

Pāli Text Society

J O U R N A L

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 PĀLI 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 PĀTISAMBHIDĀMAGGA, 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*, though it be also *dukkha*. 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 *Mahāvansā*. 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 Dīpavāyasa, the Mahāvāyasa, and, among Buddhaghosa's Commentaries, chiefly the introduction to the Samantapāsādikā. Now the Dīpavāyasa 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 Dīpavāyasa, Mahāvāyasa, 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 Mahāvāyasa and of the Samantapāsādikā wrote out the Dīpavāyasa, 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 Dipavanssa 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: 'Ahañ kho pana Sāriputta etarahi jinno vuddho mahallako addhagato vayo anuppatto, asitiko 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 xlvi. 13 (vol. v., p. 161). According to *this* Sutta, Sāriputta died while the Buddha was at Sāvatthī. 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 Sāvatthī: 'Ekaj samayaŋ Bhagavā Sāvatthiyāŋ viharati... tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Sāriputto Magadhesu viharati Nālagāmake ābādhiko dukkhito bālhagilāno... atha āyasmā Sāriputto tena ābādhena parinibbāyi...'. Again, in Saṃy. xlvi. 14, 1 (vol. v. 163) we read: 'Ekaj samayaŋ Bhagavā Vajjīsu viharati... acirapari-nibbutesu Sāriputta - Moggalānesu.' No significance attaches to the fact that, in later Suttas—e.g., xlvi. 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, undertaken in the same year, discourses at Nālandā to Sāriputta: 'Athā kho āyasmā Sāriputto yena Bhagavā ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā Bhagavantay abhivādetvā... Bhagavantay etad avoca... "U!ārā kho te ayaŋ Sāriputta āsabhi vācā bhāsitā...".'

It is further worth noticing the relation of Dīgha xvi. 5-18, 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): 'Evaj vutte āyasmā Ānando Bhagavantay etad avoca: "Mā bhante Bhagavā imasmīg kudda-nagarake ujjangala-nagarake sākha-nagarake parinibbāyatu. Santi, etc., to karissantīti." "Mā h'evaj Ānanda avaca mā h'evaj Ānanda avaca kudda-nagarakay ujjangala-nagarakay

sākha-nagarakan ti. Bhūtapubbaj Ānanda rājā Mahā-Sudassano nāma ahosi cakkavattī dharmiko dhammarājā cāturanṭo vijitāvī janapadatthāvariyapatto sattaratanaśamannāgato. Rañño Ānanda Mahā-Sudassanassa ayañ Kusinārā Kusāvati nāma rājadhānī ahosi, puratthimena ca pacchimena ca dvādasa yojanāni āyāmena uttarena ca dakkhipena ca satta yojanāni vitthārena, etc., to dasamena saddena. Gaccha tvay Ānanda Kusinārāyañ pavisitvā Kosinārakānay Mallānay ārocehi" . . .

(b) Digha xvii. 1, 1 (vol. ii. 169): 'Evaj me sutaj. Ekañ samayañ Bhagavā Kusinārāyañ viharati Upavattane Mallānay Sālavane antarena Yamakasālānay parinibbānasamaye. Atha kho āyasmā Ānando yena Bhagavā ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā Bhagavantaj abhivādetvā ekamantaj nisidi. Ekamantaj nīsinno kho āyasmā Ānando Bhagavantam etad avoca: "Mā bhante Bhagavā . . . sākhanagarake pari-nibbāyi. Santi, etc., to karissantiti." "Mā h'evaj Ānanda avaca kuddanagarakan ujjangalanagarakan sākhanagarakan ti. Bhūtapubbaj Ānanda rājā Mahā-Sudassano nāma ahosi khattiyo muddhā-vasitto cāturanṭo vijitāvī janapadatthāvariyapatto. 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 khemataj;
Sace musā na bhaṇasi, sace pāṇaŋ na hiyasi,
Sace adinnaj nādiyasi, saddahāno amaccharī,
Kiŋ kāhasi Gayaj gantvā, udapāno pi te Gayā ti.

And in S.:

Dhammo rahado brāhmaṇa sīlatittho
Anāvilo sabbhi sataj pasattho
Yattha have vedaguno sinātā
Anallinagattā va taranti pāraŋ
Saccag dhammo sanyamo brahmacariyap.

In all three versions the river Sundarikā is mentioned; all three conclude with Sundarika-Bhāradvāja announcing his conversion in the usual formula: 'Abhikkantaj 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 Evaŋ me sutaj, followed by the equally usual Ekaŋ samayaŋ . . . ; 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 ekaŋ samayaŋ ('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)—'Ekaŋ samayaŋ 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. xlvi. 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 Kusināraj . . . become, in the C.V., 'Ekañ idāhañ āvuso samayañ Pāvāya Kusināraj . . .,' with the further use of the first instead of the third person—ahañ, etc. Thirdly, the compiler of the Culla-vagga has substituted for Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo bhikkhū āmantesi, the words: 'Atha khv āhañ āvuso te bhikkhū etad avocañ . . .' 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 Kusināraj add-

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

hāna-magga-paṭipanno hoti mahatā bhikkhu-sanghena saddhiŋ pañcamattehi bhikkhu-satehi. Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo maggā okkamma aññatarasmiŋ rukkhamūle nisidi.

Tena kho pana samayena aññataro ājīvako Kusinārāya mandārava-pupphaŋ gahetvā Pāvāŋ addhāna-magga-paṭipanno hoti.

Addasā kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo ājīvakanū dūrato 'va āgacchantay. Disvā tam ājīvakanū etad avoca: 'Ap' āvuso amhākaŋ Satthāraŋ jānāsiti.'

'Āma āvuso jānāmi. Ajja sattāha-parinibbuto samaṇo Gotamo. Tato me idaŋ mandārava-pupphaŋ gahitan' ti.

Tattha ye te bhikkhū avīta-rāgā appekacce bāhā paggayha kandanti, chinna-papātay papa-tanti āvat̄tanti vivat̄tanti: 'Atikhippāŋ Bhagavā parinibbuto, atikhippāŋ Sugato parinibbuto, atikhippāŋ cakkhuŋ loke antarahitan' ti.

Ye pana te bhikkhū vītarāgā, te satā sampa-jānā adhivāsentī: 'Anicca sañkhārā, taŋ kut' ettha labbhā?' ti.

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

'Alaŋ āvuso mā socittha mā paridevittha. Sumuttā mayaŋ tena mahā-samaṇena. Upadduttā ca homa "Idaŋ vo kappati, idaŋ vo na kappatīti," idāni pana mayaŋ yaŋ icchissāma taŋ karissāma, yaŋ na icchissāma taŋ na karissāmāti.'

Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo bhikkhū āmantesī:

'Alaŋ āvuso mā socittha mā paridevittha. Nanu etay āvuso Bhagavatā paṭigacc' eva akkhātay: "Sabbeh' eva piyehi manāpehi nānābhāvo vinā-bhāvo aññathābhāvo, taŋ kut' ettha āvuso labbhā? Yan taŋ jātaŋ bhūtaŋ saṅkhataŋ

paloka-dhammañ taj̄ vata mā palujjīti n'etañ
thānāñ 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 Samana 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 Samana. It was harassing to us to be told : “This beseems you, this beseeems 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: ‘Ekañ idāhañ āvuso samayañ Pāvāya Kusinārañ addhānamaggapati-panno mahatā. . . . Atha khv āhañ āvuso maggā okkamma aññatarasmiñ rukkhamūle nisīdiy.

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

Tena kho. . . . Addasañ khv ahañ āvuso tañ ājīvakañ . . . disvāna tañ ājīvakañ etad avocañ . . . Tatrāvuso ye te bhikkhū avitarāgā . . . tañ kut' ettha labbhā 'ti. Atha khv ahañ āvuso te bhikkhū etad avocañ: Alañ āvuso mā socittha . . . n'etañ thānañ vijjatīti. Tena kho pana samayena āvuso Subhaddo nāma vuddhapabbajito . . . Atha kho āvuso Subhaddo . . . upadutā ca mayañ homa . . . na tañ 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 Parinirvāna. (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 Ājīvaka, 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 'ekañ idāhañ āvuso samayañ . . . ‡ 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-bandhanāñ Mallānañ cetiyañ 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 may bhante pari-nibbānakāle evam āha: Ākankhamāno Ānanda sangho mam' accayena khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni samūhaneyya.* 'Then said the venerable Ānanda to the thera-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 ekabhiikkhussa pi kankhā vā vimati vā Buddhe vā Dhamme vā Sanghe vā Magge vā Paṭipadāya vā: pucchatha, bhikkhave! Mā pacchā vippaṭisārino ahuvattha: 'Sammukhībhūto no Satthā ahosi, na mayañ sakkhimha Bhagavantay sam-mukhā paṭipucchitun ti.' Evay vutte te bhikkhū tuñhi ahesuñ.

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 dukkaṭaŋ yaŋ tvaŋ mātugāmehi Bhagavato sarīraŋ paṭhamāŋ vandāpesi, tāsaŋ rodantīnaŋ Bhagavato sarīraŋ assukena makkhitā. Desehi taŋ dukkaṭan ti. Ahay kho bhante mā yimā vikāle ahesun ti mātugāmehi Bhagavato sarīraŋ paṭhamāŋ vandāpesi.* . . .

'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 'paṭhamāŋ,' and it is, perhaps, better to impute a lack of 'correctitude' to the compiler.

This paragraph clearly refers to D. xvi. 5, 20 *f*:* ‘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, dishevelling 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.* 3) doubt this.

† Cf. with this the Buddha’s words (D. xvi. 5, 5 [vol. ii. 144]): *Pāñdito kho bhikkhave Ānando; jānāti: ‘Ayañ kālo Tathāgatay dassanāya upasankamituy bhikkhūnay, ayañ kālo bhikkhunīnay, ayañ kālo upāsakānay, ayañ kālo upāsikānay . . .’* (‘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 dukkaṭaŋ yāŋ tvaŋ bhagavatā olārike nimitte kayiramāne olārike obhāse kayiramāne na bhagavantāŋ yāci: tiṭṭhatu bhagavā kappāŋ tiṭṭhatu sugato kappāŋ bahujanahitāya bahujanasukhāya lokānukampāya atthāya hitāya sukhāya devamanussānan ti. Desehi taj dukkaṭaŋ ti. Ahaŋ kho bhante Mārena pariyüttacitto na bhagavantāŋ yāciŋ: 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 ākaṇkhamāno Ānanda Tathāgato kappāŋ vā tiṭṭheyya kappāvasesaŋ vā ti. 4. Evam pi kho āyasmā Ānando Bhagavatā olārike nimitte kayiramāne olārike obhāse kayiramāne nāsakkhi paṭivijjhituŋ, na Bhagavantāŋ yāci: Tiṭṭhatu bhante Bhagavā kappāŋ, tiṭṭhatu Sugato kappāŋ bahujanahitāya bahujanasukhāya lokānukampāya atthāya hitāya

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

sukhāya devamanussānan ti, yathātañ Mārena
pariyuṭṭhitacitto.

'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' etāñ dukkaṭañ, tuyh' ev' etāñ aparaddhañ, yañ tvāñ Tathāgatena evañ oṭārike nimitte kayiramāne . . . na Tathāgatañ 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 mañ bhante parinibbānakāle evam āha: tena h' Ānanda saṅgho mam' accayena Channassa bhikkhuno brahmadañdañ āñāpetū 'ti. Pucchi pana tvāñ āvuso Ānanda bhagavantāñ: katamo pana bhante brahmadañdo 'ti. Pucchiñ kho 'hañ*

* 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 bhagavantaj: katamo pana bhante
brahmadañdo 'ti.... Channo Ānanda bhikkhū
yañ iccheyya tañ vadeyya, bhikkhūhi Channo
bhikkhu n'eva vattabbo na ovaditabbo nānusā-
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 manī^m accayena brahma-dāñdo kātabbo 'ti.

Katamo pana bhante brahma-dāñdo 'ti?
Channo Ānanda bhikkhu yañ iccheyya tañ
vadeyya, so bhikkhūhi n'eva vattabbo na ovadi-
tabbo na anusāsitarabbo '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 mañ āyasmanto, vacanīyo 'mhi āyasmantehīti, so ca hoti dubbaco dovacassakaranehi dhammehi samannāgato akkhamo appadakkhiṇag-
gāhī anusāsanī, atha kho nañ sabrahmacārī na c'eva vattabbañ maññanti na ca anusāsi-
tabbañ maññanti na ca tasmiñ puggale vissā-
sañ āpajjitabbañ 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. Sanghādisesa 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: 'Ayañ 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 tay paṭirūpāy yo' hañ sekho samāno sannipātay 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: Etasmīñ antare anupādāya āsavehi cittāñ vimuccī. 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: 'Ahañ ca vat' amhi sekho sakaraññīyo, Satthu ca me parinibbānāy 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: khippaŋ
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 pan’ Ānanda etarahi bhikkhū
aññamaññaŋ āvuso-vādena samudācaranti, na
vo mam’ accayena evaŋ samudācaritabbay. 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 (pāvacanāŋ) 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 āsavānay khayā anāsavaŋ
cetovimuttij . . . 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): Yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū ye te bhikkhū therā rattāñū cirapabbajitā saṅgha-pitāro saṅgha-parināyakā te sakkarissanti garukarissanti mānessanti pūjessanti tesañ ca sotabbay maññissanti, vuddhi yeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnañ pāṭikāñkhā 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 *Saṃyutta-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 *Paribbūjakas*—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, 18 (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 sambahulānañ bhikkhūnañ . . . ayañ sankhiyā-dhammo udapādi: Acchariyañ āvuso abbhutañ āvuso. . . . xiv. 1, 13 (ii. 8): Atha kho tesay bhikkhūnañ acirapakkantassa Bhagavato ayañ antarākathā udapādi: Acchariyañ āvuso abbhutañ āvuso. . . .* With these we may compare, e.g., Anguttara x. 115, 2 (v. 225): Atha kho tesay bhikkhūnañ acirapakkantassa Bhagavato etad ahosi: Iday kho no āvuso Bhagavā . . . vihārañ paviṭṭho. . . . Further citations are superfluous.

The Vinaya Piṭaka also affords innumerable instances—e.g., M.V. ii. 12, 3: . . . bhikkhū duccolā honti lūkhacīvarañ. Bhikkhū evañ āhañsu: kissa tumhe āvuso duccolā lūkhacīvarañ ti? etc. And among the many examples in the C.V. take i. 6, 1: Atha kho sangho Pandukalohitakānañ bhikkhūnañ tajjaniyakammañ akāsi. te . . . bhikkhū upasāyakamitvā evañ vadenti: mayañ āvuso sanghena tajjaniyakammañakatā sammāvattāma . . . iv. 14, 18: tehi . . . bhikkhūhi tañ āvāsañ gantvā āvāsikā bhikkhū evam assu vacanīyā: iday kho āvuso adhikaraṇañ evañ jātañ. . . . v. 2, 4: tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno mukhe vano hoti. so bhikkhū pucchi: kidiso me āvuso vano 'ti. bhikkhū evam āhañsu: idiso te āvuso vano 'ti. vi. 3, 4: bhikkhū upadhāvitvā tañ bhikkhuñ etad avocuñ: kissa tvay 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 Mahākotṭhitō 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): Ekaŋ samayaŋ Bhagavā Gosiṅgasālavānādāye viharati sambahulehi abhiññātehi abhiññātehi therehi sāvakehi saddhiŋ, āyasmatā ca Sāriputtena āyasmatā ca Mahāmoggallānena āyasmatā ca Mahākassapa 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 Mahākotṭhitena āyasmatā ca Mahākappinena āyasmatā ca Mahācundena.

A. ii. 17, 2 (iii. 299), has: Kahan nu kho bhikkhave Sāriputto, kahaŋ Mahāmoggallāno, kahaŋ Mahākassapo, kahaŋ Mahākaccāno, kahaŋ Mahākotṭhitō, kahaŋ Mahācundo, kahaŋ Mahākappino, kahaŋ Anuruddho, kahaŋ Revato, kahaŋ 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 . . . Mahākotṭhitō . . . Mahākappino . . . Mahācundo . . . Anuruddho . . . Revato . . . Upāli . . . Ānando . . . Rāhulo. . . . Ānanda is ranked in the

list of Sākyā 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 (navehi bhikkhūhi),* and concludes his admonition with the words: 'This youth does not know his place'—navāyañ 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 dūtañ pāhesi: āgacchatu Ānando imaj anussāvessatīti. Āyasmā Ānando evaj āha: nāhañ ussahāmi therassa nāmaj gahetuñ garu me therō 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 tijsamattā saddhivihārino . . . yebhuyyena kumārabhūtā.

† In S. xxii. 83, 3 (vol. iii. 105), however, Ānanda counts himself among the novices: Āyasmā Ānando etad avoca: Puñño nāma āvuso Āyasmā Mantāniputto amhākaj navakānañ satañ 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 aññatarañ bhikkhuñ āmantesi: 'Ehi tvañ bhikkhu, mama vacanena Ānandam āmantehi: "Satthā tañ āvuso Ānanda āmantetīti."' 'Evañ bhante' ti kho so bhikkhu Bhagavato paṭissutvā yen' āyasmā Ānando ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā āyasmantañ Ānandāñ etad avoca: 'Satthā tañ āvuso Ānanda āmantetīti.'

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 Subhaddaŋ pabbā-jethāti.' 'Evaj bhante' ti kho āyasmā Ānando Bhagavato paccassosi.

