paramatṭhasuññaṇ, II, 184.
- Paraloko. °vajjabhayadassāvino, I, 121, 122.
- Pariggaho. pariggahasuññaṇ, II, 182.
- Paricito, I, 172. anupubbaṇ paricitā, I, 173.
- Pariccāgo, II, 98.
- Pariññā, II, 156.

- Parināyiko, II, 197.
 Paridevo, I, 11-15; 38; 59, 60; 65-67. a°, I, 11-15; 67.
 Parinibbāpanaṇ, I, 175.
 Parinibbāyi, *four modes of*, I, 161.
 Paripantho. paripantho ñāṇāni, I, 162.
 Paripuṇṇo, I, 172
 Paripūraṇ. °attho, I, 15; 18; 49; 172; II, 122. mūla°, II, 116; 118.
 Parimukhaṇ, I, 176.
 Pariyanto, I, 42-44. a°, I, 42, 43. evaṇ-āyu°, I, 114.
 Pariyādiyati, I, 100, 101; II, 26.
 Pariyādānaṇ, II, 21.
 Pariyogāhanaṇ, I, 106; 112-114. nānattekattaviññā-
 ñacariyā°, I, 113. °suññaṇ, II, 183.
 Pariyosānaṇ. assāsādimaṇṇha°, passāsādimaṇṇha°, I, 164, 165.
 Pariḷayhati, I, 128.
 Pavattaṇ, I, 10-13; 59; 65, 66; 91 *fol.*; 100, 101; II, 63, 64; 127. ap°, I, 11-15; 59; 66; II, 127; 184.
 Pavālho, II, 211.
 Paviveko, II, 244.
 Pasādanaṇ, II, 121.
 Passaddhi, II, 244.
 Passāso, I, 95; 164-166; 170 *fol.*; 177, 178; 180; 182 *fol.*
 Pahānaṇ, II, 98; 156; *list of*, I, 26.
 Pahitatto. asallinattapahitattapaggahaṭṭho, I, 103.
 Pāmojjaṇ, I, 177.
 Pārisuddho. °silaṇ, I, 42.
 Piṭhaṇ, I, 176.
 Pīti. °pharaṇatā, I, 48.
 Puggalo, I, 180 *fol.*; II, 1 *fol.*; 52. dve puggalā
 paṭisambhidappattā, II, 202. para°, I, 113. saddho,
 asaddho, I, 121; II, 33.
 Puthujjano, I, 61-64; 143; 156; II, 27, 28. °kaly-
 āṇako, I, 176; II, 190; 193.

Purisadosā, *the eight*, I, 130.

Poṇo. tap°, II, 197.

Pharaṇaṇ, II, 130

Pharaṇatā. pīti°, &c., I, 48.

Phalaṇ, I, 71; II, 140; *the four*, II, 38; 54; 71; 236.
 phalakkhaṇo, I, 26. °ñāṇāni, *the four*, II, 189.
 °visuddhi, II, 3. °samāpatti, I, 62; 64. sāmāñña-
 phalāni, *the four*, I, 34; II, 19; 40, 41; 166; 225.
 sotāpattiphalakkhaṇo, &c., I, 105; II, 3. sotā-
 pattiphalasamāpatti, &c., I, 20; 65; 68; 99;
 II, 11.

Phassito, I, 35; 87; 134 (*r.l.* phusito); 173; II, 32.
 a°, I, 134; II, 32.

Phasso, I, 22; 50-52; 56, 57; 75; II, 113; 162.
 phassakāyā, *the six*, II, 181, 182. *In detail*, I, 5;
 40; 136. ditṭhitṭhānaṇ, I, 138. kiṇ-nidāno, &c.,
 II, 112. nirujjhati, I, 193.

Bandhanan, I, 128.

Balaṇ. balāni, *the five*, II, 56; 86; 166; 174; 223.
In detail, I, 16; 21; 29; 88; 180; II, 84; 87;
 89; 133; 137; 143; 145; 160; 168 *fol.* *The*
sixty-eight, II, 168 *fol.* khīṇāsava°, *the seven*, I,
 35. Tathāgatā°, II, 174-176. dasabaladhārī, II,
 194. samatha°, I, 97. vipassanā°, I, 98.

Bahiddhā. dhamme vavattheti, &c., I, 77. °vutṭhānā
 vimokkhā, II, 36, 37. °suññaṇ, II, 181.

Bahulikaroti. maggaṇ, II, 93, 94.

Bahulo. tab°, II, 197.

Bāhullaṇ. pañña°, II, 197.

Bijagāmabhūtagāmo, II, 219; 223.

Bujjhati. anu°, II, 115. sam°, II, 115.

Buñjanaṇ (*sic*), II, 122. anu°, paṭi°, *ibid.*

Buddhi. °abhiropanaṇ, II, 115. °ropanaṇ, II, 115.
 paññā°, II, 190.

Buddho, I, 126; 174; II, 81; 140; 195. anu°, II, 19,
 20. Buddhānussati, I, 48; 95. Buddhacakkhu,

- II, 33. Buddhañāṇaṇ, II, 33; *the fourteen*, I, 133;
 II, 31. Pacceka°, Sammāsam°, I, 43; II, 3; 194;
 203; 225. Padesapacceka°, II, 19.
 Bojjhaṅgā, *the seven*, I, 28; II, 56; 86; 166; 174;
 223. *In detail*, I, 16; 21; 29; 74; 89; 181;
 II, 84; 87; 89; 115 *fol.*; 125; 134; 138; 142;
 145; 160.
 Bodheti. anu°, paṭi°, sam°, II, 115.
 Byāpādo, I, 31; 33, 34; 45; 100; 107; 162; II, 12;
 22; 27; 45; 164; 179, 180. a°, I, 20; 23; 31;
 34; 45; 100; 107; 162; II, 12; 22; 27; 45;
 179, 180; 228.
 Brahmaṇ. °cakkhaṇ, II, 174. brahmacariyamaṇḍo, II,
 86. °loko, I, 84, 111.
 Bhagavā, I, 126; 174; II, 1; 147; 149; 159; 194;
 210.
 Bhango, I, 57, 58.
 Bhabbo, I, 124. a°, I, 124.
 Bhayaṇ, I, 53; 59.
 Bhavo, I, 51, 52; 54; 137; II, 113, 114. kiṇ-nidāno,
 II, 111. nirujjhati, I, 193.
 Bhāvanā, II, 2; 49 *fol.*; 58 *fol.*; *the four*, I, 172;
 178; II, 93; *list of, &c.*, I, 28; 30 *fol.* °balaṇ,
 II, 170, 176. vimokkha°, II, 70. °samppanno,
 II, 245. bhāvanāya bhāvanatṭho, II, 156.
 Bhāveti. maggaṇ, II, 93, 94.
 Bhāvo. sīti°, II, 44.
 Bhikkhu, I, 176; II, 219 *fol.*; 236 *fol.*
 Bhisī, I, 176.
 Bhūtaṇ. bhūtato disvā, I, 159.
 Bhūmiyo, *the four*, I, 83, 84.
 Bhūri. °paññā, II, 196.
 Maggo, 22 *fol.* ariyatṭhangiko, I, 28; 281; II, 56;
 86; 140; 147; 166; 174; 219. angas *in detail*,
 I, 16; 21; 30; 40, 41; 69 *fol.*; 90; 107; 119;
 181; II, 20; 82 *fol.*; 86 *fol.*; 93; 120; 135;