30. Atha kho Subhaddo paribbājako āyasmantaŋ Ānanday etad avoca: 'Lābhā vo āvuso Ananda, suladdhaŋ 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 (buddha-pabbajito).^{*} 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: 'Alaŋ 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 paccassosuŋ. So in M. xviii. (i. 110), the bhikkhus address Mahākaccāna: Ekamantaŋ nisinnā kho te bhikkhū āyasmantaŋ Mahākaccānaŋ etad avocuŋ: Idaj kho no āvuso Kaccāna Bhagavā sankhittena uddesaj uddisitvā . . . vihāraŋ paviṭṭho, 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 paccassosuṇ.

In M. xxxii. (i. 212) the two senior Theras, M. Moggalāna and M. Kassapa, address each other as āvuso: 'Āyām' āvuso Kassapa . . . Evaŋ 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 Gosingasālavanāŋ sobheyya.'

In Ang. iv. 174, 4 (ii. 161), Ānanda to Mahākotthito: 'Channāŋ āvuso phassāyatanaŋ asesavirā-ganirodhā atth' aññāŋ kiñcīti.'

In Ang. iv. 179 (ii. 167), Ānanda to Sāriputta: 'Ko nu kho āvuso Sāriputta hetu . . .'; and v. 169, 2 (iii. 201): 'Kittāvatā nu kho āvuso Sāriputta bhikkhu . . .' and also vi. 51 (iii. 361). In Ang. ix. 11, 2 (iv. 374), an anonymous bhikkhu to Sāriputta: 'Satthātaŋ āvuso Sāriputta āmanteti.' In A. x. 86, 1 (v. 162), the bhikkhus to M. Kassapa: 'Āvuso ti kho te bhikkhū āyasmato M. Kassapassa paccassosuṇ.' 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: 'Vippasannāni 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: 'Evaŋ āvuso ti kho bhikkhū āyasmato paccassosuṇ' (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 antaŋ nisinno kho āyasmā Channo āyasmantam Ānandam etad

avoca: Ekam idāhañ āvuso Ānanda samayañ Bārānasiyañ viharāmi. 18. Evam etañ 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 khamaṇīyañ. . . .'

The Vinaya-Pitaka 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 āyasmantañ Mahākassapañ etad avocuñ: kissa te āvuso cīvarāni allānīti. In C.V. iv. 4, 5: Te (i.e., Mettiyabhummajakā bhikkhū) pacchābhuttañ piñḍapātapaṭikkantā there bikkhū pucchanti: tumhākañ āvuso bhattachagge kiñ ahosi. . . . In C.V. v. 8, 1: Atha kho āyasmā Piñḍolabhāradvājo āyasmantañ Mahāmoggallānañ etad avoca: . . . gacchāvuso Moggallāna. . . . In C.V. vii. 3, 10: Evañ āvuso 'ti kho te bhikkhū āyasmato Ānandassa paṭisutvā. . . . 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 samanuddeso yen' āyasmā Nāgito ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā āyasmantañ Nāgitanñ abhivādetvā ekamantañ atthāsi. Ekamantañ thito kho Sīho samanuddeso āyasmantañ Nāgitanñ etad avoca: 'Ete bhante Kassapa sambahulā . . . - brāhmaṇa-dūtā . . . idh' upasankantā. . . . A samanuddesa 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. xlvi. 13 (v. 161):

2. Tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Sāriputto Magadhesu viharati Nālagāmake ābādhiko dukkhito bālhagilāno, Cundo ca samaṇuddeso āyasmato Sāriputtassa upatṭhāko hoti.
3. Atha āyasmā Sāriputto tena ābādhena pari-nibbāyi. 4. Atha kho Cundo samaṇuddeso . . . yenāyasmā Ānando tenupasankami, upasankamitvā . . . āyasmantaŋ Ānandaŋ 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 āyasmantaŋ Mahākassapay etad avoca: Āyāma bhante Kassapa . . . xvi. 11, 6: Tayo kho bhante Kassapa atthavase paticca Bhagavatā kulesu tikabhojanam paññattāŋ. As, however, the Sañyutta-nikāya unquestionably uses portions of the Digha-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 aññatarasmiñ āvāse . . . sambahulā bhikkhū viharanti bālā avyattā. . . . Te theran ajjhesiñsu: 'Uddisatu bhante therō pātimokkhan ti.'* So evañ 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 Saṅghanava kāyañ ajjheshanti: 'Uddisatu āyasmā* Pātimokkhan ti.'* So pi evañ 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 sāmantā āvāsā sajjukāñ 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 ekañsañ uttarāsaṅgāñ karitvā ukkuṭikāñ nisiditvā añjaliñ paggahetvā 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 ahañ āvuso . . . Z. Navakena bhikkhunā ekañsañ uttarāsāṅgaj karitvā . . . thero bhikkhu evam assa vacanīyo: parisuddho ahañ 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 tañ āvāsañ gantvā te there etad avocuñ: idañ bhante adhikaraṇañ evañ jātañ*. 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 ekañsañ uttarāsāṅgaj karitvā vuddhānañ bhikkhūnañ pāde vanditvā ukkuṭikaj nisiditvā añjaliñ paggahetvā evam assu vacanīyā: ahañ bhante itthannāmañ āpat-tiñ āpanno tañ 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 Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū yāvadatthaj bhūñjiñsu yāvadatthaj supiñsu. . . . Te aparena samayena . . . āyasmantañ Ānandañ upasañkamitvā evañ vadenti: na mayañ bhante Ānanda buddha-garahino. . . .* 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: 'Gañhātu 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 saññāvedayitanirodhā* samāpajji. *Atha kho āyasmā Ānando āyasmantā* Anuruddhā etad avoca: ‘Parinibbuto bhante Anuruddha Bhagavā’ ti. ‘Na āvuso Ānanda Bhagavā parinibbuto, saññāvedayitanirodhā 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 ‘Theratara,’ 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: ‘Alaṇ āvuso mā socittha. . .’* And the bhikkhus reply: ‘*Kathān-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: 'Evay 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 un-derived passage: 'Handa mayañ āvuso dhammañ ca vinayañ ca sangayāma.* After Sāriputta and Moggallāna were dead (cf. S. xlvi. 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 'Theratara,' 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 therō 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: 'Sunātu 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 (khaṇḍaphullāṇ pātiśankharoma).†

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

† So S.B.E. xx. 373. The Samantapāśādikā 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 ussukkāṇ āpajjissati kinti nu kho vihāro khippaṇ pariyośāṇaṇ gaccheyyā ti, khaṇḍaphullāṇ pātiśankharissati. '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 khaṇḍaphullāṇ pātiśankharāṇa occurs, and are hinted at in vi. 11, 1: tena kho pana samayena sattarasa vaggīyā bhikkhū aññatarāṇ paccantimāṇ mahāvihāraṇ pātiśankharonti idha mayaṇ vassāṇ 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 cittaj vimuccī*.

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 Theravālist 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 (brahma-dāṇḍa) 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 Kosambi, 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 hiraññassa paṭiviso'—'This, friend Yasa, is your share of the money.' He declines, saying: 'N'atthi me āvuso hiraññassa 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 Vesālians, 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 *f.*). 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 Sāvatthiyān viharati Jetavane Anāthapindikassa 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. xlvi. 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 Maṇicūlaka 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 Vesālians is reported by the escort to the Vajji Bhikkhus, who address him as āvuso: 'Khamāpitā āvuso Yasena Kākandaka-puttena Vesālikā upāsakā ti?' 'Have they forgiven Yasa?' He replies with āvuso: 'Pāpikāñ no āvuso katañ. . . .' 'Evil, friends, hath been wrought against us.' They thereupon resolve to suspend Yasa temporarily (ukkhepaniyakamma). Yasa travels through the air to Kosambi, and sends messengers to the bhikkhus of Pātheyya, Avanti, 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 Sabbakāmī (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 mayañ bhante imañ adhikarañāñ ādiyissāma.' 'Come now, lord, let us take in charge

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

† According to the Dipavajsa version of the second Council (Dip. 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 Sabbakāmī, 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: 'Evāñ 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 therānāŋ bhikkhūnāŋ mantayamānānāŋ 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 cirapattāŋ arahattāŋ.' 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 singilonākappo?' (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 singilonākappo 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 Pātheyyakas, 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 Pātheyya, 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 titthāhi'), may have suggested reproducing M.V. i. 5, 4-6, here.

3. The Vajji bhikkhus present their offerings to 'bhante' Revata—'Paṭigāñhātu bhante therō . . .'—which are declined: 'Alan āvuso . . . ti na icchi paṭiggahetuj. . . .' 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. 130; 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: 'Alan āvuso . . . ti na icchi paṭiggahetuj.' They also, in persuading him, by analogy with the Buddha and Ānanda's procedure, call him āvuso: 'Manussā kho, āvuso Uttara, Bhagavato sāmañakāŋ pari-kkhāraŋ upanāmenti . . .' Uttara, in taking one robe, engages himself to present their case to Revata, whom, of course, he calls bhante: 'Ettakāŋ bhante therō sanghamajjhe vadetu.'

4. Now comes the first sitting, Revata, preceding Sambhūta, is President, and of course addresses the Thera Council as āvuso: 'Suñātu 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 (*vīsatīvassasatiko*

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 Sānavāsī, who is somewhat his inferior, that they shall both call on Sabbakāmī, to consult him privately. Revata calls Sambhūta āvuso: ‘Ahañ āvuso yasmin vihāre Sabbakāmī thero viharati tañ vihārañ upagacchāmi...’ Sambhūta replies correctly with ‘bhante’: ‘Evaj 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 tvañ, bhummi, vihārena etarahi bahulaj 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 piyavacanaj etaj, 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 ahañ bhante etarahi

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

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

7. The Council now takes place. Revata again presides, but this time, now that a theratara, Sabbakāmī, is present, he addresses the assembly, no longer as āvuso, but as bhante: ‘Sunātu me bhante Sangho!’ He moves that a committee be appointed. This consists of four Pācīnakas, including Sabbakāmī and Sālha, and four Pātheyyakas, including Revata and Sambhūta Sāṇavāsi.

8. Revata, using the correct bhante, asks permission of the committee* to question Sabbakāmī on the Vinaya; the latter, in his turn and using āvuso—‘Sunātu me āvuso Sangho!’—asks permission of the committee to be questioned. Revata then questions him concerning the ten indulgences, whether they are feasible. Sabbakāmī 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, Sabbakāmī replying with āvuso. In declaring before the committee each question in succession as closed, the latter addresses all as āvuso: ‘nihatañ etañ āvuso adhikarañāñ . . .’ But he bids Revata question him again before the Sangha: ‘Api ca maiñ tvañ āvuso Sanghamajhe 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 *Dīpavaṇja* 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 DĪGHA- NIKĀYA XVI. AND CULLAVAGGA XI., XII.

In Digha 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 cāyasmantānāg saddhāya desemi taŋ dukkaṭān.' '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 evaŋ vadeyya: "Sammukhā me taŋ āvuso Bhagavato sutaj sammukhā paṭiggahitaŋ, ayaŋ Dhammo ayaŋ Vinayo idaŋ Satthu sāsanān 'ti, tassa bhikkhave bhikkhuno bhāsitaŋ n'eva abhinanditabbaj na paṭikkositabbaj. Anabhinanditvā appaṭikkositvā tāni padavyañ-janāni sādhukaj uggahetvā Sutte otāretabbāni Vinaye sandassetabbāni. Tāni ce Sutte otāriyamānāni Vinaye sandassiyamānāni na c'eva Sutte otaranti na Vinaye sandissanti niṭṭham ettha gantabbaj: 'Addhā idaŋ na c'eva tassa Bhagavato vacanaj, imassa ca bhikkhuno dug-gahitan' ti, iti h' etaj bhikkhave chaddeyyātha. Tāni ce Sutte otariyamānāni Vinaye sandassiyamānāni Sutte c'eva otaranti Vinaye ca sandissanti, niṭṭham ettha gantabbaj: 'Addhā idaŋ tassa Bhagavato vacanaj imassa ca bhikkhuno suggahītan' 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."

⁴ 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 singilonākappo?' and then, in other words, 'Kappati bhante singinālonāy pariharitūy yattha alonākāy 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 Sāvatthī, 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 yath'eva mayā Bhagavato sammukhā sutay . . . tath' evāhāy 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 āyasmantāŋ Upāliŋ etad avoca: pathamāŋ āvuso Upāli pārājikāŋ kattha paññattan ti. Vesāliyaŋ bhante ti. Kaŋ ārabbhā ti. Sudinnaŋ Kalandaputtaŋ ārabbhā ti. Kismiŋ 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 Kalandā." "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 āyasmantāŋ Ānandaŋ etad avoca: Brahmajālaŋ āvuso Ānanda kattha bhāsitan ti. Antarā ca bhante Rājagahaŋ antarā ca Nālandāŋ rājagārake Ambalaṭṭhikāyan ti. Kaŋ ārabbhā ti. Suppiyaŋ ca paribbājakāŋ Brahmadattaŋ ca māṇavan 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, Brahmadatta."

See Digha 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 *dīpentī* (xii. 1, 1).*

In xi. 1, Mahā Kassapa proposes the first Council in the words: ‘Handa mayañ āvuso dhammañ ca vinayañ ca sangāyāma, 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 Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū Vesāliyan dasa vatthūni dīpentī,’—‘Now at that time, a century after the Parinibbāna of the Exalted One, the Bhikkhus of Vesāli, Vajjians, promulgated at Vesāli 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: *Imañ adhikaraṇañ adiyissāma, 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]): . . . adhammañ dhammo ti dīpentī . . . avinayañ vinayo ti dīpentī . . .

† 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: *Yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū appaññattay na paññāpessanti, paññattay na samuechindissanti, yathāpaññattesu sikkhāpadesu samādāya vattissanti, vuddhi yeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnay pātikankhā no parihāni.*

‘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 pattakallay, saṅgho apaññatay na paññāpeyya paññattay na samuechinddeyya yathāpaññattesu 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 Digha xvi. on the conception and construction of C.V. xi., xii., is this: in

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

D. xvi. 1, 6, the sentence quoted above is preceded by this sentence: Yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū sa-maggā sannipatissanti samaggā vutthahissanti samaggā sanghakaraṇīyāni karissanti, vuddhi yeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnay pāṭikāṅkhā no pariḥāni.

‘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 *f.*, and 1, 6 *f.*, two parallel groups of conditions for success laid down, the first of which are the special conditions for the welfare of the Vajjians? Yāvakīvañ ca Ānanda Vajjī samaggā sannipatissanti. . . . Yāvakīvañ ca Ananda Vajjī appaññattay na paññāpessanti, paññattay na samucchindissanti, yathāpaññatte porāṇe Vajjī-dhamme 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 Digha 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 Magadheśa ministers, Sunīdha and Vassakāra, of a fortified town in place of the village at Pātali (Vajjīnāg pātibāhāya). 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

Digha xvi. D. xvi. 1, 4—the last above-given quotation—ends thus: ‘Yāvakīvañ ca Ānanda Vajjinay arahantesu dhammikārakkhāvaraṇagutti susanvihitā bhavissati, kin ti anāgatā ca arahanto vijitāñ āgaccheyyuñ āgatā ca arahanto vijite phāsuy vihareyyuñ 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 Arahat, 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 sangaṇikārāmā bhavissanti . . . vuddhi yeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnay 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 Sabbakāmī 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 Sabbakāmī, 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 Sany. xlvi. 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 *khaṇḍaphullaj patisankharoma* 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: Sāy-

* 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. Kittāvatā nu kho bhante sangho bhinno hotīti. Idh' Īpāli bhikkhū adhammañ dhammo 'ti dīpenti, dhammañ adhammo 'ti dīpenti, avinayañ vinayo 'ti d., vinayam avinayo 'ti d., abhāsitāñ alapitāñ tathāgatena bhāsitāñ lapitāñ tathāgatenā 'ti d., bhāsitāñ lapitāñ t. abhāsitāñ alapitāñ t. 'ti d., anāciṇṇañ t. āciṇṇañ t. 'ti d., . . . apaññattāñ t. paññattāñ t. 'ti d., paññattāñ t. apaññattāñ t. 'ti d., anāpattiñ āpattīti d., āpattiñ anāpattīti dīpenti. . . . 3. Sanghasāmaggī sanghasāmaggīti bhante vuc-
cati. Kittāvatā nu kho bhante sangho samag-
go hotīti. Idh' Īpāli bhikkhū adhammañ ad-
hammo 'ti dīpenti dhammañ dhammo ti dī-
penti, 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 (paññattāñ) of the Buddha in this or that place, what is āpatti and anāpatti (xi. 7), as well as what the Buddha preached (bhāsitāñ, 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 paññattāñ. Again, before the laity, he emphasizes his adherence to Dhamma and Vinaya with the words (vii. 5, 3): 'Yo 'hañ adhammañ ad-
hammo 'ti vadāmi, dhammañ dhammo ti vadāmi, avinayañ avinayo 'ti vadāmi, vinayañ 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 . . .

jātarūparajatañ patikkhipi sikkhāpadañ ca
paññāpesi.'

On the other hand, the theses put forward by the Vajji-puttakas are adhamma, avinaya, apaññatta, called in xii. 2, 8, by the synonymous terms uddhamma ubbinaya, apagatasatthusāsana. When the Vajji-puttakas act in accordance with their theses, this is anāciññāñ Tathāgatena; the āciññakappa 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 (pañisārañiyakamma) 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 pañisārañiyakamma. This injunction is in C.V. i. 22.

C.V. xii. 1, 8: Atha kho satthimattā Pātheyyakā bhikkhū sabbe āraññakā sabbe piñdapātikā sabbe pañsukūlikā sabbe tecīvarikā, belongs partly to M.V. vii. 1, 1, : Tena kho pana samayena tiñsamattā Pātheyyakā bhikkhū sabbe āraññakā sabbe piñdapātikā sabbe pañsukūlikā sabbe tecīvarikā, partly to Sañy. xv. 13, 2: Atha kho tiñsamattā Paveyyakā (S. 1-3 Pātheyyakā) bhikkhū sabbe āraññakā 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 mayañ imay adhikaraññāñ idha vūpasameyyāma siyāpi mūlādāyakā bhikkhū punakammāya ukkoteyyūñ, 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.

Tasmiñ kho pana adhikaraṇe vinicchiya-māne anaggāni c'eva bhassāni jāyanti na c'ekassa bhāsitassa attho viññāyati.

Atha kho āyasmā Revato sanghajñāpesi: sunātu me bhante sangho, amhākajñimasmiñ adhikaraṇe vinicchiyamāne anaggāni c'eva bhassāni jāyanti na c'ekassa bhāsitassa attho viññāyati, yadi sanghassa pattakallajñ sangho cattāro Pācīnake bhikkhū cattāro PātHEYyake bhikkhū sammanneyya ubbāhikāya imajñ adhikaraṇajñ vūpasametuñ.

C.V. iv.

Tehi ce bhikkhave bhikkhūhi tasmiñ adhikaraṇe vinicchiyamāne anaggāni c'eva bhassāni jāyanti na c'ekassa bhāsitassa attho viññāyati.

Yācitvā vyatena bhikkhunā paṭibalena sangho nāpetabbo: sunātu me bhante sangho, amhākajñimasmiñ adhikaraṇe vinicchiyamāne anaggāni c'eva bhassāni jāyanti na c'ekassa bhāsitassa attho viññāyati, yadi sanghassa pattakallajñ sangho itthannāmañ ca itthannāmañ, ca bhikkhuñ sammanneyya ubbāhikāya imajñ adhikaraṇajñ vūpasametuñ.

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 dukkaṭajñ yañtvajñ bhagavato vassikasātikajñ akkamitvā sibbesi. 'This also, friend Ānanda, was ill done by thee, in that thou troddest 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 troddest 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 sibbenti*); 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 sibbetuṇ*); then on the treading upon this frame (with the garment stretched in it?). C.V. v. 11, 4: *Tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū adhotehi 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 Kosambi (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 brahmadaṇḍa, 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-
dha patto nikujjito
... atha kho Vaddho
Licchavi... 'ti tatth'
eva mucchito papato.
Atha kho....

XI. 15.

... etad avoca: San-
ghena te āvuso Channa
brahmadaṇḍo āñāpito
'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 brahmadaṇḍa, 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 vassan̄ vasi. . . . 2. Atha kho bhagavā āyasmantaj Ānandaj āmantesi: . . . icchat' āvuso bhagavā Dakkhiṇāgiriñ cārikaj pakkamituj; viii. 12, 1: Atha kho bhagavā Rājagahe yathābhīrantaj viharitvā yena Dakkhiṇāgiri tena cārikaj pakkāmi; Sany. xvi. 11, 4: Atha kho āyasmā Ānando Dakkhiṇāgirismiñ yathābhīrantaj cārikaj caritvā yena Rājagahañ Veluvanaj . . . 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 Dakkhiṇāgirismiñ yathābhīrantaj viharitvā punad eva Rājagahañ paccāgacchi. Atha kho āyasmā Ānando sambahulānaj bhikkhūnaj cīvarāni sañvidāhitvā yena bhagavā ten' upasankami. . . .

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 atirekācīvaraṇaṁ dhāretabbāṇaṁ.' 'Ye shall not, brethren, wear an extra suit of robes.' And in viii. 24, 3: Tena kho pana samayena aññatāro bhikkhu utukālaṇaṁ eko vasi. Tattha manussā sanghassa demā ti cīvaraṇi adaṇsu. Atha kho tassa bhikkhuno etad ahosi: bhagavatā paññattāṇaṁ catuvaggo pacchimo sangho ti, ahaṇ c'amhi ekako, ime ca manussā sanghassa demā ti cīvaraṇi adaṇsu . . . bhikkhū bhagavato etam atthāṇaṁ arocesuṇ. Anujānāmi bhikkhave sammukhībhūtena sanghena bhājetuṇ.

'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 sāmanakāŋ pari-kkhāraŋ upanāmenti . . . no ce Bhagavā paṭi-gaṇhāti āyasmato Ānandassa upanāmenti paṭi-gaṇhātu 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 (cīvara-paṭīggāhaka), as in C.V. vi. 21, 2, may have been a factor. We cannot overlook the remark by King Udena: 'Kathay hi nāma samaṇo Ānando tāva bahuŋ cīvaraŋ paṭīggahessati?'

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*, *bhummatttharaṇas*, and *pādapuñchanīs*, to that of Pāc. xiv. 2 (Vin. iv. 40); or that of *uttarattharaṇa's*, *bhummatttharaṇa's*, and *bhisicchavi's* to that of Niss. vi. 2 (Vin. iii. 212); and tā . . . *bhummatttharaṇaŋ karissāma* and tāni . . . *pādapuñchanīyo karissāma* cf. C.V. vi. 14: . . . 'tūlikāŋ vijaṭetvā bimbohanāŋ kātuŋ, avasesaŋ *bhummatttharaṇaŋ kātuŋ*.' '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: *colakaŋ uppānāŋ hoti*. 'Anujā-nāmi bhikkhave pādapuñchanīŋ kātuŋ.' 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. cikkhallaŋ 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 Kosambiyāŋ viharati Ghositārāme. Tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Channo āpattīŋ āpajjītvā . . .' 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: Ekaŋ samayaŋ bhagavā Kosambiyāŋ viharati Ghositārāme. Tena kho pana samayena rañño Udenassa uyyānagatassa antepurāŋ daddhaŋ hoti, pañca 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 jantāgharāŋ cikkhallaŋ hoti, dhovitabbāŋ':—'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, Brahmadatta.' 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 Jivaka's mango-grove.' 'In whose presence?' 'In the presence of Ajātasattu, the son of the Vedehī.' 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 *f.*), 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 Digha xvi. — of a conversation which he once had (*ekāñ samayañ*), 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 'ekāñ samayañ' 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 Upāli. In view, however, of the longevity of saintly personages, such as we meet with in C.V. xii. and repeatedly in the Dīpavajsa, 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.

* *Vinayapitaka*, 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., 'Vinayapiṭaka,' 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 Suttapitaka 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.

† Vinayapitaka i., p. xxxv.

‡ Cf. also Z.D.M.G., 52, p. 630 *f.*

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 Digha 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. 802 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 Pārajika 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. Pārajika 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 yāvadathāy bhuñjīsu yāvadatthañ supiñsu yāvadathāy nhāyīsu . . . methunāy dhammāy pāti-seviñsu. Te aparena samayena nātivyasanena pi phuṭṭhā . . . rogavyasanena pi phuṭṭhā āyasmantāy Ānandāy upasankamitvā evāy vadenti: na mayāy bhante Ānanda buddhagarahino na dhammagarahino, . . . attagarahino mayāy bhante Ānanda anaññagarahino. Mayāy ev' amhā alakkhikā mayāy appapuññā, ye mayāy evāy svākkhāte dhammadvinaye pabbajitvā māsakkhimhā yāvajīvāy paripuṇṇāy parisuddhāy brahmacariyāy caritūy.

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 (khuddānukhuddakehi sikkhāpadehi uddiṭṭhehi), in celebrating the Pātimokha, may also show literary dependence on D. xvi. 6, 8, 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 āpattiya adassane ukkhepaniyakammanākāsi asambhogā sanghena. so . . . tamhā āvāsā aññāñāvāsāñ agamāsi, tattha bhikkhū n'eva abhivādesuñ na paccutthesuñ . . . na mānesuñ na pūjesuñ.*

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 *f.* and D. xvi. 1, 19 *f.* and 2, 1 *f.* (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 Vinayapitaka,¶ and the rest of the Canon.** The 'less'

* In the Z.D.M.G. 52, pp. 613 *f.*, 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; Vinayapitaka 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 (= Digha xvi. 4, 22 *f.*).

¶ In Beal, *op. cit.*, 25 *f.*

** 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-pitaka was already existing and known. Whereas the non-existence of that Pitaka 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-pitaka 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, *Sabbakāmī*, is addressed by a specially reverential title, stated to be equal to *mahābhadanta sthavira*.†

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-pitaka 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 *Sthavira*, 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, *ff.* [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-

* Rockhill, p. 150 *f.*

ṭaka (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 *Dīpavāsa* 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 Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā Vesāliyañ dasa vatthūni dīpenti: kappati singilonakappo, kappati dvaṅgulakappo, kappati gāmantarakappo, kappati āvāsakappo, kappati anumatikappo, kappati āciṇnakappo, kappati amathitakappo, kappati jalogij pātuñ, kappati adasakaj nisidanañ, 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 vassa-sataparinibbute bhagavati Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū Vesāliyan dasa vatthūni dīpentī: kappati singilonakappo . . . jātarūparajatan 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 Mahāvajsa—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 Kathāvatthupakkaraṇa, 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 Sabbakāmī 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 *Sāsanavānsa*, and the 'Book History,' or *Gandhavānsa*, 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 *Pitakatthamain*.* 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 Suvaṇṇabhūmi—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 Môn 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 8 U 8 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 *foll.* 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 *Mahāvansā* and *Dīpavansā* 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 *Sāsanavansā*, 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 Sāsanavajsa, 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 Anorahtha 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 Anorahtha'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 *Samanas* (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 518 A.D., the Nâga 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 *Sâsanavajjâsa*, 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 coutumes du Cambodge').

even when the communities were dissolved, and the 'false Samaṇas'* 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 Pagan. 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

* *Samaṇakutṭakā*.

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 Pagān.* 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 Thatōn had been stored in a splendid pavilion,§ and placed at the disposal of the Sangha for study. Not content with his large spoils, the king sent to Ceylon for more copies of the Tipiṭaka, which Arahanta afterwards examined and compared with the Thatōn collection.|| So the ground was prepared for the harvest that soon followed.

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

† *Sāsanavajsa*, p. 64.

‡ *Ibid.*, p. 64.

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

|| *Sās.*, p. 64. The Siñhalese 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 Pagān, and in the year 1154 the monk Aggavajsa 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.

Aggavajsa was tutor to King Narapatishithu [1167-1204], a powerful and peaceable monarch whose reign was the most prosperous epoch in the history of the kingdom of Pagān.‡ According to the *Gandhavajsa*, Aggavajsa was of Jambudipa (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 Pagān, '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 Uttarājīva left Pagān 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-vajsa mentions that another learned monk of Pagān, Aggapandita, third of that name, was also called Aggavajsa. Aggapandita, who belongs to the thirteenth century, wrote the *Lokuppattipakāsanī* (see the *Piṭakatthamain*, pp. 60, 66).

‡ Forbes, 'Leg. Hist.' p. 24.

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

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

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

Uttarajīva was accompanied by his pupil, the novice Chapāṭa,† whose name was destined to eclipse, for a time at least, even that of Aggavajsa. 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 Chapāṭa, 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 Chapāṭa into Burma. The Sāsanavajsa, Gandhavajsa, and Sāsanavajasadīpa give Chapāṭa as the author, and say that he wrote at Arimaddana (Pagān).|| The Gandhavajsa adds that it was composed at the request of his pupil Dhammacāri.

The same with his other well-known work, the Sankhepavāṇṇanā. According to Forchhammer's sources,¶ Chapāṭa introduced the Sankhepavāṇṇanā from Ceylon, and transcribed it from the Siñhalese into the Burmese-Talaing alphabet, but the Sāsanavajsa, Sāsanavajasadīpa,

* 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., Fausböll'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 ; Gandhavajsa (ed. Minayeff), J.P.T.S., 1886, pp. 64, 74 ; Sāsanavajasadīpa, verses 1247-48 ; cf. Piṭakatthamain, p. 66.

¶ See Essay, p. 35.

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

His *Śimālankara*, or *Śimālankaratikā*, a treatise on boundaries and sites for religious ceremonies, is a commentary on a work by the Siñhalese thera Vācissara.†

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

The *Vinayagūlhathadīpanī*, again, is an explanation of difficult passages in the *Vinayapitaka*.

The *Nāmacāradīpanī*, on ethics, may be of Chapaṭa'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 Chapaṭa, the *Mātikatthadīpanī* and *Paṭṭhānaganānaya*, 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 Siñhalese, 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; Fausböll, Catalogue of the Mandalay MSS. at the India Office, *J.P.T.S.*, 1896. The Piṭakatthamain only says that *Sankhepavannanā* and *Śimālankāra* were written by Saddhammajotipāla of Pagān P.th., pp. 49, 50.

† *Gandhavaṇja*, p. 62; *Sāsanavaṇjesadīpa*, verses 12, 13.

‡ *Gandhavaṇja*, pp. 64, 74.

§ Forchhammer, Essay, p. 85. The Piṭakatthamain gives *Nāmacāradīpaka* (under the heading *Abhidhamma*) as Saddhammajotipāla's work (P.th., p. 45).

|| *Gandhisāra*, *Gandhavaṇja*, p. 74.

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

later.* In Chapāṭa's day, the school or sect he founded, which was known as the Sīhaṭasāṅgha of Burma, was probably absorbed by monastic questions. For Chapāṭa had returned to Pagan a missionary of Siñhalese 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 Chapāṭa'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 Siñhalese 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. 30

Pagân 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, Kyansitthâ,† a son of Anorahta, had made his name memorable by building the celebrated Ānanda temple and vihâra at Pagân. At this monastery Dhammasenâpati‡ wrote the Kârikâ—a grammatical work of far less importance than the Saddanîti, but interesting as preceding Aggavajsa's work by nearly a century—if, indeed, we can accept this early date, as the Piṭakatthamain does, which places the Kârikâ at A.D. 1064.

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

Dhammasenâpati composed two other works, the Etimâsamidîpanî (or Etimâsamidîpikâ) and the Mandhâra.§ Beyond the bare mention of the titles and of the fact that the author wrote the Kârikâ at the request of the monk Nânagambhîra and the two others on his own

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

† Kyansitthâ's religious foundations are dated A.D. 1059 (*B.E.F.E.O.*, tome iii., p. 676). His Pali name is Chattaguhinda (Sâs., p. 75; Forbes' 'Leg. Hist.', p. 23; Phayre's 'History of Burma,' pp. 39, 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).

‡ Dhammasenâpati is called an ācariya in Gandhavajsa (pp. 63, 73), but in Forchhammer's List the author of Kârikâ and Kârikâ Tikâ is put down as a Burmese nobleman of Pagan bearing the honorary title of Dhammasenâpati. 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 Gandhavajsa is my only authority here.

initiative, the *Gandhavaṇsa* leaves us without information. *Ñāṇagambhīra*, of *Pagān*, appears in the *Piṭakatthamain* as the author of the *Tathāgatuppatti*.

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 *Aggavaṇsa*. *Saddhammasiri*'s grammar is based partly on *Kaccāyana* and partly on Sanskrit authorities. The *Sāsanavaṇsa* 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 *Sāsanavaṇsa* 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 Brīhajam 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 Thatón, '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 tīkā on the Nyāsa was written by the author himself,‡ to whom a tīkā on the Abhidhammatthasāṅgaha 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 Sāsanavāyasa 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 Sāsanavāyasa 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 rajjuggāhā-macca. The Burmese title under which his work is sometimes met is Thanbyin.¶

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

* Sās., p. 75.

† Mentioned Sās., p. 75. Vimalabuddhi is Siñhalese 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 Tīkā 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 Tīkā was written 'ekena amaccena sad-dattha 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, Pinya, 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 *Gandhavajsa* mentions a grammar, *Lingatthavivaraṇa* by Subhūtacandana, who was followed by Nāṇasāgara with *Lingatthavivaraṇapakāsaka** and Uttama with *Lingatthavivaraṇatikā*. These three doctors were all of Pagān.† A *Lingatthavivaraṇaviniechaya*‡ 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 *Lingatthavivaraṇatikā*, 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 *Sāsanavajsa*),¶ 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 *Mahātikā*†† by the thera Abhaya, of Pagān. Abhaya's name

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

† G.V., p. 67. The *Piṭakatthamain*, p. 72, ascribes *Lingatthavivaraṇa* and *Tikā* 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 *tikās* on *Vaccavācaka*. They are entitled *Vaccavācavāṇṇanā*, *Vaccavācakatikā*, and *Vaccavācakadīpanī*. 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 *Tikā* 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 *Saddatthabhedacintādīpanī* (Fausböll, Cat. Mand. MSS., p. 50).

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

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

Unfortunately, the *Sāsanavajsa* and *Gandhavajsa*, 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 Sangha, or rather Sanghas.

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 Chapāṭa died, his school—the *Sīhalasangha*—split into four factions, each following one of the four theras who had come with Chapāṭa from Ceylon.

The dissensions (for they can hardly be called schisms in the usual sense of the word) that arose within the *Sīhalasangha*, once stronger and more united than the other sects in Pagān, were not, it seems, caused by questions of dogma. At all events, the *Sāsanavajsa* 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 *ṭīkā* 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 Sāsanavajsa, was 'Mallarudīpa.' The MS. corrects to Malayadīpa. The episode is interesting. The reading Malaya 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) Ṭīkās 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 Sīhaṭasaṅgha 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 Pagan. 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, *Vacīviññatti*. 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). Pagan 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 Disāpāmokkha, 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 Gandhavajsa,§ which states that Sāgara wrote a tīkā 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 Pagān, 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

Sāsanavaṇja, reproduced by Minayeff in the 'Recherches' (Sās., p. 78; 'Recherches,' p. 69), describes how busy mothers of families in Arimaddana (Pagān) 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 Līnathavisoḍhanī was written by Nāṇavilāsa of Pagān (Nevill). The tīkā on Saddabindu, called Saddabinduvinicchaya, in the India Office, is by Sirisaddhammakkittimahāphussadeva (*vide* Fausböll, Cat. Mand. MSS., p. 50). A tīkā on Paramatthabindu was written at Pagān by the thera Mahākassapa (Piṭakatthamain, p. 51).