- 138; 140; 147; 161; 173; 219; 226. arahatta°,
 I, 100 foll.; 169; II, 23; 229. See also cattāro
 maggā. ariyamaggā, the four, II, 166. cattāro
 maggā, I, 85; 169; II, 19; 40; 82 foll. In detail,
 I, 20; 25; 33; 46, 47; 65; 68, 69 foll.; 94; 96;
 99; 195; II, 11; 13; 36, 37; 54; 56; 70; 94;
 96; the three indriyāni in relation to, I, 115 foll.;
 II, 30. sotāpattimaggakkhane, &c., I, 105; II, 3;
 30; 82; 140-142. maggañāṇāni, the four, II, 189.
 maggaññū, II, 194. maggānugāmī, II, 194.
 °phalaṇ, I, 84. °visuddhi, II, 3. tathatṭhena
 saccaṇ, II, 105. maggassa maggaṭṭho, II, 32; 105.
 sañjāyati, II, 93. sammāditṭhiyā, &c., vivekā,
 viragā, nirodhā, vossaggā, II, 220. maggo and
 phalaṇ, II, 140. maggo ca hetu ca, II, 82-84.
 maggassa hetuṭṭho, I, 17; 20; 118; II, 120.
- Mañco, I, 176.
- Maṇḍo, II, 86 foll.
- Manasikāro, 6, 7, 8; 162. yoniso, II, 14; 17; 189.
- Manasikaroti. aniccato, dukkhato, anattato, II, 48; 58;
 100.
- Mano, I, 131; 189; 190. °mayo iddhi, II, 210.
 °viññāṇaṇ, I, 5.
- Maranaṇ, I, 59, 60; 65, 66, 67; II, 147. maccu,
 I, 38.
- Mahaggato. a°, I, 113.
- Mahanto, II, 190.
- Mahā. °paññā, II, 190. °sālo, II, 72 foll.
- Mānaso. viggahita°, II, 101.
- Mānusako. ātikanta°, I, 115.
- Māno. the seven, I, 130. atī°, I, 102; II, 197. asmi°,
 I, 26. asajja°, I, 111. nimāno, I, 82.
- Micchattā, the eight, the ten, I, 26; 130.
- Micchādītṭhi. I, 45; 69; 107; 140; 149; 156; 158;
 II, 140. micchādītṭhiko, I, 115.
- Mukhaṇ, I, 176; II, 69. vimokkha°, II, 48; 67; 69.
- Muditā, I, 8.
- Mudindriyo, I, 121; II, 195.

Mūlaṇ, I, 19; 22; 75; 182; II, 85; 115; 117, 118;
143. aghamūlato, II, 238. iddhiyā mūlāni, II, 206.

Meṇḍako, II, 213.

Mettā, cetovimutti, II, 130.

Moho, I, 81; 102. vītā°, I, 113. sa° I, 81; 113.
nimoho, I, 82.

Yathatthā, *the ten*, I, 173.

Yathābhūtaṇ. yathābhūtañāṇadassanaṇ, I, 33; 43;
45; 47; II, 11; 13.

Yānikato, I, 172; II, 122; 130.

Yāganandhaṇ, I, 16; 70; 74; II, 85; 90; 92; 97
fol.; 119. (*Cf. nandiṇ varattañ ca*, S. I, 16).

Yogā, *the four*, I, 129.

Yogakkhemo. ayogakkhemakāmo, I, 39. ayogakkhe-
magāmino, II, 81. yogayutto, II, 81; yogāvacaro,
II, 26.

Rajakkho. appa°, mahā°, I, 121; II, 33; 195.

Rajjati, I, 58; 77, 78; 130; 178.

Raṇo. araṇavihāro, I, 97.

Rāgo, I, 80, 81; 102; 113. rūpa°, arūpa°, II, 37; 95;
142; 145. nirāgo, I, 80, 82.

Ruci, I, 176.

Rūpaṇ (*khandho*), I, 23; 53; 55; 104; 106; 135; 151-
155, 192; II, 96; 102. (*āyatanaṇ*), I, 79. (*matter*),
I, 113. °kāyo, I, 183. °nimittaṇ, I, 92. rūpā-
rammaṇatā, I, 57. attato samanupassati, I, 143;
149. rūpassa aniccattṭho, &c., I, 131. rūpe anic-
cānupassanā, II, 186, 187. assādo, ādīnavo,
nissaraṇaṇ, II, 109, 110. 'rūpāni passatīti' vi-
mokkho, II, 38.

Ropanaṇ. buddhi°, II, 115.

Lakkhaṇaṇ. khandhānaṇ, I, 54, 55. jhānānaṇ,
I, 167, 168. saccānaṇ, II, 108. °suññaṇ, II, 179.

Lahu. °paññā, II, 198.

Lālappo, I, 38.

Leṇaṇ. aleṇo, I, 127; II, 238.

Loko, II, 166. *list of*, I, 122; 174. antavā, I, 151-153; 157, 158. anantavā, I, 157, 158. °dhammā, *the eight*, I, 22; 122; 130. °vādo, I, 157, sassato, asassato, I, 151, 152. suñño, II, 177. lokuttaro. dhammā lokuttarā, II, 136. vimokkho, II, 40.

Vajjaṇ, I, 122. anavajjo, II, 195

Vaṇṇā, *the six*, I, 126.

Vatthu. °kato, I, 18; 172. °kāyā, *the ten*, I, 130.

Vayo. °dhammo, I, 53; 76; 78.

Vavattheti, I, 53; 76-78; 84.

Vasī. vasiyo, *the five*, I, 99. °bhāvo, II, 116, 117.

-Vādo. sassata°, saññi°, *etc.*, I, 155.

Vāmo, I, 125.

Vāhanaṇ. tadupagaviriya°, I, 31; 34; 172; II, 93; 232.

Vikkhambhanaṇ. °suññaṇ, II, 179.

Vikkubbaṇ. iddhi, II, 174; 210.

Viggahito. °mānaso, II, 101.

Vicāro. rūpa°, I, 136.

Vicikicchā. sa°, I, 81. nivieikicchā, I, 83.

Vijjā. *the three*, I, 34; II, 56. °mayo, II, 174; 213.

°vimutti, II, 243. udapādi, II, 150 *fol.*; 159.

Avijjā, I, 26; 31; 50-52; 54-57; 76-78; 102; 138;

162; II, 2; 9; 113; 142; 145; 169; 176. ditthi-

ttḥāṇaṇ, I, 138. nirujjhati, I, 192, 193.

Viññāṇaṇ (*khandho*), I, 53 *fol.*; 83; 85; 96; 98; 104;

106; 135; 144; 151; 153-155; 190; II, 67; 102.

(*nidāna*), I, 50; II, 113. °kāyā, *the six*, II, 181.

°cariyā, I, 79-81. °cāyatanaṇ, I, 36. °tṭhitiyo,

the seven, I, 22; 122. °nimittaṇ, I, 93; cakkhu°,

etc., II, 234. mano°, I, 5, 40. attato saman-

passati, I, 148. °assa aniccaṭṭho, I, 132. assādo,

ādinavo, nissaraṇaṇ, II, 109, 110. nirujjhati,

I, 193.

Viññātaṇ. a°, II, 31.

Viññāpayo. su°, du°, I, 121; II, 195.

- Viññu, II, 19; 21.
- Vitakko, I, 36. rūpa°, I, 136. avitakko, I, 35. °vip-phāraṇ, I, 112. uppādo, upatṭhānaṇ, atthangamo, I, 178, 179. ditṭhiṭṭhānaṇ, I, 138.
- Viditā, I, 179 *fol.*
- Vidūro, su°, II, 193.
- Vidhūpeti, II, 167.
- Viniggaho, I, 16; II, 119.
- Vinibandho. māna°, I, 155, 156; 158.
- Vinetā, II, 194.
- Vipatti. °bhavaloko, °sambhavaloko, I, 122.
- Vipannadiṭṭhi, I, 160.
- Vipariṇāmo, I, 54; 76, 77; 110. °suññaṇ, II, 178. avipariṇādhhammo, I, 109.
- Vipassako, I, 167.
- Vipassanā, I, 28; 57, 58; 64; 67; 70; 74; 181; II, 92, 93; 96; 119. °pubbangamaṇ, II, 92; 96, 97. °balaṇ, I, 98; II, 172; 176. °vasena ñāpāni, I, 194. samatha°, II, 92; 97 *fol.*; 119. adhi-paṇṇādhammavipassanā, I, 20; 25; 33; 45; 47; 169; II, 11, 13.
- Vipallāso, II, 80.
- Vipāko. kamma°, II, 78. dukkha°, II, 79.
- Vippayatto. °paccayo, II, 73, 74. ñāṇa°, II, 75.
- Vippalāpo, I, 38.
- Vipphāro. ñāṇa°, samādhi°, II, 174. nānattekatta-kamma°, I, 113, 114. vitakkavipphāro, I, 112. vipphārattaṇ, I, 113.
- Vimutti, I, 22; 34; II, 117; 143 *fol.*; 162. (phalaṇ), II, 140; 143. ceto°, I, 8; 34; 138; II, 130; 176. pañña°, II, 176. micchā°, I, 107. °raso, II, 88. vijjā°, II, 243. sammā°, I, 107; II, 173. °sukhe ñāpāni, I, 195. vimuttāyatanāni, *the five*, I, 5.
- Vimutto. a°, I, 113; II, 234. saddhā°, II, 52; 56; 61. suvimuttaṭṭho, I, 18.
- Vimokkho, I, 22; 74; 102; 181; II, 243. *the three*, II, 35. nānākhane, ekakkhane, II, 65. *the eight*, I, 35. *list of*, II, 35 *fol.* jhāna°, II, 245. °vivaṭṭo,