† Sās., p. 77 (see Preface to Subhūti's edition of the Abhidhānapadāpikā, 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, Pāgan, 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 Maingala, 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 Tīkā, 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 Tīkā (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 Rājavajsa, 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 (PAGĀN).*—Forchhammer (E.), Archæological Reports. Pagān.
9. *G.V.*—Gandhavajsa. 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.*—Sāsanavajsa. Ed. Bode. 1897.
16. *S.V.D.*—'Sāsanavajṣadipo; 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 Pitaka 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 *Añguttara-Nikāya*, III., p. 348⁴ and V., p. 138⁶; *abbeti* (p. 64); cf. *Jāt.* III., p. 84, 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 *Mahāvāmsa*, 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, muṭṭāla S. mṛṇāla, nangala S. lāngala, nangula S. lāngula, nalāṭa S. lalāṭa, veṭu S. veṇu (proceeding from the oblique cases), pilandhati 'to ornament,' from pilandha¹ 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. nishanṇā, piṭṭhi S. pṛshṭha,² etc.

Mil. 1¹¹. Taṇiyathā '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. rāmaṇīyaka, seems always to be used as a substantive; comp. Abhijānāsi no (i.e., nu) tvāṁ rājañña divāseyyam upagato supinakam passitā, ārāmarāmaṇeyyakam vanarāmaṇeyyakam bhūmirāmaṇeyyakam pokkharaṇirāmaṇeyyakam (DN. 24); iccheyyasi 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 taṁ bhikkhūnaṁ 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 n-i), Jāt. 307, v. 4 (vol. iii., p. 27).

tvam [56] mārisa Moggallāna Vejayantassa pāsādassa rāmaṇeyyakām daṭṭhum (MN. 37, vol. i., p. 253¹⁾). At Dh. v. 98 bhumiṁrāmaṇeyyakām is a compound with m̄ 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 gjjha S. grdhra, ekacca⁴ S. ekatara (after contraction into *ekatra).

Mil. 2¹. Dānagga is no doubt a contraction of dānāgāra, 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 uposathāgāra). The like contraction occurs in ekacca, referred to in the preceding note. Also in pitucchā, mātucchā, S. pitṛshvasar, mātṛshvasar: sasār, which is otherwise unused in Pali, being contracted to -ssār, will, according to a well-known Sanskrit rule, form -tsār, which in

³ Exactly as at v. 153 sandhāvissam with a double for a single s, to prevent the verse from ending in three iambi. 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 mahacarājānubhāvena, 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 mātyā, petyā, S. mātrā, pitrā, Jāt. 527, vv. 3, 5 (vol. v., p. 214); 538, v. 29 (vol. vi., p. 16). At Khudakap. 9, v. 1=Sn. 8, v. 1 (v. 143), I consider abhisamecca the instrumental of -tar 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. Jñū 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 'Kodumbararat̄the uppānnāni (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-idām, 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 - Tissathero 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 sutām, 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. *simbali*, 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 *sāṅkhyā*, *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* *atthangiko 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, Belaṭṭha- and Belaṭṭhiputto are written indifferently wherever they occur. The latter, however, is said by Buddhaghosa to mean Belaṭṭhassautto. But on the whole metronymics alternate with corresponding patronymics 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 versa*.⁶ Sometimes the cause [59] is evidently dissimilation, as in kipillika, -laka, S. pipīlikā (in Spiegel's Kammav. incorrectly written kimirṇaka); 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 ḡvan; 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 = lubdhā 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 mettām cittām bhaveyya SN. XIX. 4 (vol. ii., p. 264²³); AN. IX. ii.9 (vol. iv., p. 395). Nābhijānāmi sābādham uppānapubbañ 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; kaṭopi (kalopi, also kha-) is possibly identical with karoṭi.¹⁰ The influence of a following labial consonant¹¹

kiñci apuññām āpajjeyya antamaso gaddūhanamattam-pi Mil., p. 110. The traditional explanation is very different and most absurd: Gaddūhanamattam-piti gāvīm thane gahetvā ekakhirabindudūhanakālamattam-pi (Ps.). Gandhūhanamattam-piti gandhavahanamattam dvīh angulihī gandhapiṇḍam gahetvā upasinghanamattam; apare gaddūhanamattanti pālim vatvā: gāviyā ekavāram thanam añjanamattanti 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. m h and m b h 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 -rumbhati 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 b h.

¹⁰ Ālupa for āluka, Jāt. 446, v. 1. (vol. iv., p. 46). It is possible on this analogy to identify sippi with çukti, 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, daṭhadhammo (dhanuggaho) 'having a strong bow,' from dhanvan. So Buddhaghosa, no doubt correctly.

is evident in bā- for dvā- (bārasa, bāvīsati, bat-timśa), ubbham in certain cases for uddham (ubbha-tthako 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); ubbham 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 -ssukkati), 'to ascend' (ādicco nabham abbhussakkamāno, DN., MN., S.N., AN., mostly written -sukk-); nissakkati, 'to go out' (whence nissakkavacanam, Buddhaghosa's appellation for the ablative¹²); parisak. kati, 'to plan for' (parisappanti, Dh., v. 342, 343, in a different sense); pasakkiya = prasṛpya.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 kārakam says to the contrary I believe to be an error—except in so far as Vanaratana, the author of Payogasiddhi, winds up his Kārakāṇḍo with the following memorial stanza, which Alwis, Cat. I., p. 68, quotes from Suttaniddesa: Paccattam-upayogañ-ca karānam sampadāniyam | nissakkasāmivacanam bhummam-ālapan' aṭṭhamam.

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

Mil. 6³. *Acchati* is in comments explained by *nisidati* 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=20¹⁶)=Jāt. 450, v. 7 (vol. iv., p. 65²¹): *Appasm' eke pavecchanti, bahunā eke na dicchare* (=dadanti, Jāt. Com.). In the same Jāt. v. 1: *Apacanto* (not cooking) *pi dicchanti santo laddhāna bhojanain*, 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 *adṛkshata*, but it is possibly a mistake, owing its origin to a confusion with the former word. 'Pavecchati,' 'to give,' is traditionally explained by *paveseti* (as if caus.) 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 *aruhat*. 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*, *dakkhemā*, -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 sakuno*, synonymous with *disākāko*, which was rightly explained by Minayeff, Mél. As. VI., p. 597), and *dakkhāpita*, Mil., p. 119³. *Pahamisitvā*, Five Jāt., p. 2, if it meant 'striking,' might be referred to a possible aor. **pahamisi=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. 450-8.

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

Mil. 6¹⁹. The particle pātu, in pātubhavati, pātukaroti, from S. prādūr, 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 l = d 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; pithīyati¹⁷ 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 dhamma, aggni.

¹⁶ I shall add some more: chakala S. chagala; akalu for agalu; paloka from palujjati (RUJ); ^oupaka for ^oupaga in kulūpaka, 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); upatheyya (DHĀ), 'a cushion,' ib. 547, vv. 34, 237 (vol. vi., pp. 490¹³, 515²³); lāpa, S. lāba; lāpu, alāpu for -bu; pajāpati, 'wife,' from prajāvatī (perhaps also nelapatī, puttapatī for -vatī); pettāpiya, AN. VI., v. 2 (vol. iii., p. 348⁴); X. viii. 5 (vol. v., p. 138⁶), from pitṛvya; tippa for tibba in a certain formula of frequent use, especially in MN. Chakanā is S. chagāna, but as it derives from çakṛt, çakan, like yakana from yakṛt, yakan, the Pali form is the older of the two. Upa-cikā is connected, through ^oupatikā, 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 Pithiyati 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 adjective 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, apāpurāṇa or avāpurāṇa, 'a key,' and the well-known pāpurāṇa (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 pīthīyati may be suspected of being a Singhalese blunder for pīdhiyati, 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, pīthīyatī 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., huveyya (*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 apāpurāṇa 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*, *pārupati*¹⁹ (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*; *pidahati*, *pithiyati*, and *pidhāna*; *ludra*, *rudda*, *ludda* (Fausböll and Childers failed in explaining this word), and *rūla* (Mil., p. 275); *tikiucchā*, *vicikiucchā*; *byāpāra*, *byāvāta* (whence *veyyāvacca*; from PAR, as Böhtlingk suspected); *pāruta*, *vivāta*, *sāmvuta*; *apāpurati*, *ovaraka* (S. *apavaraka*; at Jāt I., p. 391, read *jātovarake*); *niyāteti*, *-deti*; *pājeti*, *pāceti* (AJ); *gilāna*, *akilāsu* (GLĀ); *āḍha*, *āḍhiya* (S. *āḍhya*); and a great many more. Secondly, the regular Pali conjugation of VAR is *varati*, see *āvarati*, *vivarati*, *sāmvarati*. Forms corresponding to S. *vṛṇoti*, *vṛṇāti* are rare (*vaṇimhase*, Jāt. II., p. 137; *apāpuṇanti* *amatassa dvāram*, It. 84, v. 2 (p. 80⁶); *vaṇomī*, Jāt. 513, v. 14 (vol. v., p. 27²⁵), if I conjecture rightly, the MSS. have *apāmuṇanti* and, against metre, *vaṇṇemī*), and partly questionable. *Sāmvuṇoti* is known only from grammarians, and so is *āvuṇoti*, *-ati*, 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 kibbisakārakām abbenti nimbasūlasmīm*, Jāt. 311, v. 3 (vol. iii., p. 34); *ekām sūlasmīm abbetha*, *ib.* 538, v. 37 (vol. vi., p. 17).

²⁰ *Mutinga*, or *mudinga*, from *mṛḍ-aṅga*; by false analogy, it seems, *-taggha* from *-daghna*. The latter part of *bhinkāra* for *bhingāra*, *vākarā* (the Burmese write *vākurā*) for *vāgurā*, 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. *Uṇunka* 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 *sāmyañc*, 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 *anavajja* being actually the reverse of *vajja*, *anāññāta*, 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: *kusīta*, *Pokkhara-sāti* or -sādi, the locatives *sāmīti*, Jāt. 429, v. 5=430, v. 5 (vol. iii., pp. 493-95), and the frequent *parisati-m* (whence the synonymous *sabhati-m* from *sabhā*, mentioned by grammarians); perhaps this irregularity may somehow be connected with the fact that *sāteti* (also *sāteti*, *sādeti*; *paññasaṭa* = *parṇaçada*), S. *çātayati*, is the actual causative of ÇAD. *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 *su vāna*, etc. (see above, p. [59];) for initials seem to be exempt from this sort of change, except under peculiar circumstances. *Tu vā in tu vā in* or *t vā in t vā in*, 'quarrel,' is undoubtedly S. *dvan-dva*; but it was made to look like the doubled pronoun *t vā in*, and Buddhaghosa accordingly mistook it to mean 'theeing and thouing.' 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 *dāḍhi* (in *kāyadāḍhibahula*, a word much used by scholiasts, but not found in the Nikāyas), S. *dāṛḍhya*, means 'sloth, inertness.' In the Sanskrit, or rather Prakrit, *dandha*, 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. 8²⁰. 'Aticchathā bhante' is the phrase by which a mendicant priest is refused alms in a civil way (comp. Dh., pp. 241, 242). A tīkā explains it thus: *Atikkamitvā icchathā, 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 *Ketubha* 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' (*ketubhan-ti kiriyākappavikappo, kavīnam upakārāya sattham*). The *Akkharappabhedā*, according to the same authority, means *Çikshā* and *Nirukti* (*saha-akkharappabhedenā 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, tukkhādīnām vevacanappakāsakām 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 *upajjhām* for *-āam*, *-āyām*; *ettam* for *-aaṁ*, *-akaṁ* (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 paripūrakāri*; *avayo na hotīti vuttam*

Mil. 11⁴. Pāpakaṇam malānam pabbajetum seems to be inadmissible; it is probably an error for pāpakaṇi malāni.

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

Mil. 11²⁹. Onītapattapāṇi is thus explained in Payogaśiddhi: Onito pattato pāṇi yena, so onītapattpāṇi. 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 peyyālam, 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 santiānetum na sakkoti. Lokāyata in is explained by vitāṇḍavādasatthām.

²⁴ Buddhaghosa says: Onītapattapāṇi-anti pattato onītapattpāṇi, apanītahatthanti vuttam hoti. He mentions another reading, which is not in our MSS. : onītapattpāṇi, 'having washed his bowl and his hands,' from NIJ. The best Singh. MSS. write the word with n, not η, 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 gh a; the latter I am unable to account for, unless it be a contraction of la-pa—to which Burmese gh a bears some likeness—instead of p a.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 -tayya, -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 'bhuttāvīm onītapattpāṇīm . . . ekamantam nisidi' is very frequent in the suttas, and no [67] absolute is ever added, like disvā in M, or viditvā farther down in all our MSS. Scholiasts supply nātvā or upagantvā. Some such verb, it is true, must be understood, unless we are to consider 'bhuttāvīm onītapattpāṇīm' 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, Alajjītāye lajjanti, lajjītāye 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: Et ad-attani sambhūtam brahmāyānam anuttaram niyanti dhirā lokamhā aññadatthum (only, exclusively) jayā jayaṁ, SN. XLIV., 4, v. 4 (vol. v., p. 6). Yathā pi camarī, vālam kismiñca (or -ci) paṭilaggitaṁ, upeti maranam tathā, na vikopeti vāladhim, Bv., v. 202 (II., v. 124)=Jāt. I., p. 20. Evam-pi mām tvam khali-tam, sapañña, pahinamantassa punappasida, Jāt. 474, v. 10 (vol. iv., p. 206). Tā, chandarāgam purisesu uggataṁ, hiriyaṁ nivārenti sacittam-attano, ib., 535, v. 92 (vol. v., p. 410¹⁵). The comment in these two cases supplies 'viditvā.' Santam yeva kho pana param lokam: na-tthi paro loko ti 'ssa diṭṭhi hoti . . . ti sankappeti, . . . ti vācam bhāsati, . . . ti āha; . . . santam yeva kho pana kiriyaṁ: na-tthi kiriyaṁ ti 'ssa diṭṭhi hoti, . . . ti āha, MN. 60 (vol. i., p. 402). Evaṁmānī assa, atathām samānam, MN. 105 (vol. ii., p. 256). Ps. makes no remark on the subject. Yo bhikkave evam vadeyya: Yathā yathā 'yam puriso kammam karoti tathā tathā nam paṭisamvediyatiti, evam santam bhikkhave brahmacariyavāso na hoti, okāso na paññāyati sammā dukkhassa antakiriyāya; yo ca kho bhikkhave evam vadeyya: Yathā yathā vedaniyam ayam puriso kammam karoti tathā tathā 'ssa vipākam paṭisamvediyatiti, evam santam bhikkhave brahmacariyavāso hoti, okāso paññāyati s. d. antakiriyāya, AN. III., x., 9 (vol. i., p. 249); evam santanti evam sante, Mp. In more recent Pali I do not consider this use of the accusative admissible. Hence in Mil., at p. 148, for hatthagatam janapadaṁ 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 anussavasacco, so anussavena itihītihaparamparāya piṭakasampadāya dhammaṁ deseti; anussavikassa kho pana Sandaka satthuno anussavasaccassa 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 -a in and -c 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-vatte tvā, -tvā being not unfrequently omitted or added at random. Nite 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 evaṁ sampada, syn. with īdisa; 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 brāhmaṇānam porāṇām mantapadām itihītihaparamparāya piṭakasampadāya (āgataṁ should be added, I suppose; ib. 95, vol. ii., p. 169). Working people are represented as accoutred with kuddāla-piṭakam,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] Pāli,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: samāṇo 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 vaggapanṇāsakāya piṭakabandhanasampattiyā (Ps.); mā piṭakasampadānenāti amhākām 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 jana-kāyo āgaccheyya kuddālapiṭakam ādāya: mayām imām Gangānadīm pacchāninnām karissāma pacchāpoṇām pacchāpabbhāran-ti, SN. XXXIV., 242 (vol. iv., p. 191), etc. Comp. Jāt. I., p. 336²⁹.

³² The word pāli, 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. paṭipāti 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 Mohammanan terms, it is first the 'isnād,' next the hadīth' resting on its authority.³³ Tanti, used as a synonym for pāli, originally means 'string, chord.' As a third synonym I consider the much-discussed 'sutta'; literally the 'thread' of tradition.³⁴ In the like manner pavenī, 'race, lineage, the traditional law for secular matters,' lit. signifies 'a long (pa-) braid.' Vāmsa, '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. Atimadhura(m) Buddhavacanā(m) mā nassatu, tantim dhāressāmi, vāmsam ṭhapessāmi, pavenī(m) pālessāmi (Ps. 22). A tīkā says, Pavenīti dharmasan-tati, dharmassa avicchedena pavattīti 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. 21³⁷. *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. 22³⁷. *Katheti* is probably a passive form for *kathīyati*; a rare contraction certainly, of which no other undoubted instance is known to me except *paṭisamvēdeti*, used indifferently with *-diyati*. I take it, like the synonymous *akkhāyati* in the frequent phrase *aggam-akkhāyati*, in the sense of 'appearing, proving to be,' or simply 'being.'

Mil. 22³⁸. *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 *santuṭṭhitā*; very often to those in *-ya*, as *kāruṇṇatā*, *kamyatā*, *sahavyatā*, *pāṭikulyatā*, *pāguṇṇatā*, *dovacassatā*, etc., or in *-ana*, especially in later writings, as *anivattanatā*, *ano-sakkatā* (*tānatā*, Dh., v. 288), etc. Transcribers frequently corrupt these forms, comp. Dh., p. 383, l. 16 [read *patthanatāya*], 18; Mil., p. 132, etc.) Also *-na* is superadded, as *jārattana*, *purisattana*, etc.

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

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 Transgangangetic, 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, 'Dāmsassa 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^o 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: upagañchimsu, SN. XLI., 18 (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). Gacchimsu, 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: gacchimsu is to gañchi as -mhi to -smim, or -im su (= -am su = S. -an + su) to -isum.

the aorist by means of the suffix *ñchañ*, 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, gañchati or gañchiti, which is far from unfrequent, though grammarians, as far as I know, have left it unnoticed. Compare the following examples: Ehi tvām rājakumāra, samanassa Gotamassa vādām āropehi; evam te kalyāṇo kittisaddo abbhug-gañchiti:¹ Abhayena rājakumārena samanassa 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 papatām cirarattām (Sn. 36, v. 9 (v. 665); the metre is Dodhaka). Evañ-ce mām viharantām 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. adāñkshīt, is found, I believe, at Jāt. 444, v. 3 (vol. iv., p. 32; written 'aðanthi' in the Cop. MS.); ib. 490, v. 5 (vol. iv., p. 330, 'añdachi'); Cp., v. 338 ('atamisi' in the London Phayre MS. ['adāmisi' 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 abbhuggañchati.

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

Mātue-ca³ me rodantyā jetṭhassa ca bhātuno akāmassa hatthe pi te gahessām, na hi gañchisi no akāmānam (Jāt. 525, v. 19; vol. v., p. 183). Mettam cittām bhāvetha appamāṇām divā ca ratto ca, atha gañchitha devapurām, āvāsam puññakammānam (*ib.*, v. 51 (p. 191); written 'gañchittha' against the metre, thoughtless scribes mistaking it for an aorist). Sā jja lohitasañchannā gañchisi Yamasādhanām (*ib.*, 531, v. 47 (vol. v., p. 304); the metre recommends gañchisi). Pūjitā nātisanghehi na gacchisi (*sic*) Yamakkhayām (*ib.*, v. 49). Ekarattim vasitvāna pāto gacchasi (read gañchasi or gañchisi) brāhmaṇa, nānāpupphēhi 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 purāṇa-*ca* vedanām paṭihankhāmi navañ-*ca* vedanām na uppādēssāmi'), hañchati Jāt. 457, v. 6 (vol. iv., p. 102), hañchema, Jāt. II., p. 418 (an optative of the future; the form was noticed by Moggallāna and Vanaratana), and, I believe,

³ The metre requires mātu ca, which is most uncommon in Piṭaka texts; for even in prose I have otherwise found mātue-ca, pitue-ca, bhātue-ca, in exclusive use. Comp. kaccic-ca, Jāt. 547, v. 738 (the reading C^k not referred to, vol. vi., p. 585¹⁶); muni-*ca*, MN. 91, v. 2 (vol. ii., p. 144); perhaps maccue-*ca*, Dh., vv. 185, 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. 589, vv. 184, 187 (vol. vi., pp. 59-60).

āhañchām.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 socchām from CRU.

Mil. 1⁴. Thānātāhāna. 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 thānātāhāna, unless we write it with the Burmese thānātāhāna. 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 gāmām, dumā dumām. 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 angapac-canga, buddhānubuddha, mañcātimañca, etc.; but the compounds in question can scarcely contain the prep. ā. Nor can they be considered to be analogous to calācala, keçākeçī, etc.

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

[75] Mil. 1¹¹. Tam�athā. 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 āhañcam, āhaññā (Burm.), agajūm; Alwis (Buddh. Nirv., p. 133) quotes āhañcūm; Oldenberg gives āhañci, āhañhi, ahañhi, ahañhi. From these elements I construed a new reading, āhañchām, and I think it is confirmed by Buddhaghosa, who explains the word in question by paharissāmi, and no doubt had that reading before him 'Āgacchām (sic) amatadundubhin-ti dhammacakkapatiñlabhāya amatabherim paharissāmīti 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 bhāmte bhagavatā budhena bhāsite save se subbhāsite vā,' = 'yām kiñci . . . bhāsitam sabbam tam subbhāsitam yeva.' Secondly, in a *Māgadhi*zing passage of MN. 105 (vol. ii., p. 254²⁵), it is said, 'Āñāñjādhimuttassa purisapuggalassa ye (= yām) lokāmisasaññojane (= -nam) se vante (= tam vantañm),' 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. *Sārāñiya* is the spelling of the Singh. Nikāya MSS., with scarcely an exception. It is formed with double *Vriddhi*, like *sāmāyika*, *pettāpiya* (or *pettāviya*, from *pitṛvya*; see p. [62]), *poroseyya* (MN. 54 (vol. i., p. 366¹), explained by *purisānucchavika*), *āvenika* (not -ñ-, 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: *Koñdañña* (S. *Kauñdinya*), *sākhalya* (*sakhila*), *kolañña* (*kulina*), *kosajja* (*kusīta*), *āñāñja* ('immovableness,' from **aniñja*), *porohacca* (or *-hicca*), *bāhusacca* (*bahussuta*; doubling induced by composition is dropped in case of *Vriddhi*, 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*), *khipita*, '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, pa-ṭhavī, pokkharanī, gharanī, dhajanī (or -inī), kāhasi kāhati, karahaci, timingala (or -gila), perhaps icchasaṁ,² etc., and so is occasionally a [76] single i: koṭṭhaka (Five Jāt., p. 36), ñātaka, upapaj-jare and similar forms from the Vedic termination of -ire. The vowel a likewise influences u: pana, āyasmant, kappara (S. kürpara), kahāṁ (S. kuha), tavāṁ for tuvāṁ, bāhā for bāhu, Sutanā (Jāt. 501; vol. iv., p. 413¹³), perhaps for -tanu, sakkhali (S. çashkuļī), accharā and accharikā of the same origin with S. āchurita (Dasaratha-Jāt., p. 22). Oftener, however, u assimilates a and i: uļunka, kurunga, kunkuṭṭha (Burmese kan-, S. kankushtha), puthujana (partly confounded with puthu), anutthunaṁ, Dh., v. 156, and elsewhere, usūyā;¹ ucchu, usu, susu, kukku, etc. The transformations of the vowel r̥ are partly to be accounted for in the same manner, as gaha, gihin, anana (inā), 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 nandissaṁ (aor.) yesañ-ca bhavam-icchasaṁ, SN. VII., 14, vv. 1, 6 (vol. i, p. 176). The commentary on Dh., v. 324, quotes this stanza with the reading icchisaṁ, and an imitation of it has, Yena jātena nandissaṁ yassa ca bhavam-icchisaṁ, Jāt. 432, v. 9 (vol. iii., p. 513). Icchisaṁ, if correct, may, however, have been formed by adding, -saṁ to the A-terminations, like pamādassaṁ, MN. 180 (vol. iii., p. 179); AN. III., iv. 6 (vol. i, p. 139¹).

¹ In an asūyaka the preceding a sometimes preserves the primitive sound, and at Five Jāt., p. 18=Jāt. II., p. 192, this is likely to be the right reading. Payogasiddhi quotes 'kā asūyā avijānatāṁ, 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 *nuṭṭh-*, 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: *seleti* (Sn. 37, v. 4 (v. 682), etc.) from *ÇĀD*, *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 *īreti* (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. 5²⁰. *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: 'Dosiṇā ti dosāpagatā, abbha-mahika-dhūma-rajo-rāhūti imehi upakkilesehi virahitā ti attho.'

Mil. 7⁹. I ought, no doubt, to have written *uparūparūpapattiko*; the Singhalese are extremely apt to substitute *upappajjati*, *uppatti* for *upapajjati*, *upapatti*.

Mil. 7²⁰. *Pagganhitvā 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 . . . taccentānam parivattetvā deti* (turned the logs for them), *Ten Jāt.*, p. 25. *Dārūni āharitvā aggiṁ katvā dassati*, *Five Jāt.*

² At Dh., v. 184, 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. *Pettikam me rajjam gāṇhitvā dehi*, Dh., p. 157; Ten Jāt., p. 29; Five Jāt., p. 3. *Civaram no katvā detha*, Jāt. I., p. 220. *Pallankam attharitvā adāsi*, *ib.* I., p. 129. *Gitassa attham kathetvā detha*, Jāt. 415 (vol. iii., p. 410⁸), etc., etc. I also think that *gāṇhāti* 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: *Nālikodanaparamam bhuñjāmi tadūpiyañ-ca sūpeyyam*, SN. XXI., 96 (vol. iii., p. 146²⁸). *Pañcamattāni tāṇḍulavāhasatāni pañḍumutikassa* (or -tī-) *sālino tadūpiyañ-ca sūpeyyam*, MN. 81 (vol. ii., p. 54). In Ps. it is explained 'tadanurūpa-telaphāṇitādīni' (comp. Minayeff's Pātim., p. 81). In a tīkā I have found 'Bhandāgāriko alankārabhāṇḍam patisāmetvā pasādkanakāle tadūpiyam alankārabhāṇḍam rañño upanāmetvā tam 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*: *Rukkhamūlagahanaṁ pasakkiya* (see p. [60]) *nibbānam hadayasmīm opiya jhāya* *Gotama mā ca pamādo*, *kin-te bilibilikā karis-sati*, SN. IX., 5, v. 1 (vol. i., p. 199) = Th., v. 119. *Na tesam kōṭhe openti*, *na kumbhī* (= *kumbhyā*, loc.), *na kaṭopiyā*, 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-VIÇ*; it occurs in comments in phrases like 'pat-tam̄ dhowitvā vodakam̄ (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*: *pātihīra* = -*hera* = -*hāriya*, *parihīrati* (Sn. 11, v. 13, v. 205) for *-*herati*, -*haryati* (hence *sām-hīrati*, the passive of *sāmharati* or *sangharati*), *abhijihana* (Jāt. 546, v. 49; vol. vi., p. 373¹⁶ = *viriya-karaṇa*) from JEH¹; *abhirūhati*, *virūhati* (whence the syn. *rūhati*; comp. *ārohati*,² *orohati*), *visūka* from *viçoka* (Childers' Dict.), *mittadūbhīn* from -*drohin*, *sītūdaka*, *nirūdaka* from -*odaka* (for in

¹ VEN, VEN appears in the shape of *apavīñati*, MN. 48 (vol. i., p. 324); Jāt. 533, v. 1 (vol. v., p. 339); *pavīnati*, 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 *ī*: *anuhiramāna*, DN. 14 (vol. ii., p. 15), MN. 123 (vol. iii., p. 123), for **-hera-*, *-hariya-*; *dvihi*, *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]); *ahesum* (comp. *ahosi*), *antepura* for *antopura*, *pure* for **puro*, *suve* (*sve*) for **svo*, *duve* (*dve*), **duvehi*, **duvesu* (assimilated to *-i-*) 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 *Ukkusa*, 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 *ech*, 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*, *yobbañña*). From *dussila* derives *dussilya*, but *pātikulyatā* 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*, *abbhi-bhāsi*, *Jāt. 524*, v. 21 (vol. v., p. 169), *pattiya* S. *pratyaya*, whence *pattiyāyati*, 'to believe,' *Jāt. I.*, p. 426¹⁰, etc.; comp. *pattiyāmi*, 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 *ai* with *i* for *ya*, the latter through *au*, with the second vowel labialized and *v* elided.

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

[80] Mil. 10¹⁸. *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. *Anuyogaṁ 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. *Urattāliṁ*, which is of frequent use in the suttas in the above phrase, is S. *uras-tāḍam*, with *-iṁ* for *-aṁ*, like *uttariṁ*, *saddhiṁ*, *kuhiṁ* (for *kuhaṁ*, S. *kuha*). Absolutives in *-aṁ* are not much in use, and there is, perhaps, no second example of *-iṁ*. Forms in *-akam*, on the contrary, are frequent, as *paripphosakam* (PRUSH), *samarivattakam*, *ālumpakārakam*, *sannidhikārakam*, *dantullehakam*, *pheṇuddehakam*, *udarāvadehakam*, 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 kapte yam Vipassi bhagavā loke udapādi*, DN. 14 (vol. ii., p. 2), (comp. in the same sutta *ito so ekatimso kappo*); *sukhe dukkhe*, DN. 2 (vol. i., p. 56²⁴); MN. 76 (vol. i., p. 517²⁵); SN. XXIII., 8 (vol. iii., p. 211¹¹), for *sukho dukkho* (*i.e.*, *sukham dukkham*), 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*, *tañhā*, *pubbanho*, *amhe*. We may reasonably conclude that *nh* is also the correct spelling of *cinha*, *junhā*, *majjhānha*, 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 *ñ* (comp. *tāñā*, *pāñā*, *tīñi*, etc., with *ghāñā*, *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 *tañhā*, *gañhāti*, 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 *majjhānha* 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-rāñam ta-tha-ñalā—ta-tha-na-rāñam ta-tha-ñalā honti yathākkamam: dukkatañam dukkatañam, evam sukatañam sukañam, pahaño uddhaño visaño; atthakathā; pañidhāñam pañipāto pañāmo pañitam parināto parināmo sunnayo (meaning, I suppose, *duññayo*) onato; paripañño palipanño (sic) evam palibodho pallankam taluñomahāsālo māluto sukhumālo. It is obvious that with 'paripañño palipanño' 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.; *palipalipalipanno* 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. prāçu.

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

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 samyoga. Napparūpa is no proof to the contrary,¹ for lacchasi napparūpam, Ten Jāt., p. 115, is, I dare say, a mere erratum for lacchasi 'napparūpam, as the scholiast explains it. Natthi, if written n' athi, 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 līnam cittam. 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 aham, and I consider it preferable to write 'ham; as tāva 'ham, eva 'ham (Mil., p. 219), tattha 'ham, and especially nāma 'ham (and nāma 'yam). But also nāmāham (and nāmāyam), etc., are found, and altogether the reading is not always, if ever, indubitable. Besides the Prakrit ham, there is other evidence that the initial of aham 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-a-antakāni, antavirahitāni vatthakhaṇḍādīm'; 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 lakṣtaka, 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 ahaṁ, ayaṁ, and the present of AS; after e (with the exception of re'yya, Mil., p. 124) only to ahaṁ, 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 maggañāṇehi gato,' 'catumaggañāṇasankhātehi vedehi akusalānam dhammānam vedagū, 'catuhi maggañāṇavedehi kilese vijjhitvā gatattā vedagū,' etc.

Mil. 21²⁰. Sāgaro viya akkhobbho—i.e., like the depth of the sea. Comp. Majjhe yathā samuddassa ūmi no jāyati, thito hoti, Sn. 52, v. 6 (v. 920) (= mahāsamuddassa uparimahet̄thimabhāgānam vēmajjhāsankhāte 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 sacāhaṁ, 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, ham-sa-riva = haṁ so 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 sang-a-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. Raṇañjaha 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 raṇañjaya, 'victorious in the battle (with Māra).'

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

Mil. 22⁵. Sudam is a combination of su = sma with daṁ or idam, and might also be written su daṁ or su 'daṁ.

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 *foll.*

 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, 40.

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, 78, 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.

Metronymics, 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 *n*, 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.

Prākrit grammarians, 61.

Prākritism, 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 *y a 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.

Sinhalese blunders, 62, n. 17; 76, 553.
influence on Pali, 77

Sinhalese 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 *√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.

-aṁ, confounded with -e, 67, n. 28.
replaced by -e, in *Māgadhi*, 75.

-aṁ, ending of l. sg. aor. (impf.) very rare in Pali, 429.
absolutives in, 80.

-akaṁ, absolutives in, 80.

-aya-, becomes e, 79, n. 3.

-ayana, contracted to -āna, 428.

-are, medial ending from Vedic -ire, 76.

-ava-, becomes o, 79, n. 3.

ā, from a, 70; from -ar, 56.

-āna, contracted of -ayana, 428.

i, from a, 55; from u, 75, 79; i (or ī) from -ya, 64;

causing assimilation of e to ī (o-ū), 78.

-im̄, ending of absolutives for -am̄, 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.

r (Sanskrit), 76.

e, from -aya-, 79, n. 3; for o, 79; final, before vowels, 82, n. 1; -e confounded with -am̄, 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.

m̄, inserted for metrical reasons, 56.

k, from p, 59; kk from pp, 60, n. 13; becomes t or p, 59; elided, 65, n. 28.

-kara, -kāra, false ending, 64, n. 20.

g, from d, 59

gha, abbreviation, 65, n. 25.

c, -cca, in cases of Sandhi, 78, n. 8; -cca, from -tya or -tara, 56, n. 4.