- i, 109, 110; ii, 70. saññāvedayitanirodhasamāpatti°, ii, 40.
- Vimocayo, i, 191.
- Virāgo. *five*, ii, 220 *fol.* maggo, ii, 140. virāga-dhammā, i, 53; 76; 78. virāgānupassī, i, 192. virāgānupassanā, ii, 44-47.
- Viriyaṇ. tadupagaviriyavāhanaṇ, i, 31; 34; 172; ii, 93. viriyārambho, i, 103, 104.
- Vivattaṇaṇ, ii, 98. bahiddhavutthānavivattaṇaṇ, i, 66; dubhatovutthānavivattaṇaṇ, i, 69.
- Vivatto. citta°, i, 108; 110; ii, 70. ceto°, i, 108; 110; ii, 70. ñāṇa°, i, 109, 110; ii, 70. vimokkha°, i, 109, 110; ii, 70. sacca°, i, 110; ii, 70. saññā°, i, 107; 110; ii, 70.
- Vivādamūlāni, *the six*, i, 130.
- Viveko, ii, 117, 118; 173. *five*, ii, 220 *fol.*
- Visaṇyutto. (vimokkho), ii, 41.
- Visāri. avisāri, i, 15; 49.
- Visineti, ii, 167.
- Visuddhi, ii, 3; 116, 117; 244. *the three, in detail*, i, 21; ii, 85; 90. dassana°, i, 105. paṭipadā°, i, 167.
- Visodhanaṇ ādi°, ii, 21; 23.
- Vihāro, ii, 20. anupubba°, i, 5. araṇa°, i, 97. ditṭhadhammasukha°, i, 84. °samāpatti, i, 91; 93, 94.
- Vimaṇsā, i, 19; ii, 123.
- Vutthānaṇ. bahiddhāvutthāno, i, 66; ii, 36-38. dubhatovutthāno, i, 69; ii, 36-38.
- Vedanā, i, 50-54; 56, 57; 75; 85; 96; 135; 151; 153-155; ii, 102; 113; 162. *in detail*, i, 6; 40; 136; 145 *fol.* *the three*, i, 22; 122. °anupassanā, i, 187; ii, 152, 153; 163; 253. °kāyā, *the six*, ii, 181, 182. nidānā, &c., ii, 112. °nimittaṇ, i, 93. attato samanupassati, i, 145. vedanāya aniccaṭṭho, &c., i, 132. assādo, ādinavo, nissaraṇaṇ, ii, 109, 110. uppādo, upatṭhānaṇ, atthangamo, i, 178. nirujjhati, i, 193.

- Venāteyyaṇ, II, 196.
 Vebhabyā, I, 119.
 Vesārajjāṇ. catuvesārajjappatto, II, 194.
 Vodānaṇ, I, 166.
 Vossaggo, I, 109; II, 117, 118; 245. *the two*, II, 24, 25.
 indriyānaṇ vossaggo°, II, 223. sammādiṭṭhiyā,
 etc., II, 221.
 Vyañjanaṇ, II, 63-65.
 Vyanti, I, 171.
 Vyādhi, I, 59, 60; 65, 66; II, 147. avyādhi, I, 11-15, 67.
 Vyāpādo. *See* Byā°.

 Sakadāgāmi, II, 194. °maggo. *See* Maggo (cattāro
 maggā).
 Sakkāyaditṭhi, I, 143; 149; 157; 161.
 Sakkāyavatthuko, I, 150.
 Sakkhī. kāya°, II, 51-54; 56, 57; 61.
 Sankappo. upakkiliṭṭha°, I, 165. sammā°. *See*
 Maggo, ariyatṭhangiko.
 Sankilesiko, II, 218.
 Sankhato. a°, I, 17; 20; 84; 110; 131, 132; II, 121;
 157.
 Sankhāro, I, 37; 50-54; 60, 61; 83; 85; 96; 104;
 106; 135; 153-155; II, 48; 62; 67; 102; 113;
 236; *the three*, I, 124; II, 178; *the two*, I, 184
 fol. kāya°, I, 184; 186, 187. citta°, I, 95; 188.
 List of, II, 178. sankhārupekkhā, I, 64. °nimit-
 taṇ, I, 66; 68; 93. °suññaṇ, II, 178. kiṇ-nidānā,
 etc., II, 113. attato sammanupassati, I, 147.
 sankhārānaṇ aniccattṭhaṇ, I, 132. assādo, ādinavo,
 nissaraṇaṇ, II, 109, 110. nirujjhati, I, 193.
 Sangahavatthūni, *the four*, I, 84.
 Sangahito. cattāri saccāni ekasangahitāni, II, 105 *fol.*
 Sangaho. sangahabalaṇ, II, 170; 176.
 Sangho. sanghānussati, I, 48.
 Saṇyutto. (vimokkho), II, 41.
 Saṇyojanaṇ, I, 143 *fol.*; 171; II, 92; 94; *the seven*,
 I, 130; *the ten*, I, 130. kāmāraga°, paṭigha°, I,

- 70; 72, 73; II, 37; 83; 94; 141; 144. *taṇhā*°, I, 127.
- Sanjogo, I, 19. °tṭhiti, I, 50. sanjogābhiniveso, I, 33; 46, 47; II, 13.
- Saccaṇ, II, 104 *fol.*; 120. saccapaṭivedho, II, 57; 61. saccavivaṭṭo, I, 110; II, 70. ariyasaccāni, *the four*, I, 5; II, 14; 19; 225; *in detail*, I, 8, 9; 37; 86; 105; 118, 119; 133; II, 16; 18; 57; 61, 62; 104 *fol.*; 147 *fol.*; 151; 157.
- Sacchikiriya, II, 120; 156. sotāpattiphala°, &c., II, 189.
- Sañcetanā, I, 136.
- Saññā (khandho), I, 23; 53, 54; 57, 58; 83; 96; 135, 136; 151; 153-155; II, 67; 102; 172. (*other categories*), I, 107; 136; 138; II, 182. (*cause of vedayitaṇ*), I, 107; *list of*, I, 32; 45; 47; 49. °kāyā, *the six*, II, 181, 182. °nimittaṇ, I, 93. rūpa°, I, 136. rūpa°, paṭigha°, nānatta°, I, 64; 67; 97; II, 12; 36; 39; 172; 211. °vipallāso, II, 80. °vimokkho, II, 36; 41. °vivaṭṭo, I, 107; II, 70. saññāya aniccaṭṭho, I, 132. āloka°, I, 23; 31; 45, 46; 95; 107-109; 123; 162, 163; II, 23; 27; 45; 169; 228; 230. attato samanupassati, I, 146. assādo, ādīnavo, nissaraṇaṇ, II, 109, 110. uppādo, upaṭṭhānaṇ, atthangamo, I, 179. diṭṭhiṭṭhānaṇ, I, 138.
- Saññogo. *See* Sanjogo.
- Sati, I, 176, 177; 183; 187. asati, I, 54. ānāpāna°, I, 166; 172. ānāpānasatisamādhī, I, 164, 165; 185, 186; 196.
- Satipaṭṭhānaṇ, II, 85; 90; 120; 161; *the four*, I, 28; 84; II, 14, 15; 18; 56; 86; 166; 174; 225. kāye kāyānupassanā, &c., II, 152; 232. °bhāvanā, I, 184; 186, 187; II, 232.
- Satokāri, I, 175 *fol.*
- Sattāvāsā, *the nine*, I, 22; 122.
- Saddo, I, 112.
- Saddhā. °vimutto, II, 52; 56; 61. as°, I, 16; 21;

29; 74; 89; 121; 124; 180; II, 1, 2; 8, 9, 10;
21; 33; 87; 168.

Santi, II, 98.

Santhāro, I, 176.

Sandhūpeti, II, 167.

Sapariyutthānaṃ, I, 72.

Sabbaññutā, I, 174. °ñāṇaṃ, I, 131-134; 174.

Sabrahmacārī, I., 19; 21.

Sabhāgo. sabhāgasuññaṃ, II, 181.

Samaṇ, I, 102; 173; 180; II, 231. sa°, I, 173.

Samattho, I, 180.

Samatho, I, 28; 64; 67; 70; II, 92, 93; 96; 119.

°balaṇ, I, 97; II, 172; 176. °vipassanā, II, 92; 97
foll.; 119.

Samanto. °cakkhu, I, 133; II, 31. assamantapaññā,
II, 193.

Samayo. °vimokkho, II, 40.

Samādinṇaṇ, I, 43.

Samādhi, I, 94; 162; 164; 191; II, 162; *the three*,
I, 28. *list of*, I, 48. °vasena ñāṇāni, I, 194.
°vipphārā iddhi, II, 211.

Samāpatti, *the four*, I, 8; 20; 24; 31; 45; 47; 64;
67; 97 foll.; 138; II, 10; 12; 36, 37, 38; 41;
55; 70; 172; 211. ādi, &c., I, 169. arūpa°, II,
40, 41. jhānavimokkhasamādhi°, II, 175. phala°,
I, 64. mahākaruṇā°, I, 126; 133; II, 32; 158.
°vimokkho, II, 35; 39. sammā°. *See* Maggo
(ariyaṭṭhangiko). sotāpattiphala°, &c., I, 20; 99.

Samāraddho. su°, I, 173; II, 122, 126, 127, 128.

Samuggato. su°, II, 122.

Samucchedo. sammā°, I, 101; II, 230. °visuddhi,
II, 3. °suññaṇ, II, 180.

Samudayo, I, 55-57, 58; II, 4, 5, 6; 32.

Samodāhanaṇ, I, 107.

Samodhāneti, I, 180.

Sampanno, I, 168. °diṭṭhi, I, 160.

Sampajāno, I, 100.

Sampatti. °bhavaloko, °sambhavaloko, I, 122.

- Sampayutto. °paccayo, II, 49 foll. ; 58 foll. ; 73 foll.
 Sampayogo, I, 38 ; II, 147.
 Sampahaṅgsanā, I, 167.
 Samphasso, I, 5 ; 40 ; 136. samphassajo, I, 6 ; 38 ;
 40 ; 136 ; 145. ceto°, I, 38.
 Sambuddho. sammā°, I, 43 ; II, 3 ; 194 ; 203 ; 225.
 Sammappadhānaṇ. See Padhānaṇ.
 Sambojjhango. See Bojjhango.
 Sambodho, II, 109.
 Sammasanaṇ, I, 53.
 Sammādiṭṭhi, II, 82 foll. °samādānaṇ, II, 81. See also
 Maggo (ariyatṭhangiko).
 Sarīraṇ, I, 153.
 Saḷāyatanaṇ, I, 50. 51 ; II, 113. kiṇṇidānaṇ, &c., II,
 112. nirujjhati, I, 193.
 Sallīno. a°, I, 173. asallinattaṇ, I, 103.
 Sallekho, I, 102, 103. a°, I, 103.
 Sassato. a°, I, 76, 77. attā, I, 157.
 Sassatadiṭṭhi, I, 150 ; 157.
 Sassatavādā, the four, I, 155.
 Sahagato. anu°, I, 33 ; 70 ; 73 ; II, 13 ; 23 ; 37 ; 83 ;
 94.
 Sahajāto, II, 49 foll. ; 58 foll. ; 71 foll. ; 83 ; 140.
 Saṅghāni, I, 37.
 Sātaṇ. asātaṇ, I, 38.
 Sāraddho, I, 165. a°, I, 173.
 Sāro, I, 75, 76. sārādānābhiviveso, I, 33 ; II, 13.
 Sāvako, II, 140.
 Sīgho. sīghapaññā, II, 198.
 Sikkhā, II, 119 ; the three, I, 46 ; 48 ; 184 ; 186 ; II, 56.
 °padaṇ, I, 43.
 Sītisiyo. sītisiyāvimokkho, II, 43.
 Silaṇ. silāni, the five, I, 42 foll. ; 46. adhi°, II, 243.
 Silabbataṇ. sakkāyadiṭṭhivicikicchāsīlabbataparāmāso,
 II, 36 ; 94.
 Sīsaṇ. sama°, II, 230 ; the thirteen, I, 102.
 Sukko, I, 80 ; 82 ; 83 ; II, 79.
 Sukhaṇ. sukhāni, the two, I, 188.

- Sukho, I, 11, 12; 59; 70; 80; 82, 83; 188; II, 24; 79, 80. sukhudrayo, I, 80; 82, 83; II, 79.
- Sukhumako, I, 185, 186.
- Sucaritāni, *the three, in detail*, I, 115.
- Suññaṇ, II, 100. suññato vimokkho, II, 36; 59-62; 65 *fol.* suññāgāragato, I, 175.
- Suññatānupassanā, II, 43; 46, 47; 63.
- Suñño, I, 176; II, 177 *fol.* tadanga°, II, 180.
- Sutamayo, I, 4; 22; 26, 27, 28; 34, 35; 37; 42.
- Suttantiko. suttantikavatthūni, I, 186.
- Suppahīnattaṇ, II, 2.
- Subho, II, 39; 80. asubhā, *enumeration of*, I, 49; 95. asubhaṇ asubhataddasaṇ, II, 81.
- Sekho, I, 42; 61 *fol.*; II, 27 *fol.* sekhabalāni, asekhabalāni, *the ten*, II, 173; 176.
- Senāvyūho, II, 213.
- Soko. sokasallaṇ, I, 38.
- Socitattaṇ, I, 38.
- Sotāpatti. sotāpattiyangāni, *the four*, II, 14; 16. °maggakkhaṇe, II, 217. °maggo. *See* Maggo (cattāro maggā).
- Sotāpanno, I, 161; II, 193, 194.
- Sotāvadhānaṇ, I, 4; 22; 26, 27, 28; 34, 35; 37; 42.
- Hammiyaṇ, I, 176.
- Hāso. hāsapaññā, II, 185; 199.
- Hiri. °balaṇ, II, 169; 176.
- Hiriyati, II, 169; 176.
- Hetu, II, 116-119.

SIMILES IN THE NIKĀYAS.

(JOURNAL, 1906-7, pp. 52 ff.)

SOME ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS.

[THE following supplementary list is the result partly of incidental discovery made during the past twelve months, partly of the perusal of Dr. Rouse's translation of the concluding volume of the Jātaka. Pressure of time when, on the eve of the *Journal* going to press, the first list was compiled from the text, prevented my doing justice to the wealth of figures in that volume. One of them—that of the moth and the candle—

kīto va aggiṇṇaṃ jalitaṃ apāpataṃ,

applied, not as is usual in the West, but to 'the idiot who has adopted a naked (ascetic's) life,' is possibly unique. It was conceivably suggested by the term *tapo*, although the word indicating such a course of life is here *naggabhāvo*. The quotations are drawn from both prose and *gāthā*'s.

C. A. F. RHYS DAVIDS.]

ADDENDA.

Under Akkhi: sūken' akkhiṇṇaṃ va ghaṭṭitaṃ, J. vi., 294.

pārevaṭakkhi, J. vi., 456.

„ Aggi: yo mittānaṃ na dūbhati . . . aggi yathā
pajjālati, J. vi., 14.

hemantaggi sikhāriya, J. vi., 456.

aggisikhūpamā, J. vi., 537.

kappuṭṭhānaggi viya, J. vi., 554.

Under Angāra (2) : cf. A. iv., 324.