ñ, confounded with n, 80-81; 80, n. 1; from n by influence of a latent r, 81; nñ and nh, 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 bhh, 60.

dvā, becomes bā-, 60.

n, confounded with ñ, 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; bhh 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. 28;

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 n, 81 ; r after dentals becomes y, 56.

l, from n, 55 ; becomes n, 55 ; being on a par with surds, 62.

l, from d, always sonant, 62 ;
from n, 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 ; confounded 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.
aṅgapaccāga, 74.
acchati, 61.
accharā, accharikā, 76.
ajakara, 64, n. 20.
ajaddhuka, 550.
ajjhogāhitvā, 422.
ajjhopanna, ajjhāpanna, 543.
añchatī, 532.
aññadatthu(m), 67, n. 28 ; 424.
adañchi, 72, n. 3.
addha, 63, n. 19.
atathām samānaṁ, 67, n. 28.
aticchatha bhante, 65.
atiradakkhinī, 61, n. 14.

attadattha, 70.
atraja, 59, n. 6.
adhibacchatī, 72, 430.
an-aññāta, 64, n. 20.
an-aṇa, an-inā, 76.
Anantakāya, 70.
anabhāva, anabhāva-kata, 64, n. 20.
anamatagga, 64, n. 20.
anavajja, 64, n. 20.
anavaya, 65.
anasūyaka, 76, n. 1.
anivattanatā, 70, n. 37.
anuttara, 427.
anuñthunaṁ, 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.
 anuhīramāna, 79.
 anoñamidanda, 427.
 anosakkanatā, 70, n. 37.
 antepura, 79.
 annukāri, 79, n. 3.
 anva-d-eva, 70.
 anha, 81.
 Apacara, 426.
 apanīta, 66, n. 24.
 aparañha, 81.
 apavīnati, 78, n. 1.
 apasakkati, 60.
 apāpuñanti, 63, n. 19.
 apāpurāṇa, apapurati, 63.
 apāruta, 63, n. 18.
 appañvibhāttabhōgin, 429.
 appesakkha, 422.
 aphusāni kiriyāni, 425.
 abbeti, 64, n. 19.
 abbhībhāsi, 79, n. 3.
 abbhuggañchati, °-gañchīti,
 73
 abbhussakkati, -sukkati, 60,
 76.
 abyābajjhām, 538.
 abhijhana, 78.
 abhirūhati, 78.
 abhivañdhayim, 430.
 abhisamecca, 56, n. 4.
 amhe, 81.
 arana, 83.
 alajjītāya, 66, n. 27.
 alapu, 62, n. 16.
 aliyava(m)sāni, 69.
 ava, 79, n. 3.
 avañ-hoti, 81.
 ava-CHAD, ava-VAR, 63,
 n. 18.
 avasissatu, avasussatu, 569.
 avāpurāṇa, avāpurati, 63.
 asammatt(h)atthāna, 81.
 asūyā, 76, n. 1.
 aham, 82.

ahu tam yeva, 551.
 ahesum, 79.
 ākurati, 425.
 ācamati, 425.
 āñāñja, 75.
 ātu māri, 567.
 ādānena, 425.
 ānantariyakamma, 421.
 āpātha, 428.
 āyasmant, 76.
 āruhati, ārūhati, 78, n. 2.
 ārūgya, 79, n. 1.
 ārohati, 78.
 ālimpana, ālimpeti, 421.
 āluka, ālupa, 60, n. 10.
 ālumpakārakaṁ, 80.
 ālhiya, 63, n. 19.
 āvarati, 63, n. 19.
 āviñjana, āviñjati, 59, n. 7.
 āvunāti, āvunotī, 63, n. 19.
 āvuta, 64, n. 19.
 āvethana, āvethikā, 421.
 āvenika, 75.
 āsiyati, 422.
 *āhañchaṁ, 74, 545.
 āhārattaṁ, 425.
 ice-eva, 423.
 icchasaṁ, icchisam, 75.
 itveva(m), 423.
 inda, 55.
 iva (va), 422.
 ukkūsa, 79, n. 2.
 uggañchi, uggañchitvāna, 61,
 n. 14.
 uechh, 76.
 uju, 76.
 ujju, 531.
 utu, 76.
 uttarim, 80.
 uttittha, uttitthe, 426.
 udarāvadehakam, 80.
 uddham, 60.

°upaka, 62, n. 16.
 Upaku, 62, n. 16.
 upagañchi, 71.
 upagañchimśu, 72, n. 2.
 Upacara, 426.
 upacikā, 62, n. 16.
 upacchubhati, 423.
 upajjhām, 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.
 ubbhām, ubbhātṭhaka, ubbhāmukha, 60.
 ubho, 79.
 ummi, 428, 429.
 urattālim, 80.
 uļuika, 64, 76.
 usu, 76.
 usūyā, 76.
 ussakkati, ussukkati, 60.
 ūmi, 428.
 ekacea, ekatiya, 56, n. 4.
 ekānika, 428.
 etam, 426.
 ettam, 65, n. 23.
 ettaka, 80.
 ettakā, ettikā, 427.
 edisa, 80.
 ereti, 76.
 evaṁsampada, 68, n. 30.
 ogāhitvā, 422.
 oṭṭhubhati, 424.
 onīta, 66, n. 24.
 onojeti, 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.
 katucchū, 76.
 kāṭṭhaṭṭhām pharati, 425.
 °kata, °gata, 64, n. 20.
 kathiyati, katheti, 70.
 kathetukamyatāpucchā, 531.
 kapañiddhika, 76.
 kappara, 76.
 kamyatā, 70, n. 37.
 °kara, 64, n. 20.
 karahaci, 75.
 kalopi (kalopi, khalopi, 60.
 kasata (sakata), 423.
 kahām, 76.
 kākacchamāna, 422.
 kāyadaddhibahula, 65, n. 20.
 °kāra, 64, n. 20.
 kāraka, 60, n. 12.
 Kārambhiya, 426.
 kāruññatā, 70, n. 37.
 kāhati, 75.
 kinkato, kijikate, 430.
 kicca, kiccaya, 421.
 kiccākicca, 74.
 kittaka, 80.
 kipillika, 59.
 kukku, 76.
 kuñkuṭṭha, 76.
 kujjhisi, 79, n. 3.
 kuddāla-piṭaka, 68.
 kumbhī, kumbhyā, 78.
 kuruṅga, 76.
 kulūpaka, 62, n. 16.

kusīta, 63, n. 19; 64, n. 20; 75. gharanī, 75.
 kuhim, 80. ghāna, 81.
 ketubha, 65. ghāyati, 57.
 ketāra, kedāra, 62, n. 16.
 keyūra, 79, n. 3.
 kotthaka, 76.
 Kondañña, 75.
 Kodumbaraka, 56.
 kolañña, 75.
 kolaputti, 64.
 kosajja, 63, n. 19; 75.

 khajjūpa, °-ka, khajjūpanaka,
 khajjota(ka), khajjopana-
 naka, 59, n. 8; 79, n. 1.
 khanati, 59, n. 6.
 khalopi, 60.
 khānu, 58, n. 6.
 khādati, khāyita, 57.
 khipita, 75.
 khepeti, 76.
 khemām, 571.

 gacchatī, 71 *foll.*; gacchi,
 gañchi, 71, 72, n. 1; gac-
 chimsu, 72, n. 2; gac-
 chissati, 72, n. 1; gañ-
 chati, gañchīti, 73.
 gañetuye, 79.
 gañhāti, 77.
 °gata (°kata), 64, n. 20.
 gaddūhana, 59.
 gadhita, 430.
 gantvā, 72, 73. .
 gaha, 76.
 gāmā gāmain, 74.
 gāmika, 425.
 °gāmīni pañipadā, 530, 531.
 gjijha, 56.
 gimhāna, 428.
 gilāna, 63, n. 19.
 gihin, 76.
 gumba, 57, 58.

 ghañasahassa, 426.

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

 chakana, 62, n. 16.
 chakala, 62, n. 16.
 chañaka, 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.
 jigucchatī, 73.
 junhā, 81.

 jhāyati, 65, n. 20.

 ñātaka, 76.
 ñāya, 58.

 ñānāñhāna, 74.

 tam...tam, 424.
 tamiyathā, 75.
 tamiyathā 'nusūyate, 55.
 takkola, 59.
 °taggha, 64, n. 20.
 tajja, 422.
 tañ-hi, 81.
 tañhā, 81.

tattaka, 80.
 tathāgata, 424, 542.
 tadaminā, 75.
 tadūpiya, 77, 78.
 tanti, 69.
 ta-y-idam, 57.
 tarahi, 421.
 tavam (tuvam), 76.
 tāṇa, 81.
 tāṇatā, 70, n. 37.
 tāsam, 424.
 ti (iti), 423.
 tikiēchā, 63, n. 19.
 tippa, 62, n. 16; 425, 526.
 timiṅgala, 75.
 tiracchāna, 428.
 tini, 81.
 tiradassī, 61, n. 14.
 tuvam (tavam), 76.
 tuvamtuvam, 64, n. 10; 539.
 tv-eva, 423.
 thaketi, 62, n. 16.
 tharu, 70.
 thāmasā, 430.
 theva (cheva), 70.
 dakkhissati, 61, n. 14.
 datthavisa, 425.
 daḍḍhi, 65, n. 20.
 dantullehakam, 80.
 dandha, 65, n. 20.
 damasā, 430.
 daḍhadhamma, 60, n. 11.
 dānagga, 56.
 dicehati, 61, n. 14.
 Dinna, 422.
 disākāka, 61, n. 14.
 dissati, 57.
 duddittha, 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.
 dvattiṁsākāra, 533.
 dvīsu, dvīhi, 79.
 dve, 79.
 dhajanī, °-inī, 75.
 dhamma, 60, n. 11.
 Dhammantari, 60, n. 11.
 dhammī kathā, 543.
 naingala, 55.
 naṅgula, 55.
 nantaka, 81, n. 1.
 nandissaṁ, 75, n. 2.
 napparūpa, 81.
 naṭāta, 55.
 Nātaputta, Nāthaputta, 58.
 nikkama, nikkamatha, nik-
 khamatha, 428.
 niggumba, 57.
 Nighaṇdu, 65.
 nicchuddha, nicchubhati,
 423.
 niṭṭhubhati (nutṭhubhati),
 76, 424.
 nidhin-nikhāto, 55, n. 2.
 nibbethana, nibbēṭhikā, 421.
 nimantaka, 426.
 niyyāteti, °-deti, 63, n. 19.
 nirumbhati, 59.
 nirūdaka, 78.
 nilacchita, nilicchita, 55.
 nivātaka, 426.
 nisinna, 55.
 nissakkati, 60.
 nissakkavacana, 60.
 niti, 58.
 nutṭhubhati, 76.
 nutṭhura, 76.
 nelepatī, 62, n. 16.
 Pakudha, 58.
 pakkha, 422.

paggañhitvā dehi, 77
 paccācamati, °-vamati, 425.
 paccosakkati, 60.
 pajāpati, 62, n. 16.
 patigacc' eva, 421.
 patipāti, 69, n. 32.
 patisāmvedeti, 70.
 patisakkati, 60, n. 13.
 patīhañkhāmi, 74.
 pathavi, 75.
 panaka, 421.
 paññasata, 64, n. 20.
 patara, 62, n. 16.
 pattiya, pattiyāmi, patti-
 yāyati, 79, n. 3.
 padasā, 430.
 pana, 76.
 pabbaja, 64, n. 20.
 pamādassaiñ, 76, n. 2.
 Payāka, 62, n. 16.
 payurupāsatī, 76
 parakkama, 428.
 parāmasā, 541.
 paritta, 425.
 parideva, pariddava, 532.
 paripanna, 80, n. 1.
 paripphosakam, 80.
 pariyāya, 66.
 pariyoga, 423.
 pariyonandhati, 55.
 parisakkati, 60.
 parisatīm, 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, pāvāra, 63, n. 19.
 pavīnati, 78, n. 1.
 pavecchati, 61, n. 14.
 paveni, 69.
 pasakkiya, 60.
 pahāmsati, 61, n. 14.
 pāguññatā, 70, n. 37.
 pācana, pāceti, pājeti, 62;
 63, n. 19.
 pañkulyatā, 79, n. 3; 70,
 n. 37.
 pātiyamāna, 425.
 pātihīra, 78.
 pāna, 81.
 pātu, pātu-karoti, °-bhavati,
 61.
 pāpurana, 62, n. 17; 63.
 pāpurati, 63, n. 19.
 pāramitā, 70.
 pāramī, 64, 70.
 pāripūri, 64.
 pārisuddhi, 64.
 pāruta, pārupati, 63.
 pārumpeti, 64.
 pāli, 69.
 pāvāra, 63, n. 19.
 pāvurañā, 63.
 pāhetha, pāhesi, 61, n. 14.
 piñtaka, 67, 68.
 piñtaka-sampadāya, 68.
 piñthām, piñthi, 55.
 pitito, 79.
 pituechā, 56.
 pithiyati, 62.
 pidahati, 63, n. 19.
 pidhāna, 63, n. 19.
 pidhīyati, 62, n. 16.
 pilandha, pilandhati, pilan-
 dhita, 55.
 pisuñā vācā, 530.
 pukkusa, 75.
 puñtha, 553.
 puttapatī, 62, n. 16.
 puthu, puthujjana, 76.
 pubbanha, 80, 81.
 Purāñā, 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.
 pokkharanī, 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, phuttha, 553.
 phenuddehakaṁ, 80.
 battimsa, 60.
 babbaja, 64, n. 20.
 balasata, 59, n. 6.
 balasā, 430.
 bārasa, 60.
 bāvisati, 60.
 bāhā, bābu, 76.
 bāhusacca, 75.
 bilaṅgathālika, 426.
 buddhānubuddha, 74.
 Belatṭha-, Belatṭhi-putta, 58.
 byāpāra, 63, n. 19.
 byāvata, 63, n. 19.
 bhaṭtiputta, 426.
 bhattagga, 56.
 bhadanta, 69.
 bhaddiputta, bhaddhiputta, 426.
 bhante, 69, 70.
 bhavābhava, 74.
 bhiṅkāra, bhiṅgāra, 62, n. 16; 64, n. 20.
 bhiyyo, 79.
 bhuttāvīṁ onītapattapāṇīṁ, 66, 67.
 bhummi, bhūmi, 429.
 bhūtahacca, bhūnahu (bhū-tahu), 428.
 bho, 70.
 bhovādin, 69.
 maṅkato, 430.
 Maṅkura, 70.
 majjhantika, 75.
 majjhanka, 81.
 mañcātimañca, 74.
 Mataja, 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.
 mātyā, 56, n. 4.
 māno, mānavo, 422.
 māraṇantika, 421.
 māsalu, 428.
 mittadūbhīn, 78.
 Milinda, 55.
 mutiṅga, mudiṅga, 64, n. 20.
 muṅala, 55.
 mendaka-pañha, 422.
 Moggaliputta-Tissathera, 57.
 yaṁ, yassa (= yam-assa), 426.
 yakana, 62, n. 16.
 yattaka, 80.
 Yamataggi, 64.
 yādisikidisa, 423.
 ye (= yaṁ), 75.

yebhuuyena, 75, 79.
 Yonaka, 58, 70.
 yobbana, yobañña, 79, n. 3.
 rajāpatha, 74.
 rana, 83.
 ranañjaha, 85.
 rathesabha, 59, n. 6.
 randha, 423.
 rāmaneyyaka, 55.
 Rāhulovada, 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.
 läpa, 62, n. 16.
 läpayati, 63.
 läpu, 62, n. 16.
 luta (lunāti), 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.
 vamsa, 69.
 vanomī (vanimhase), vanū-nemi, 63, n. 19.
 vatapada, vattapada, 423.
 vabbhācita, 545.
 vamati (camati), 425.
 vayo, 553.
 varati, 63, n. 19.
 varalañcaka, 424.
 vassagga, 56.
 vassāna, 428.
 vākarā (vākurā), 64, n. 20.
 vāhasā, 430.
 vicikicchā, 63, n. 19.
 vijjotananta, 55.
 vita (vīta), 64, n. 19; 79.
 Vītañsā, 423.
 vinati, 63, n. 19.
 vinubbhujati, 76.
 vibhādati, 425.
 virūhati, 78.
 vilāngaka, 547.
 vilāka (vilagga), 62, n. 16.
 vivañta, vivarati, 63, n. 19.
 visīveti, 422.
 visūka, 78.
 viñati, 78, n. 1.
 vita, 64, n. 19; 79.
 vinati, 78, n. 1.
 Vītañsā, 423.
 vitivatte (vītivattetvā), 67, n. 28; 428.
 vutapada, 423.
 vegasā, 430.
 vedagū, 82.
 vedheti, 76.
 veyyāvacca, 63, n. 19.
 veļu, 55.
 vodaka, 78.
 vyaya, 553.
 vyāpāra, vyāvāta. See byā-°.
 saññavarati, 63, n. 19; 425.
 saññuñoti, sañvuta, 63, n. 19.
 saññati, 64, n. 20.
 saññhīratī, 78.
 sakāta, 423.
 sakkati, 60.
 sakkhalī, 76.
 sakkhissati, 61, n. 14.
 sañkucita, sañkuñita, 60.
 sañgāyati, sañgīti, 57, n. 5.
 sañcarati, 425.
 satī, 58.
 sadattha, 70.
 saddhim, 80.
 sañikam, sanikam, 540.
 santuñhitā, 70, n. 37.

sandahati, 429.
 sandhāvissam̄, 56, n. 3.
 sannayhati, 429.
 sannidhikārakam̄, 80.
 sannirumbhati, 59.
 sapadāna, 428.
 sappati, 60, n. 13.
 Sabbadinna, 70.
 sabhatim̄, 64, n. 20.
 samathita, 74.
 samuttaram̄ (-im̄), 429.
 samudāpikā, samupādikā
 (samupodikā), samedikā,
 427.
 sampadā, sampadāna, 68,
 n. 30.
 samparivattakaṁ, 80.
 samputita, 59, 60.
 sammati(h)atthāna, 81.
 samma-d-eva, 70.
 sammiñjati, 533.
 sammuti, 58.
 sa-rāna, 83.
 salākagga, 56.
 savana, 81.
 sassatisamaṁ, 423.
 sahavyatā, 70, n. 37.
 sākhalya, 75.
 sāteti, sāteti, sādeti, 64, n.
 20; 548.
 sāmāyika, 75.
 sāmici, 64.
 sāyati, sāyaniya, sāyita, 56,
 57.
 sāyanha, 80.
 sāramatino, 430.
 sārāniya, 75.
 sippi, 60, n. 10; 75.
 simbali, 58.
 sitūdaka, 78.
 sukhumāla, 66.
 suñkhasādhaka, °-sāyika,
 429.
 sunāti, suta, 64, n. 19.
 Sutanā, 76.
 sutta, 69.
 suttajāla-samathita, 74.
 suttadhara, 69, n. 32.
 sutta-nikkhepa, 69, n. 34.
 suttanta, 69, n. 34.
 sudaṁ, 83.
 sudiṭṭha, suddiṭṭha, 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.
 'seṭṭho jane tasmiṁ,' 425.
 senānigama, Senānigāma,
 544.
 seyyathā, 75.
 seleti, 76.
 sotthāna, 428.
 sovañnaya, 421.
 sve. See suve.
 hañkhāmi, hañchati, 74.
 hīnāy' āvattati, 428.
 hupeyya, huveyya, 62, n. 17.
 hetuye, 79.
 hemantāna, 428.
 hoti, 57.