„ *Acci* : acci vātena khittā dūraṇ gacchati, S. iv., 399.

maṇiṇ accimantaṇ, J. vi., 279.

„ *Aṇṇava* (1) : S. ii., 158.

Before 21, *Adhikuṭṭanā*.

(1) khandhāsaṇ, S. i., 128.

(2) khandhānaṇ, Thig. 58, 142.

Under Andha : andhakāragabbhaṇ pavitṭhā viya, J. vi., 351.

„ *Abbha* : abbhakūṭasamā dumā, J. vi., 250.

„ *Amba* : ambā ca patitā chamā, J. vi., 499.

„ *Ambuja* (2) : cf. J. vi., 234.

After 39, *Asmā* : asmā nūna te hadayaṇ, J. vi., 549.

Under Assa : assaṇ va sambandhaṇ . . . vijjhasi, J. vi., 439.

khalunken' eva sindhavo, J. vi., 452.

„ *Ahi* : ahī va ucchangagato daseyya, J. vi., 437.

„ *Ākāsa* : sabbaso ākāsasamena cetasā viharati, A. iii., 315.

„ *Ādāsa* : suvaṇṇādāsasadiṣaṇ mukhaṇ, J. vi., 451.

„ *Ādicca* (5) : = J. vi., 447.

„ *Āsivisa* : daṇḍena ghaṭṭitāsiviso viya, J. vi., 456.

„ *Īsā* (2) : cf. J. vi., 488, 490.

„ *Ulūka* : ulūkaṇ ñeva vāyasā, J. vi., 508.

Before 91, *Oṭṭha* (*lip*) : bimboṭṭha, J. vi., 456. *See also* *Gīva* (*addendum*).

After *Kadalī*. *Kaddamaṇ* : paradāraṇ vivajjeyya dhota-pādo vā kaddamaṇ, J. vi., 240.

Before 107, *Kaṇikāra* : kaṇikārā va samphullā, J. vi., 188.

kaṇikāro va nivātapupphito, J. vi., 269.

Under *Kadalī* : kadalī va vātācchupitā, J. vi., 590.

„ *Kali* : ayam eva mahantaro kali, A. ii., 3.

„ „ pubbe kali duggahito va, J. vi., 234.

„ *Kāka* : leḍḍuṇ gahetvā kāko viya . . . palāpessāmi, J. vi., 399 ; cf. 428, 443.

After 120: Kānana: kānanaṃ va . . . (aggo), Thig. v. 254.

„ 124: Kālā (kālā) kālā taruṇā va uggatā, J. vi., 269.

„ 128: Kīto. kīto va aggiṃ jalitaṃ apāpataṃ, J. vi., 234.

Under Kukkuṭa: baddhakukkuṭā viya, J. vi., 406.

„ Kukkuṭī: pahatakkukkuṭī viya, J. vi., 565.

„ Kuñjara (4): cf. J. vi., 443.

„ Kuṇapa: rajjasiriṃ kuṇapaṃ viya chaḍḍetva, J. vi., 18.

Before 145: Kurarī. kurarī hatachāpā va, J. vi., 189;
= 500.

„ Kūtāgāra: Kūṭā. kūṭaṃ gaṇhanti viya, J. vi., 478.

After 158: Khoma. khomā va tattha padumā, J. vi., 534.

Before 169: Gāḍha. See Udakaṇṇava.

Under Gīva: aṭṭalakā otthagīviyo, J. vi., 269.

„ Guhā: siharakkhitā guhā viya, J. vi., 395.

„ Go: carantaṃ gonaṃ paharantaṃ viya, J. vi., 225.

After 176: Goṭavisa. yathā goṭaviso tathā, J. vi., 225.

„ 179: Cakkavāka. cakkavākīva pallalasmiṃ anū-
dake, J. vi., 189; = 501.

Under Cakkhu: dvīhi cakkhūhi visālaṃ viya khayati,
J. vi., 66.

„ Canda (14): cf. J. vi., 426; 443; 551.

„ (18): cf. J. vi., 263.

„ (21) = J. vi., 41: cf. J. vi., 242; 362.

„ (22): cando va patito chamā, J. vi., 89.

„ (23): nabhe cando viya pākato, J. vi., 470.

After 185: Camma. yathāpi āsabhaṃ cammaṃ . . . san-
kusamāhataṃ, J. vi., 453. See also Phalaka.

Under Cāpa (1): cf. J. vi., 482.

After Cāpa: Citakā. citakā viya me kāyo, J. vi., 576.

Under Cunda: cundo yathā nāgadantaṃ kharena, J. vi.,
261.

After 189: Chakalī. chakalī va . . . nikkhamiṃ, J. vi.,
559.

Under Chattha. rañño setachattam eva . . . vicāremi,
J. vi., 389.

„ Chindati (7) = Dhp. ver. 398.

Under Jātaveda (3) : *cf.* J. vi., 441.

„ *Dayhati* (15) : āditte vārimajjhaṇ va . . . tvaṇ no
'si, J. vi., 250.

„ *Dayhati* (4) : *cf.* J. vi., 319.

After 216 : Tamba. tambanette, J. vi., 290.

tambanakhī, *ibid.*

Under Tārakā : satarāṇsīva tārakā, J. vi., 448.

„ *Tittha* : (3) kalyānatitthaṇ supipij . . . rahadū-
pamaṇ, J. vi., 526.

„ *Tulā* : (2) tulā yathā paggaḥitā . . . unnameti, J. vi.,
235 ; *cf.* 292.

„ (3) hatthena tulento viya, J. vi., 372.

„ *Deva* (6) : devaputtā va Nandane, J. vi., 449.

(7) : devarājālīhāya, J. vi., 450.

„ *Dhanka* (4) : haṇsarājaṇ yathā dhanko anujavaṇ,
J. vi., 452.

„ *Dhaja* : (3) dhammadhajo dhammaketu, A. iii., 150.
: (4) dhajo rathassa paññāṇaṇ bhattā . . .
itthiyā, J. vi., 508.

„ *Dhana* : (2) koṭṭhe ṭhapitadhanaṇ viya khepetvā,
J. vi., 362.

„ *Dhūma* : (6) dhūmo paññāṇaṇ aggino [*cf. supra*
Dhaja (4)], J. vi., 508.

„ *Nadī* [*after* (14)] : nadīva giriduggesu, J. vi., 456.
naggā nadī anodakā, J. vi., 508.

After 267 : Nandhi, nandha. *See Chindati.*

Under Nāvā : (13) yathā nāvā . . . atibhāraṇ . . . avasī-
dati, J. vi., 234.

(14) yānanāvā ca me hotha, J. vi., 546.

„ *Nikkha* (4) : *cf.* J. vi., 290 ; 574.

„ *Nigrodha* (3) : = S. i., 207.

(4) bhūtapubbaṇ . . . Supatitṭho nāma
nigrodharājā ahoṣi, A. iii., 369.

„ *Nidhi* (5) : nidhī va udakantike, J. vi., 237.

„ *Nemi* : rathacakkaṇ viya vaṇsaṇ ghaṭento, J. vi., 96.

„ *Pakkhī* : (1) pakkhīva pañjare baddhe, J. vi., 447 ;
= 465.

: (2) pakkhī muttā va pañjarā, J. vi., 559.

Under Panka : (5) cf. J. vi., 505.

After 291 : Pajunno. See Megha.

Under Paṇṇa. See also Siṅsapā.

„ Patta. See Paduma, Pavāla.

„ Paduma : padumaṃ yathā hatthagataṃ . . . mukhaṃ, J. vi., 187 ; = 263 ; cf. 578.

padumapattato udakam iva, J. vi., 331.

S. Isakapoṇe paduminipatte udakaphusitāni pavattanti, M. iii., 300.

„ Pannaga : (2) peḷābaddhaṃ va pannagaṃ, J. vi., 443.

„ Pabbata : (19) pupphābhikinnaṃ Himavaṃ va, J. vi., 272.

: (20) pabbatamatto soko, J. vi., 385.

: (21) setaṃ kelāsasadiṣaṃ, J. vi., 490.

„ Pallanka. S. gahapatissa . . . pallanko, A. iv., 231.

„ Pavāla : (3) vedhaṃ assatthapattaṃ va, J. vi., 548.

After 321 : Paṭhīna. paṭhīnavañṇā nettiyaṃ, J. vi., 449.

„ 325 : Pāda. See Kaddamaṃ.

Under Pāvaka : bhasmācchanno va pāvako, J. vi., 236.

„ Pītā : sakiṃ pītā va māṇavā, J. vi., 528.

After Purejayaṃ : Peta. yathā petaṃ susānasmiṃ, J. vi., 464.

„ Phālāpācana, Phāleti. udaraṃ phāletva . . . viya, J. vi., 384.

Under Balisa : (3) cf. [J.] vi., 432.

Before 361 : Bhattapātī. bhattapātiyaṃ kacavaraṃ khipanto viya, J. vi., 225.

Under Bhamara : (3) bhamaravaṇṇe kese, J. vi., 53 ; cf. Thig. v. 252.

„ Bhesajja : (2) S. gahapatissa . . . nānābhesajjāni, A. iv., 232.

„ Makkaṭa : (6) dhanuṃ gahetvā makkaṭo viya, J. vi., 399.

„ Magga : (12) ujumaggaṃ avahāya kummaggaṃ, J. vi. 234.

icchā . . . kummaggo ujumaggo ca saṃyamo, J. vi., 252.

Under Maccha (2): = J. vi., 236.

(8) maccho va maraṇaṇ attānaṇ, J. vi.
416; = 437.

(9) macche jalagateriva, J. vi., 443; = 447;
= 465.

„ Maṇi (1): = D. ii., 15. (6) *See* Thig. v. 257.

„ Madhu: (5) madhūni* va palātāni, J. vi., 499.

„ Māluta: (3) dohaḷāyasi . . . Mālutaṇ, J. vi., 263.

„ Miga: migaṇ pathānupannaṇ va, J. vi., 416.

migachāpā va, J. vi., 456.

migo kūṭe va ohito, J. vi., 437.

migā viya ukkaṇṇā, J. vi., 559.

nīlakkhī ca yathā migī, J. vi., 482.

„ Rājan: (5) S. rañño khattiyassa . . . putto abhi-
sekho, A. ii., 86, 87.

„ Rukkha: (28) idam pi rajjaṇ phalitarukkhasadisāṇ,
pabbajjā nipphalarukkhasadisā, J.
iii., 377; = vi., 45.

(29) yathā rukkho tathā rājā, yathā sākha,
tathā ahaṇ, J. vi., 13.

(30) yathā ambo phalī hato, J. vi., 61.

(31) sālā va . . . mālutena pamadditā,
J. vi., 189.

(32) acchecchuṇ . . . rukkhay . . . yathā
Vessantaraṇ . . . pabbājenti, J. vi.,
502.

„ Laṭṭha: (2) bhujalaṭṭhīva . . . tanumajjhimā,
J. vi., 456.

„ Vaccha: (after 4) vacchadantamukhā senā, J. vi.,
448.

vacchā bālā va mātaṇ, J. vi.,
557.

„ Vadhaka: (4) S. ukkhittāsike vadhake, A. iii., 443;
= iv., 52.

„ Vana: (8) sālavanaṇ viya nirantaraṇ, J. vi., 300.

After 461: Vāka: sāṇavakasadisā, Thig. v. 252.

* In the Cambridge translation read *honey* for *money*.

Under Vāta: (13) vātavegena āgantvā, J. vi., 103; cf. i., 164

: (14) ṭhānā vāto va dharanīruhaṇ, J. vi., 482.

After 465: Vāyaso. *See* Ulūka.

„ „ Vāraṇo. kesarasīhena gahitamattavāraṇo viya, J. vi., 551.

Under Vāri, *after* (3): Vāricaro. vāricaro va ghamme, J. vi., 358.

„ „ *after* (5): vārijass' eva . . . kumināmukhe, J. vi., 552.

„ „ *after* (8): yathā vārivaho pūro . . . na khīyati, J. vi., 543.

After 466: Vāruṇī. vāruṇīva pavedhati, J. vi., 500.

Under Vālukā: (2) suvaṇṇavālukaṇ uddharāṇ viya, J. vi., 363.

„ *Vijju* (4): cf. vi., 278; 313.

(5) kañcanapattena . . . vijjuvaṇṇinā, J. vi., 217.

(6) vijju v'abbhagghanantare, J. vi., 449. *See also* Sateratā (*addendum*).

„ *Visa*, *after* (12): kammāṇaṇ phalaṇ . . . duṭṭha-visaṇ yathā, J. vi., 237.

After Visa: Visāṇa. *See* Go.

„ 483: Velūriya. velūriyavaṇṇasannibhaṇ, J. vi., 534.

Velli. vellīva tanumajjhimā, J. vi., 456.

Under Vyaggha: (2) Indasadisehi vyagghēh' eva surakkhitaṇ, J. vi., 125.

(3) viyaggharājassa nihīmajacco, J. vi., 291.

„ *Sakuṇa*: sakunī mānusinīva, J. vi., 590.

After 487: Sakkabhavana. Sakkabhavanaṇ viya alankatapaṭiyattaṇ, J. vi., 46.

Under Sangāma: (1) = M. iii., 67.

(3) yathā āgantvā sangāmaṇ ayuddho, J. vi., 524.

After Sañcaya: Sateratā. sateratā abham iva, J. vi., 231.

Under Sappa : (6) uddhatadathā viya sappā, J. vi., 389.

(7) sappadatthañ va māṇavañ, J. vi., 585.

„ *Samudda* : (17) samuddo viya ajjhottharanto, J. vi., 404.

„ *Sāgara* : (3) velantam iva sāgaro, J. vi., 226.

(4) yañ udadhiñ . . . so sāgaro . . .
velañ na ucceti mahāsammuddo,
J. vi., 358.

(5) parivarayissañ . . . Jambudīpan va
sāgaro, J. vi., 464.

After Sāgara : Sāna. *See Vāka (addendum).*

Under Sārathi : (11) aniddhinañ . . . damet' assañ va
sārathi, J. vi., 584.

„ *Sāsapa* : (3) Sinerusantike sāsapo viya, J. vi.,
174.

„ *Si[n]gāla*. *See also Vyaggha* (3).

„ *Sīha* : (22) sīhasaṅkāso, J. vi., 155.

(23) vijambhissañ sīhavijambhitāni, J. vi.,
373 ; *cf.* 404.

(24) sīho viya asambhīto, J. vi., 396 ; 404.

(25) sīhī vāmisagiddhinī, J. vi., 559.

(26) sīhā bilā va nikkhaṇṇā, J. vi., 574. *See
also Guhā.*

„ *Sukka* : (2) M. i., 319 ; A. iii., 406.

(4) akaṇhañ asukkañ nibbānañ abhijāyati,
A. iii., 387.

„ *Sunakha* : (2) dadhiñ pātuñ āradddhasunakho viya,
J. vi., 358.

„ *Suriya* : (10) suriyo va patito chamā, J. vi., 89.

(11) dohaḷāyasi suriyañ, J. vi., 263.

(12) gaganamajjhe suriyañ utthāpento
viya, J. vi., 376.

(13) Rāhugahitañ va sūriyañ, J. vi., 443.

„ *Hatthi* : hatthi kantaviṇāsarena paluddhā . . .
viya, J. vi., 262. *See also Nāga.*

„ *Hansa* : (10) haṇṣā va upari pallale, J. vi., 557.
See also Dhanka.

CORRIGENDA.

In Akkha (1), the more obvious and probably correcter rendering would be to read the quotation from S. i., 57, not as a double simile (likening the wrongdoer to a carter who, again, losing his way, is like a brooding, ruined gamester, ('dice-broken'), but as a single one, showing the axle-broken state to which the error has reduced the carter. The 'yathā' and 'va' suggested the figure within a figure. I have no present access to the Commentary.* Thus corrected, the passage should stand thus :

(1) vutto 'mhi . . . jūte akkhaparājito, J. iii., 198.

(3) . . . (*axle*) yathā sākaṭiko, &c. . . . S. i., 57.

(4) . . . ratho . . . jhānakkho, S. v., 6.

(5) avihingsāsāritakkho, J. vi., 252.