IV.

INDEX
TO THE
PĀTISAMBHIDĀMAGGA
COMPILED BY
MABEL HUNT.

Akappiyat̄ho. *See* Akampiyaj.

Akampiyaj. °at̄ho, I, 16, 17; 29; 89; II, 161.
°ābhisaṃyayo, II, 216. °maggio, II, 84. °maṇḍo,
II, 87. °vimutti, II, 145. °virāgo, II, 143.

Akuppo (vimokkho), II, 40.

Akusalakammapathā, *the ten*, I, 130.

Aggi. aggī, *the ten*, I, 129. °kkhandho, I, 125.

Aggo. aggasuññaṃ, II, 179.

Ajjhattaj (cakkhu, *etc.*), I, 76. °vut̄hāno (vimokkho),
II, 36, 37. °suññaṃ, II, 181.

Ajjupekkhati, I, 62; 64; 91; 168; 170; II, 24, 25.

Ajjupekkhanaṭ̄ho, I, 16; II, 119.

Aññamañño, II, 49 *foll.*; 58 *foll.*; 73 *foll.*

Aññāṇaṃ. °cariyā, I, 80.

Attiyamāno, I, 159.

Att̄hamako, II, 193.

-Att̄ho, I, 15; 88; 90, 91; 118; 173; 180; II, 108; 150;
194.

Atighamisitvā (*v. l.* atikkamitvā), II, 196.

Attavādo. °paṭisāṇyutto, I, 156-9.

Attā, I, 107; 143 *foll.*; 157; 159 *foll.*; II, 80. °anu-
diṭṭhi, I, 143. °parinibbāpanaj, I, 175. Anattā,
152

II, 106. anattānupassanā, II, 37; 45-47; 63; 241, 242. anattato manasikaroti, II, 48 *foll.*; 58 *foll.*; 101. Atthangamo, II, 4; 6, 7; 39. Attho. °paṭisambhidā, I, 132; II, 150; 157. °raso, II, 88. °sandassanaŋ, I, 105. yathatthā, *the ten*, I, 173, 174. Addhā, II, 19, 21. Adhiccasamupannikā, *the four*, I, 155. Adhitthānaŋ, I, 108; 111; II, 21; 245. °balāŋ, II, 171; 176. °iddhi, II, 174; 207. °suññaŋ, II, 183. Adhipateyyaŋ, II, 161. dhammādhipateyyo, II, 160. Adhimutti, I, 124. Anaññaŋatho, II, 104; 124. Anativattanaŋ, I, 16; 21; 31, 32, 33; 74. Anabhissaro, I, 126. Anavajjo, II, 116, 117. °balāŋ, II, 170; 176. Anāgāmī, II, 194. °maggo. *See* Maggo, Cattāro Maggā. Aniñjanāŋ, I, 15. Aniṭhangatā, I, 81. Anujotanaŋ, I, 18. Anutṭhitī, I, 18. Anuttariyāni, *the six*, I, 5. Anudhammo. °atā, I, 35, 36. dhammānudhammapatipatti, II, 189. Anunetā, II, 194. Anupassati, I, 57; 187. Anupassanā. anicce°, anatt°, dukkh°, &c., I, 10; 20; 24; 32; 45; 47; 96; 98; II, 11, 12; 37; 41 *foll.*; 56; 172; 185; 211. °ñāṇaŋ, *list of*, II, 67 *foll.* Anupassī. anicca°, I, 191. nirodha°, I, 192. virāga°, I, 192. Anupādā, II, 45, 46. Anupubbanirodhā, *the nine*, I, 35. °vihārā, *the nine*, I, 5. Anubujjhanaŋ, 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.

Anusāsanī. ^{°pāṭihāriya}ŋ, II, 227, 228.

Anussati. ^{°tṭhānāni}, *the six*, I, 28. *In detail*, I, 48; 95. ^{upasama}°, I, 95. ^{upatṭhānānussati}, I, 186.

Anulomaŋ. vimokkhānulomaŋ, II, 67; 70.

Antaggāhiko, I, 151 *foll.*; 158.

Antavā. attā, I, 157. loko, I, 151 *foll.*; 157.

Antānantikā, *the four*, I, 155.

Antoparisoko, I, 38.

Antosoko, I, 38.

Apariyāpanno, I, 101. *See also* Bhūmi.

Apāyagamanīyo, I, 94.

Appamaññāyo, *the four*, I, 84.

Appamāṇo, II, 126, 127.

Abhijjamāno, II, 208.

Abhiññā, II, 156; *the six*, I, 35. ^{°ñāṇāni}, *the six*, II, 189.

Abhiṇataŋ, I, 165; 167.

Abhitunna. assāsena°, I, 164. dukkhābhitunno (? ^{°tuṇno}), I, 129 (*J.P.T.S.*, 1886, p. 135).

Abhiniropanaŋ, I, 16; 21; 30; 69; 75; 79; 90.

Abhinīhāro, I, 61 *foll.*; II, 121.

Abhippamodayo, I, 95; 176; 190.

Abhibhāyatanāni, *the eight*, I, 5.

Abhiropanaŋ, II, 82; 98. ^{°abhisamayo}, II, 216. ^{°cariyā}, II, 20. ^{°maggo}, II, 84. ^{°vimutti}, II, 145. ^{°virāgo}, II, 142. buddhi-abhiropanaŋ, II, 115. (*Cf. Dh. S.*, § 7: abhiniropanā.)

Abhisandanaŋ, I, 17.

Abhisamayo, II, 215.

Abhisambhavati, II, 193.

Anabhisambhavāniyo, II, 193.

Amarāvikkhepikā, *the four*, I, 155.

Araññāŋ, I, 176.

Arahaŋ, II, 3; 19; 194; 208; 207; 210; 225.

Arahattamaggo. *See* Maggo (Cattāro Maggā).

Ari, II, 197.
Ariyo. *ariyatthangiko*. *See Maggo*. *ariyā iddhi*, II, 212. *ariyapuggalo*, I, 167. *ariyavamśāni*, *the four*, I, 84. *ariyasacecañ*. *See Saccañ*.
Arūpāvacaro, I, 83, 84; 101. [°] *samāpatti*, I, 84, 85.
Avadhānan. *See Sotāvadhānañ*.
Avikkhepo, II, 228. [°] *parisuddhatañ*, I, 94.
Avijjā. *See Vijjā*.
Avicinirayo, I, 83.
Avecca. [°] *pasanno*, I, 161.
Avyākato, II, 108, 109.
Avyāpādo. *See Byāpādo*.
Asekho. *asekhabalañ*, II, 176; *the ten*, II, 173.
Asmimāno, I, 26.
Assako (*v. l. asako*), I, 126.
Assādo. *assādādiñthi*, I, 139 *foll.*; 157.
Assāso, I, 95; 164-166; 170 *foll.*; 177, 178; 180; 182 *foll.* *assāsādimajjhapariyosānañ*, *etc.*, I, 164; 165.

Ākāsānañcāyatanañ, I, 36.
Ākiñcaññāyatanañ, I, 36.
Āgārañ, I, 176.
Āghātavatthūni, *the nine*, *the ten*, I, 130.
Ādinñattāñ, I, 49. *an[°]*, I, 49.
Ādīnavo, I, 192-194; II, 9, 10.
Ādevo, I, 38.
Ādesanā. [°] *pātihāriyañ*, II, 227.
Ānāpānakathā, I, 162.
Ānāpānasati, I, 166; 172. [°] *samādhi*, I, 185, 186.
Āneñjañ, II, 206.
Ābhujati. (*pallankāñ*), I, 176.
Āmasati, II, 209.
Āmisāñ. *mārāmisato*, II, 238. *sāmiso vimokkho*, II, 41. *nirāmiso*, I, 59. *nir[°] vimokkho*, II, 41.
Āyatanañ. *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-*

kabāhirāni, *the six*, I, 19; 225. āyatanaṭṭho, I, 132; II, 121. āyatanañaloko, I, 122. kasiṇāyata-nāni, *the ten*, I, 28. saḷ^o. *See that title.*
 Āyuhānā, I, 10-15; 32; 52; II, 218. an^o, I, 11-15; II, 218. āyuhānaṭṭhitī, I, 50.
 Āraddhaviriyo, I, 171.
 Ārammaṇaŋ, I, 57, 58; 180; II, 97; 118; 150.
 ārammaṇāni, *the four*, I, 84. an^o, I, 170.
 vimuttārammaṇo, II, 143. virāgārammaṇo, II, 141.
 Āloko. udapādi, II, 150 *foll.*; 159; 162.
 Āvacarā, *the three, in detail*, II, 72; 74.
 Āvajjanāŋ, II, 5, 6, 7; 120.
 Āvajjitattāŋ, II, 27, 28, 29.
 Āvaraṇaŋ, I, 131-134. an^o, I, 131-134; II, 158.
 Āsavo. *the four*, I, 94; 117. khīṇāsavo, II, 173; 176.
 an^o II, 99; 117; 176. an^o vimokkho, II, 40.
 Āsayo, I, 123. āsayānusayo, I, 133.
 Āsevati. maggāŋ, II, 93.
 Āhāro, I, 55; 57; 76; 78. *the four*, I, 22; 122.
 āhāraṭṭhitiko, I, 5; 122.

 Ijjhānaŋ, I, 17; 19; 74; 111; 181; II, 125; 143; 145; 161; 174.
 Iñjanā. aniñjanatṭho, II, 118.
 Iddhi, *the ten*, II, 205. °balāni, *the ten*, II, 174.
 °pātiḥāriyaŋ, 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 *foll.*; II, 154, 155; 164; 205. iddhipādā-rammaṇā, II, 164. iddhipādavatthukā, II, 164.
 Indriyaŋ, 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 *foll.*; 18; 21; 31; 84; 88; 119; 132; 187; 143; 145; 160; 223. *the nineteen*, I, 137. *the twenty-two*, I, 7. indriyaparopariyattāŋ, I, 121, 122; 133, 134; II, 158; 175. indriyānaŋ pañca

vivekā, virāgā, &c., II, 223. man°, I, 190. paññ°, II, 49 *foll.* saddhindriyā, II, 49; 51 *foll.* samādh°, II, 49; 51 *foll.*

Iriyāpathā, *the four*, II, 225.

Issariyā, issariyabala, II, 171; 176.

Ucchedo. ucchedaditthi, I, 150; 158.

Utt̄hito. an°, I, 172.

Udakadhārā, I, 125.

Udayo, I, 54. udayabbayo, I, 54.

Uddhacca, II, 9; 87; 97 *foll.*; 119; 142; 145; 169; 176. ni-uddhacca, I, 83.

Udhacco. sa-uddhacco, I, 81. °sahagatakilesa, II, 98, 99.

Udraya. sukh°, dukkh°, I, 80.

Upakkilesā, *the eighteen*, I, 164.

Upakkhittako, II, 196.

Upago. ākāsānañcāyatana°, I, 84. nevasaññānāsaññā-yatana°, I, 84.

Upat̄thānay. upat̄thānakusalo, II, 28, 29. an°, I, 101; II, 7, 8, 9. ekatt°, II, 5. anupat̄thānatāpaññā, II, 230.

Upapatti. an°, I, 11-15.

Upavādako. an°, I, 115.

Upavicāro, I, 17.

Upādāna, I, 51, 52; 54; 193; II, 46; 118. upādā-nāni, *the four*, I, 129; II, 46, 47. nidāna, &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. °anubrū-hanā, I, 167. °sukha, I, 36.

Uppādo, anuppādo, I, 59-61; 66, 67.

Ussineti, II, 167.

Ekaggatā, I, 48; 97; 177.

Ekaccasassatikā, *the four*, I, 155.

Ekattaj, I, 108; 163; 167; II, 7, 8; 105, 121.
 ekattavimokkho, II, 41. ekattasuññaj, 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. °suññaj, II, 182.

Okappati, II, 19; 21.
 Oghā, *the four*, I, 26.
 Ottappañj. ottappabalañ, II, 169; 176.
 Ottappati, II, 169; 176.
 Odhiso. an°, II, 180.
 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.
 Kammañj, 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. °samādānañ, II, 174.
 Kamyatā. muñcitu°, I, 60; 65.
 Karuṇā, I, 8. mahā°, I, 126. mahākaruṇāsamā-
 patti, I, 133.
 Kasaṭo, II, 87 *foll.*
 Kasiñā, *the ten*, I, 6; 95; 136; *the eight*, I, 49; 143-
 144; 149-151. °samāpatti, II, 208. °ayatanāni,
 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. ujuñj kāyaj pañidhāya, I, 175, 176. kāyā,
 the two, I, 183. °sankhāro, I, 184; 186.

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

Kuppo. (vimokkho), II, 40.

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

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

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

Khanti, I, 176. anulomika, II, 236, *foll.*; °balāŋ, II, 171; 176. °suññaŋ, 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. ditṭhitthānāŋ, I, 138. °dhātu, I, 83. khandhānāŋ khandhaṭṭho, I, 17; 132; II, 121; 157. dhammākkhandhā, *the five*, I, 34. khandhaloko, I, 122. khandhānāŋ nirodho, II, 238.

Khayo. khayadhammā, I, 53; 76; 78.

Khīnāsavo. khīnāsavabalāni, *the seven*, I, 35; *the ten*, II, 173; 176.

Khiyati, I, 94; 96; II, 31.

Khemaŋ, I, 59. *See also* Yogo.

Gati. °sampatti, II, 72 *foll.*

Ganthā, *the four*, I, 129.

Gambhiro. °paññaŋ, II, 192. (thānāŋ), II, 19, 21.

Garu. °upanissito, II, 202.

Garuļo, II, 196.

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

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

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

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

°samphasso, I, 5; 40; 136. °samphassajo, I, 6; 40; 136. acakkhuto, I, 129. Buddha°, II, 33. samanta°, II, 31. °ssa aniccaṭṭhaṇ, I, 132. udapādi, II, 150 *foll.*; 159; 162.

Candimā. abbhā mutto va, I, 175.

Cammakhando, I, 176.

Caritan (sattānaŋ), I, 124.

Cariyā, II, 17; 245; *the three*, I, 79 *foll.*; *the eight*, II, 19, 20; 225. adhimokkha°, II, 8. upatṭhāna°, II, 8; 20. gambhirañāṇa°, II, 1. dassana°, II, 9; 20. ñāṇa°, I, 82; 99. paggaha°, II, 8; 20. samādhi°, I, 99.

Cittāŋ, I, 17; 19; 111; 118; 189-191; II, 121. adhi°, II, 243. anupādā cittassa vimokkho, II, 45. cittānupassanā, II, 152, 153; 163. cittānupassi, II, 233. cittacetasiko, I, 84. cittavipallāso, II, 80. cittavivatṭo, II, 70. cittasankhāro, I, 95; 188.

Cetasiko. citta°, I, 84.

Ceto. cetasa, II, 39. °vivatṭo, I, 108; 110; II, 70.

Chando, I, 19; 107; II, 5, 6, 7; 23 *foll.*; 123; 182. chandarāganirodho, I, 9.

Chinnamanupassanāŋ, I, 72.

Jarā, I, 11-15; 59; 60; 65; 67; 128; II, 147. a°, I, 11-15. °maraṇaŋ, I, 50-54; 85; 96; 98; 105, 106; II, 67; 102; 111; 113. jarāmaraṇassa aniccaṭṭho, I, 132. jarāmaraṇanimittaŋ, I, 93. °maraṇaŋ nirujjhati, I, 193, 194.

Javanaŋ, 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.

Jīvitāŋ, II, 245. *See also* Indriya (*the nineteen, the twenty-two*).

Jotanaŋ. anu°, paṭi°, sañ°, II, 122.

Jhānaŋ. jhānāni, *the four*, I, 8; 20; 24; 31; 35, 36; 41; 45; 47; 64; 67; 84; 95; 97 *foll.*; 138; II,

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

Ñānaŋ, I, 60, 61; 64; 69, 70; 88; 102 *foll.*; 118 *foll.*; 162; 175; 194-196; II, 32; 189; 191, 192; 195; 244. anupassanā°, *list of*, II, 67 *foll.* anupassane ñāñāni, I, 186. appatihataŋ, II, 195. udapādi, II, 150 *foll.*; 159; 162. khanti°, I, 106. dibba-cakkhu°, I, 114. dhammatthiti°, I, 50. ñāñacariyā, I, 82. ñāñavimokkho, II, 36; 42. ñāñavippārā (iddhi), II, 211. ñāñavivatṭo, I, 109, 110; II, 70. nibbidā°, I, 195. Buddha°, I, 133; II, 31; 195. sabbaññuta°, I, 131-134. sammā°, II, 173. sotadhātuvisuddhi°, I, 112.

Thānaŋ (vijjati), II, 236, 237.

Thiti, I, 50. dhammatthitiñānaŋ, I, 50, 51, 52.

Tatṭiko, I, 176.

Taṇhā, I, 50, 51, 52; 55-57; 76-78; 102; 127, 128; 136; II, 118; *the three*, I, 26. *In detail*, I, 39; II, 147; *the six, in detail*, I, 6. kiŋ-nidānā, *etc.*, 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.

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

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

Tathāgato, I, 48; 121 *foll.*; 151; 154, 155; 160; II, 9; 19; 31; 38; 194; 203; 225. Tathāgata-balāni, *the ten*, II, 174.