69 : Read *Īsā*, and place opposite second pair of quotations standing opposite *Issāsa*, inverting numbers 69 and 70.

129 : Read *Kukkuṭa*.

186 (2) : Read *v' ūnudaro*.

374 : Read *v. 347*.

* I rejoice to hear that Professor Duroiselle has undertaken the editing of it.

MISPRINTS IN 'THE BUDDHIST COUNCILS,' ETC.

- p. 7, l. 18, *read* historical.
- p. 10, l. 33, *delete* , whereas.
- p. 15, l. 27, *for* friends *read* sirs.
- p. 28, l. 14, *read* bhikkhū.
- p. 31, l. 2, *for* Z *read* 7.
- p. 41, *last* l., *read* vīsaṃvassasatiko.
- p. 48, l. 14, *read* consensus.
- p. 57, l. 4, *for* with *read* to.
- p. 65, l. 1, *after* register *read* in consonance.
- p. 65, l. 2, *before* Nikāya *read* Dīgha.
 after Nikāya *read* was in existence at the time
 of the compiler.
- p. 65, l. 23, *after* C.V. *read* whom there is no reason not
 to identify.
- p. 67, l. 10, *read* Dīgha Nikāya, which would then have
 been the borrower.
- p. 67, †, *delete* n. 2.
- p. 68, l. 15, *for* only that *read* that only.
- p. 72, l. 14, *after* Council *read*, *for* this reason also.
- p. 74, l. 1, *for* in *read* as.
- p. 74, l. 3, *read* paragraph.
- p. 74, l. 16, *read* rest.
- p. 74, l. 18, *read* Piṭ.
- p. 74, l. 24, *for* although *read* because.
- p. 77, l. 7, *read* Māhākāśyapa.
- p. 78, l. 1, *after* piṭaka *read* *.
- p. 78, l. 2, *for* * *read* †.
- p. 78, l. 3, *delete* †.
- p. 79, l. 1, *delete* in.

PALI TEXT SOCIETY.

HARBORO GRANGE,

ASHTON-ON-MERSEY,

CHESHIRE.

Issues of the Pali Text Society.

I.—ARRANGEMENT BY YEARS.

1882.	1889.
1. Journal.	1. Journal.
2. Buddhavaṇsa and Cariyā Piṭaka.	2. Dīgha, Vol. I.
3. Āyāranga.	3. Peta-Vatthu.
1883.	1890.
1. Journal.	1. Journal.
2. Thera-therī-gāthā.	2. Saṃyutta, Vol. III.
3. Puggala-Paññatti.	3. Itivuttaka.
1884.	1891.
1. Journal.	1. Journal, 1891–1893.
2. Saṃyutta, Vol. I.	2. Mahā-Bodhi-Vaṇsa.
1885.	1892.
1. Journal.	1. Dhātu-Kathā.
2. Anguttara, Part I.	2. Therīgāthā Cy.
3. Dhamma-Saṅgaṇi.	1893.
4. Udāna.	1. Saṃyutta, Vol. IV.
1886.	2. Sutta-Nipāta Glossary.
1. Journal.	1894.
2. Sumaṅgala, Vol. I.	1. Peta-Vatthu Cy.
3. Vimāna-Vatthu.	2. Kathā-Vatthu, Vol. I.
1887.	1895.
1. Journal.	1. Anguttara, Part III.
2. Majjhima, Vol. I.	2. Kathā-Vatthu, Vol. II.
1888.	1896.
1. Journal.	1. Journal, 1893–1896.
2. Saṃyutta, Vol. II.	2. Yogāvacara's Manual.
3. Anguttara, Part II.	3. Majjhima, Vol. II., Part 1.

1897.	1903.
1. Attha-Sālinī.	1. Dīgha, Vol. II.
2. Sāsana-Vaṇṣa.	2. Journal, 1902-1903.
1898.	1904.
1. Saṃyutta, Vol. V.	1. Saṃyutta, Vol. VI. (Indices).
2. Majjhima, Vol. II., Part 2.	2. Vibhanga.
1899.	1905.
1. Anguttara, Part IV.	1. Paṭisambhidā, Vol. I.
2. Majjhima, Vol. III., Part 1.	2. Journal, 1904-1905.
1900.	1906.
1. Anguttara, Vol. V.	Duka-Paṭṭhāna, I.
2. Majjhima, Vol. III., Part 2.	Dhammapada Com ^y , I.
1901.	1907.
1. Vimāna-Vatthu Cy.	1. Journal, 1906-7.
2. Journal, 1897-1901.	2. Paṭisambhidā, Vol. II.
1902.	1908.
1. Netti-Pakarāṇa.	1. Journal, 1908.
2. Majjhima, Vol. III., Part 3.	2. Mahāvaiṣa.

Total, 26 years; 46 texts; 63 volumes; 17,600 pages.

II.—INDEX TO TEXTS.

NAME.	Net Sub- scription Price.
£ s. d.	
1. Anāgata-Vaṇṣa (in <i>Journal</i> for 1886)
2. Abidhammattha - Sangaha (in <i>Journal</i> for 1884)
3. Anguttara Nikaya, 5 vols. ...	2 10 6
4. Attha-Sālinī (1897) ...	0 10 6
5. Āyāranga (1882) ...	0 14 0
6. Buddha-Vaṇṣa (together with No. 7) ...	0 14 0
7. Cariyā-Piṭaka (1882)
8. Cha-kesa-dhātu-Vaṇṣa (in <i>Journal</i> for 1885)	...

II.—INDEX TO TEXTS—*continued.*

NAME.	Net Sub- scription Price.		
	£	s.	d.
9. Dāṭhā-Vaṇṣa (in <i>Journal</i> for 1884)			
10. Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 1 (1906) ..	0	10	6
11. Dhamma-Saṅgaṇī (1885)	0	10	6
12. Dhātu Kathā (1892)	0	10	6
13. Digha-Nikāya, 2 vols. (third nearly ready) ...	1	1	0
14. Duka-Patthāna (1906)	0	10	6
15. Gandha-Vaṇṣa (in <i>Journal</i> for 1886) ...			
16. Iti-vuttaka (1890)	0	7	6
17. Jina-Carita (in <i>Journal</i> for 1905)			
18. Kathā Vatthu, 2 vols.... ..	1	1	0
19. Kathā Vatthu Commentary (in <i>Journal</i> for 1889)	0	10	6
20. Khudda-Sikkhā (in <i>Journal</i> for 1883) ...			
21. Mahāvaṇṣa (1908)	0	10	6
22. Mahā-Bodhi-Vaṇṣa (1891)	0	10	6
23. Majjhima-Nikāya, 3 vols.	1	11	6
24. Mūla-Sikkhā (in <i>Journal</i> for 1883) ...			
25. Netti-Pakaraṇa (1902)	0	10	6
26. Pajja-Madhu (in <i>Journal</i> for 1887)			
27. Pañca-gati-dīpana (in <i>Journal</i> for 1884) ...			
28. Paṭisambhidāmagga, two vols.	1	1	0
29. Peta-Vatthu (1889)	0	10	6
30. Peta-Vatthu Commentary (1894)	0	10	6
31. Puggala-Paññatti (1883)	0	14	0
32. Saṃyutta-Nikāya, 6 vols.	3	3	0
33. Sad-dhamma-saṅgaha (in <i>Journal</i> for 1890)			
34. Sad-dhammopāyana (in <i>Journal</i> for 1877) ...			
35. Sandesa-Kathā (in <i>Journal</i> for 1885) ...			
36. Sāsana-Vaṇṣa (1897)	0	10	6
37. Simā-vivāda-vinicchaya-kathā (in <i>Journal</i> for 1887)			
38. Sumangala-Vilāsinī, vol. 1 (1886)	0	10	6
39. Sutta-Nipāta Glossary (1893)	0	10	6
40. Tela-kaṭāha-gāthā (1884)			

II.—INDEX TO TEXTS—*continued.*

NAME.	Net Subscription Price.		
	£	s.	d.
41-42. Thera-therī-gāthā (1883)	0	14	0
43. Therī-gāthā Commentary (1892) ...	0	10	6
44. Udāna (1885)	0	10	6
45. Vibhanga (1904)	0	10	6
46. Vimāna-Vatthu (1886)	0	7	0
47. Vimāna-Vatthu Commentary (1901) ...	0	10	6
48. Yogāvacara's Manual (1896)	0	7	0

III.—INDEX TO AUTHORS.

- Alwis, JAMES ; Lectures on Pali and Buddhism (1883).
 Andersen, D. ; Index to Trenckner's Notes (1908).
 Anesaki, M. ; The Abhidhamma literature of the Sarvāstivādins (1905). The Sutta Nipāta in Chinese (1907).
 Bell, H. C. P. ; List of MSS. in the Oriental Library, Kandy, 1882.
 Bendall, Cecil ; On the Mahāvagga (1883).
 Benson, A. C. ; Buddha, a sonnet (1883).
 Bode, Mabel H. ; ed. of Sāsana-Vaṇsa. Index to the Gandha-vaṇsa (1896). Index to Pali words discussed in Translations (1901). Early Pali Grammarians in Burma (1908).
 Carpenter, J. E. ; ed. of Dīgha and Sumangala-Vilāsini.
 Chalmers, R. ; ed. of Majjhima, vols. 2 and 3.
 Clauson, G. L. M. ; A New Kammavācā (1907).
 De, Harinath ; Notes and Translations (1907).
 Fausböll, V. ; Glossary to the Sutta-Nipāta (1893). Catalogue of Mandalay MSS. in the India Office Library (1896).
 Feer, Léon ; ed. of Saṃyutta, 5 vols ; and of Pañca-gati Dīpana.
 List of MSS. in the Bibliothèque Nationale (1882).

III.—INDEX TO AUTHORS—*continued.*

- Franke, R. Otto ; Three Papers on Pali Grammarians and Lexicographers (1903). On the alleged Buddhist Councils (1908).
- Frankfurter, Otto ; List of MSS. in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (1882).
- Geiger, W. ; ed. of *Mahāvāṇsa*.
- Gooneratne, E. R. ; ed. of *Tela-Kaṭāha-Gāthā* (1884), *Vimāna-Vatthu* (1886), *Pajja-Madhu* (1887), and *Dhatu-Kathā* (1892).
- Hardy, Edmund ; ed. of *Anguttara*, vols. 3-5, *Peta-Vatthu*, *Peta-Vatthu Commentary*, *Vimāna-Vatthu Commentary*, and *Netti-Pakarāṇa*.
- On some stanzas in eulogy of the Buddha (1901). On the enlarged text of the *Mahāvāṇsa* (1903).
- Hoerning, Dr. ; List of Pali MSS. in the British Museum (1883 and 1888).
- Hunt, Mabel ; Index to the *Paṭisambhidā* (1908).
- Jacobi, H. ; ed. of *Āyāranga*.
- Konow, Sten ; Pali words beginning with "H" (1907).
- Minayeff, J. P. ; ed. of *Sandesa-Kathā* (1885), *Cha-kesa-dhātu-vaṇsa* (1885), *Anāgata-vaṇsa* (1886), *Gandha-Vaṇsa* (1886), *Simā Vivāda* (1887), and *Kathā Vatthu Commentary* (1889).
- Moore, Justin H. ; Collation of the *Iti-vuttaka* (1907).
- Morris, Richard ; ed. of *Anguttara*, vols. 1 and 2, *Buddha-vaṇsa*, *Cariyā-pitaka*, *Puggala-paññatti*, and *Saddham-mopāyana* (1887).
- Notes and Queries (1884, 1885, 1886, 1887, 1889, and 1891).
- Müller, F. Max ; On *Kenjur Kasawara* (1883).
- Müller-Hess, Edward ; ed. of *Attha-sālinī*, *Khudda-sikkhā*, *Mūla-sikkhā*, *Dhamma-saṅgaṇi*, and *Theri-gāthā Commentary*.
- Glossary of Pali Proper Names (1888).
- Oldenberg, Hermann ; ed. of *Thera-gāthā*.
- List of MSS. in the India Office Library (1882).

III.—INDEX TO AUTHORS—*continued*.

- Runkle, C. B.; Index to Warren's 'Buddhism in Translations' (1903).
- Rouse, W. H. D.; Index to the Jātakas (1890). Text and translation of the Jina Carita (1905).
- Rhys Davids, T. W.; ed. of Dīgha, Sumangala, Abhidhammattha-sangaha, Dāṭhā-Vaṅsa, and Yogāvacara's Manual.
- List of MSS. in the Copenhagen Royal Library (1883).
Persecution of Buddhists in India (1896). The Bhabra Edict of Asoka (1896). On spelicans (1887).
Abbreviations of titles of Pali books (1896). Political Divisions in India (1901).
- Rhys Davids, Mrs.; ed. of Vibhanga and Duka-Paṭṭhāna.
Index to Saṅgyutta (1904). Similes in the Nikāyas (1907 and 1908). The Earliest Rock Climb (1901).
- Saddhānanda, N.; ed. of Saddhamma-Sangaha (1890).
- Schrader, F. Otto; Nirvana (1905).
- Steinthal, P.; ed. of Udāna.
- Strong, S. A.; ed. of Mahā-bodhi Vaṅsa.
- Suzuki, Daisetz T.; The Zen Sect of Buddhism (1907).
- Taylor, Arnold C.; ed. of Kathā Vatthu and Paṭisambhidā.
- Trenckner, V.; ed. of Majjhima, vol. 1.
- Warren, H. C.; Pali MSS. in the Brown University Library (1885). Visuddhi Magga (1891).
- Watanabe, K.; A Chinese collection of Iti-vuttakas (1907).
- Wenzel, H.; Nāgārjuna 'Friendly Epistle' (1886). Index to verses in the Divyāvadāna (1896).
- Windisch, E.; ed. of Iti-vuttaka.
Collation of Udāna (1890).
- Zoysa, Louis de; List of MSS. in the Colombo Museum (1882).

For 1907 to 1910 the issues will be selected from the following:—The Dīgha, Vol. III., the Dhammapada Commentary, the Peṭakopadesa, the Samanta-Pāsādikā, a second edition of Vol. I. of the Sutta-Nipāta, the rest of the

Paṭisambhidā, the Papañca-Sūdanī, the Sārattha-ppakāsinī, the Yamaka, and an Index to the Anguttara.

SUBSCRIPTION one guinea a year.

BACK ISSUES, one guinea a year (except for the years 1882, 1883, and 1885, which are now advanced to two guineas each). Separate volumes can be supplied to subscribers on payment of a subscription of fourteen shillings a volume for the issues of 1882 and 1883, and of half a guinea a volume for the issues of subsequent years. No book can be supplied until the subscription for it has been paid.

List of Donors to the Pali Text Society down to April, 1907.

	£	s.	d.
His Majesty the King of Siam	200	0	0
H.R.H. Prince Krom Mun Devavajsa Varo- prakar	20	0	0
H.R.H. Prince Prisdang	10	0	0
The Secretary of State for India	31	10	0
'A Friend of historical research'	29	0	0
H. Vavasor Davids, Esq.	3	0	0
L. T. Cave, Esq.	5	0	0
R. Hannah, Esq.	10	10	0
„ (2nd donation)	6	6	0
R. Pearce, Esq., M.P.	10	10	0
Miss Horn	10	0	0
Professor Edward Müller	10	0	0
General Forlong	1	1	0
Mrs. Plimmer	10	0	0
Henry C. Warren, Esq.	50	0	0
Another 'Friend of historical research'	75	0	0
Ditto (Edmund Hardy)	25	0	0
J. B. Andrews, Esq.	5	0	0
H.M.'s Government	200	0	0
Miss Ridding	10	0	0
R. F. Johnston, Esq.	2	2	0
H.H. the Rāja of Bhinga	100	0	0
F. H. Baynes, Esq.	5	5	0
	<u>£829</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>0</u>

Besides the above donations, Edward T. Sturdy, Esq., has paid for the printing of the *Attha-Sālinī*, the *Dhātu Kathā*, the *Kathā-vatthu*, the 'Yogāvacara Manual of Indian Mysticism as practised by Buddhists,' the *Dhamma-saṅgaṇī*, the *Vibhaṅga*, and the *Paṭṭhāna*, I.