Tadangaŋ. tadangasuññaiŋ, II, 180.

Taraṇaṭṭho, I, 15; II, 99; 119.

Tikkha. °paññā, II, 200.

Tikkhindriyo, I, 121; II, 195.

Titthiyo, I, 160.

Timi. timitimingalaiŋ, II, 196.

Tiranaṭṭho, I, 17; 87; II, 120.

Tirayitvā, II, 200. tirito, 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.

Ditṭhi, I, 80, 81; 135 foll. antaggāhikā, I, 151. °ṭṭhānāni, *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. saditṭhi, I, 81. °gataṇ, I, 155; *the two*, I, 129; *the six*, I, 130; *the sixty-two*, I, 130; 161. ditṭhekaṭṭho, I, 33; II, 13; 23. nidiṭṭhi, I, 88.

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 dukkhaṭṭho, I, 132; 134; II, 31; 106. dukkhudrayaṇ kammaṇ, I, 80; 82, 83; II, 79. dukkhavipāko, I, 80; 82, 83 II, 79. dukkhato manasikaroti, II, 48 *foll.*; 58; 101. dukkhānupassanā, II, 37, 43; 45, 46, 47; 241. dukkhābhītunno, I, 129. See also Saccāṇ (ariya).

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

Dubhato. °vuṭṭhānavivatṭane paññā, I, 69. °vuṭṭhāno vimokkho, II, 35 *foll.* °suññan, 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 *foll.*; 237. dhammā, *lists of*, I, 5; 22; 26; 28; 34. dhammatthitīñāṇaŋ, I, 50; 52. dhammānupassanā, II, 152; 154; 163; 234. dhammānusati, I, 48. dhammapatiſambhidā, II, 150; 157. °raso, II, 88. °saññā, *etc.*, I, 40. kañhasukka°, II, 217. kāmāvacarā, rūpā-, arūpāvacarā, I, 101; 132; II, 230. nānādhammā, 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 lokuttara, II, 166. dhammuddhaccaviggahitaŋ, II, 100-102. tañhāmūlakā, I, 130. pāmojjamūlakā, *the nine*, I, 85. manasi-kāramūlakā 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. dhātūnaŋ dhātuttho, I, 132; II, 121; 157. nibbāna°, I, 101. °loko, I, 122. sotadhātuvisuddhiñāṇaŋ, I, 112.

Nandhaŋ. *See* Yuga.

Nānattaŋ, I, 63, 64; 88 *foll.* nānattā, *the nine*, I, 87. nānatekattāŋ, I, 103. °saññā, II, 172. °vimokkho, II, 41. vihāra°, I, 91. samāpatti°, I, 91.

Nāmakāyo, I, 183.

Nāmarūpaŋ, I, 22; 50, 51; 56, 57; 122; 138; II, 72; 113. kijñ-nidānaŋ, *etc.*, II, 112. nirujjhati, I, 193.

Nikanti, II, 101, 102. °kkhaṇe, II, 72 *foll.*

Niggahaṭṭho. *See* Viniggaho.

Nicco, II, 80. aniccānupassanā, II, 37; 43; 45-47;

241, 242. *anicca*ŋ, I, 191; II, 28, 29; 80; 106.
aniccato manasikaroti, II, 48 *foll.*; 58; 100.

Nicchāto, II, 243.

Nijjāravatthūni, I, 5.

Nijjhanti. °*balaj*, II, 171; 176.

Nitṭhā. *nitṭha*ŋ *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.

Nibbānaŋ, I, 60; 66, 67; 75; 91; II, 40; 140; 142, 143; 165; 237. °*ārammaṇatā*, II, 140, 143.
°*dhātu*, I, 101.

Nibbidā. °*nānāni*, I, 195. °*ānupassanā*, II, 43; 45-47.

Nibbedhiko. *nibbedhikapaññā*, II, 201.

Nimittāŋ, I, 60; 66; 91, 92; 164; 170; II, 39; 64;
with pavattāŋ, II, 62, 63. *animittāŋ*, I, 60; 66; 91; II, 99. *animittānupassanā*, II, 44-47. *animitto vimokkho*, II, 36; 59-62; 65 *foll.* *jarā-maraṇa*°, 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 *foll.*

Niyyānaŋ, I, 163. °*attho*, I, 176.

Nirayo. *Avicinirayo*, I, 83.

Nirutti, I, 88 *foll.*; II, 150. °*paṭisambhidā*, II, 150.

Nirodho, I, 66, 67; 70; 91; 101, 102; 118; II, 230. *nirodhānupassī*, I, 192. *nirodhānupassanā*, II, 44-47. *nirodhassa nirodha*°*tho*, I, 182; 184; II, 32. *nirodhasamāpatti*, I, 97; 100. *bhava*°, I, 159. *sammādiṭṭhiyā*, *dc.*, *pañca nirodhā*, II, 221. (*indriyānaŋ*), II, 223.

Nissaŋo, II, 10-13. *su*°, II, 13.

Nissayo. °*paccayo*, II, 49 *foll.*; 58 *foll.*; 73 *foll.* (*indriyānaŋ*), II, 223. *sammādiṭṭhiyā*, *dc.* *nissayā*, II, 220.

Nissaraṇaŋ, II, 244. °suññaŋ, II, 180.

Nivaraṇaŋ, I, 31; 163. nīvaraṇāni, *the fire*, I, 26; 129.

Nekkhammaŋ, I, 20; 23; 31; 33, 34; 94; 100, 101; 107 *foll.*; II, 12; 22; 26; 55; 93; 116; 169 *foll.*; 179, 180; 228; 230; 244. nekkhammā-bhirato, II, 173.

Nevasaññānāsaññāyatanāŋ, I, 36.

Pakati, II, 208.

Pakāsanaŋ. dhammapakāsanatā, I, 104.

Paggaho, II, 8, 20.

Paccaniko. vimokkha°, II, 67; 69.

Paccayo, II, 116, 117.

Pajahati. pahīno, I, 63; II, 244.

Paññatti. °balaŋ, II, 171; 176.

Paññā, I, 53; 59; 64-66; 72, 73; 87 *foll.*; 102 *foll.*; 119; II, 162; 185 *foll.* adhi°, I, 20; 25-33; 45-47; 58; 169; II, 11; 13; 243. udapādi, II, 150 *foll.* 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 *foll.*; 114.

Paṭijotanaŋ, 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.

Paṭipassaddhi. vimokkha°, II, 71. °visuddhi, II, 3. °suññaŋ, II, 180.

Paṭipassaddho. sup°. II, 2, 3.

Paṭibandho, I, 172. kāya°, I, 184.

Paṭibhānaŋ. °paṭisambhidā, II, 150; 157.

Paṭilābho. paññā°, II, 189. paṭilābhasuññaŋ, II, 182.

Paṭividito, I, 188.

Paṭivijjhati, I; 180 *foll.* paṭividdho, II, 19, 20.

Paṭivedho, I, 105; II, 50; 59; 111, 112. paṭivedhā-
 divisodhanaŋ, II, 168. paṭivedhasuññaŋ, II, 182.
 sacca°, II, 57; 61. cattāri saccāni ekapaṭivedhāni,
 II, 105 *foll.*
 Paṭisankhā, I, 33; 45; 57; 60; 62; 64. ap°, I, 33; 45.
 Paṭisankhānaŋ. paṭisañkhānabalāŋ, II, 169; 176.
 Paṭisandhi, I, 11-15; 52; 59, 60; 62. ap°, I, 11-15.
 °kkhāne, II, 72 *foll.*
 Patisayvedī, I, 95; 186 *foll.* evaŋsukhadukkha°, 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.
 °ñāñāni, *the four*, II, 189. paṭisambhidāya paṭi-
 sambhidat̄tho, I, 132; 134; II, 32. paṭisambhi-
 dappattā, II, 202.
 Pātihāriyaŋ. iddhi°, ādesanā°, anusāsanī°, II, 227.
 Pātihīraŋ. yamaka°, I, 125; 133; II, 158.
 Pañamati. pañato, a°, I, 165; 167.
 Pañihito. (vimokkho), II, 41. appañihito, II, 100.
 (vimokkho), II, 36; 41; 59-62; 65. appañihitānu-
 passanā, II, 43-47.
 Pandiccaŋ, II, 185.
 Padahanaŋ, I, 17; 21; 181.
 Padhāniyangāŋ. pārisuddhipadhāniyangāni, *the nine*,
 I, 28.
 Padhānaŋ. sammappadhānaŋ, II, 1; 85; 90; 161; *the*
 four, I, 84; II, 14 *foll.*; 56; 86; 166; 174.
 Pabhangato, II, 238.
 Pabhāseti, I, 174.
 Pamādo, II, 8, 9; 169; 176; 197.
 Pamut̄tho. a°, I, 173.
 Payogo. sammāpayogapaccayā iddhi, II, 213.
 Paramat̄tho. paramat̄thasuññaŋ, II, 184.
 Paraloko. °vajjabhayadassāvino, I, 121, 122.
 Pariggaho. pariggahasuññaŋ, II, 182.
 Paricito, I, 172. anupubbaŋ 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.
 Parinibbāpanaŋ, I, 175.
 Parinibbāyi, *four modes of*, I, 161.
 Paripantho. paripanthe ñāñāni, I, 162.
 Paripuṇṇo, I, 172.
 Paripūraŋ. °attho, I, 15; 18; 49; 172; II, 122. mūla°, II, 116; 118.
 Parimukhaŋ, I, 176.
 Pariyanto, I, 42-44. a°, I, 42, 43. evaŋ-āyu°, I, 114.
 Pariyādiyati, I, 100, 101; II, 26.
 Pariyādānaŋ, II, 21.
 Pariyogāhanaŋ, I, 106; 112-114. nānattekattaviññā-ñācariyā°, I, 113. °suññaŋ, II, 183.
 Pariyosānaŋ. assāsādimajjha°, passāsādimajjha°, I, 164, 165.
 Parīlayhati, I, 128.
 Pavattan, I, 10-13; 59; 65, 66; 91 *foll.*; 100, 101; II, 63, 64; 127. ap°, I, 11-15; 59; 66; II, 127; 184.
 Pavālho, II, 211.
 Paviveko, II, 244.
 Pasidanaŋ, II, 121.
 Passaddhi, II, 244.
 Passāso, I, 95; 164-166; 170 *foll.*; 177, 178; 180; 182 *foll.*
 Pahānaŋ, II, 98; 156; *list of*, I, 26.
 Pahitatto. asallinattapahitattapaggahaṭṭho, I, 103.
 Pāmojjaŋ I, 177.
 Pārisuddho. °silaŋ, I, 42.
 Pīthaŋ, I, 176.
 Piti. °pharaṇatā, I, 48.
 Puggalo, I, 180 *foll.*; II, 1 *foll.*; 5?. dve puggalā paṭisambhidappattā, II, 202. para°, I, 113. saddho, asaddho, I, 121; II, 33.
 Puthujjano, I, 61-64; 143; 156; II, 27, 28. °kaly-āñako, I, 176; II, 190; 193.

Purisadosā, *the eight*, I, 130.

Pono. tap°, II, 197.

Pharaṇaŋ, II, 130

Pharaṇatā. pīti°, dc., I, 48.

Phalaiŋ, 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. sāmañña-

phalāni, *the four*, I, 34; II, 19; 40, 41; 166; 225.

sotāpattiphalakkhaṇo, dc., I, 105; II, 3. sotā-

pattiphalasamāpatti, dc., 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. ditṭhiṭṭhānai, I, 138. kiñ-nidāno, dc.,

II, 112. nirujjhati, I, 193.

Bandhanai, I, 128.

Balaŋ. balāni, *the fire*, II, 56; 86; 166; 174; 223.

In detail, I, 16; 21; 29; 88; 180; II, 84; 87;

89; 133; 137; 143; 145; 160; 168 *foll.* *The*

sixty-eight, II, 168 *foll.* khīṇasava°, *the seven*, I,

35. Tathāgatā°, II, 174-176. dasabaladhārī, II,

194. samatha°, I, 97. vipassanā°, I, 98.

Bahiddhā. dhamme vavattheti, dc., I, 77. °vutṭhānā vimokkhā, II, 36, 37. °suññai, II, 181.

Bahulikaroti. maggaŋ, II, 93, 94.

Bahulo. tab°, II, 197.

Bāhullaŋ. pañña°, II, 197.

Bijagāmabhūtagāmo, II, 219; 223.

Bujjhati. anu°, II, 115. sam°, II, 115.

Buñjanai (*sic*), II, 122. anu°, paṭi°, *ibid.*

Buddhi. °-abhiropanaŋ, II, 115. °ropanaŋ, II, 115.

pañña°, II, 190.

Buddho, I, 126; 174; II, 81; 140; 195. anu°, II, 19,

20. Buddhānussati, I, 48; 95. Buddhacakkhu,

ii, 33. *Buddhañāṇaŋ*, ii, 33; *the fourteen*, i, 133; ii, 31. *Pacceka°*, *Sammāsam°*, i, 43; ii, 3; 194; 203; 225. *Padesapacceka°*, ii, 19.

Bojjhangā, *the seven*, i, 28; ii, 56; 86; 166; 174; 223. *In detail*, i, 16; 21; 29; 74; 89; 181; ii, 84; 87; 89; 115 *foll.*; 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.

Brahmaj. *°cakkaŋ*, ii, 174. *brahmacariyamāṇdo*, 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.

Bhayaŋ, i, 58; 59.

Bhavo, i, 51, 52; 54; 137; ii, 113, 114. *kiŋ-nidāno*, ii, 111. *nirujjhati*, i, 193.

Bhāvanā, ii, 2; 49 *foll.*; 58 *foll.*; *the four*, i, 172; 178; ii, 93; *list of*, *etc.*, i, 28; 30 *foll.* *°balaŋ*, ii, 170, 176. *vimokkha°*, ii, 70. *°sampanno*, ii, 245. *bhāvanāya bhāvanāṭtho*, ii, 156.

Bhāveti. *maggaj*, ii, 93, 94.

Bhāvo. *sīti°*, ii, 44.

Bhikkhu, i, 176: ii, 219 *foll.*; 236 *foll.*

Bhisī, i, 176.

Bhūtaŋ. *bhūtato disvā*, i, 159.

Bhūmiyo, *the four*, i, 83, 84.

Bhūri. *°paññā*, ii, 196.

Maggo, 22 *foll.* *ariyatṭhangiko*, i, 28; 281; ii, 56; 86; 140; 147; 166; 174; 219. *angas in detail*, i, 16; 21; 30; 40, 41; 69 *foll.*; 90; 107; 119; 181; ii, 20; 82 *foll.*; 86 *foll.*; 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, *etc.*, I, 105 ; II, 8 ; 30 ; 82 ; 140-142. maggañāṇāni, *the four*, II, 189. maggañāñū, II, 194. maggānugāmī, II, 194. °phalaŋ, I, 84. °visuddhi, II, 3. tathatthēna saccāŋ, II, 105. maggassa maggattho, II, 32 ; 105. sañjāyati, II, 93. sammādiṭṭhiyā, *etc.*, vivekā, virāgā, nirodhā, vossaggā, II, 220. maggo and phalaŋ, II, 140. maggo ca hetu ca, II, 82-84. maggassa hetuttho, I, 17 ; 20 ; 118 ; II, 120.

Mañco, I, 176.

Mañdo, 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. °māyo iddhi, II, 210. °viññāṇaŋ, I, 5.

Maraṇaŋ, I, 59, 60 ; 65, 66, 67 ; II, 147. maceu, I, 38.

Mahaggato. a°, I, 113.

Mahanto, II, 190.

Mahā. °paññā, II, 190. °sālo, II, 72 *foll.*

Mānaso. viggahita°, II, 101.

Mānusako. ātikkanta°, I, 115.

Māno. *the seven*, I, 130. ati°, I, 102 ; II, 197. asmi°, I, 26. asajja°, I, 111. nimāno, I, 82.

Miechattā, *the eight, the ten*, I, 26 ; 130.

Miechādiṭṭhi. I, 45 ; 69 ; 107 ; 140 ; 149 ; 156 ; 158 ; II, 140. micchādiṭṭhiko, I, 115.

Mukhaŋ, I, 176 ; II, 69. vimokkha°, II, 48 ; 67 ; 69.

Muditā, I, 8.

Mudindriyo, I, 121 ; II, 195.

Mūlaj, I, 19; 22; 75; 182; II, 85; 115; 117, 118; 143. aghamūlato, II, 238. iddhiyā mūlāni, II, 206. Menḍako, II, 213. Mettā, cetovimutti, II, 180. Moho, I, 81; 102. vītā°, I, 113. sa° I, 81; 113. nimoho, I, 82.

Yathatthā, *the ten*, I, 173.

Yathābhūtaŋ. yathābhūtañāṇadassanaŋ, I, 38; 43; 45; 47; II, 11; 18.

Yānikato, I, 172; II, 122; 180.

Yuganandhaŋ, I, 16; 70; 74; II, 85; 90; 92; 97 foll.; 119. (Cf. nandīŋ varattañ ca, S. I, 16).

Yogā, *the four*, I, 129.

Yogakkhemo. ayogakkhemakāmo, I, 39. ayogakkhemagāmino, II, 81. yogayutto, II, 81; yogāvacaro, II, 26.

Rajakkho. appa°, mahā°, I, 121; II, 88; 195.

Rajjati, I, 58; 77, 78; 130; 178.

Rāṇo. arāṇavihāro, I, 97.

Rāgo, I, 80, 81; 102; 113. rūpa°, arūpa°, II, 87; 95; 142; 145. nirāgo, I, 80, 82.

Ruci, I, 176.

Rūpaŋ (*khandho*), I, 28; 53; 55; 104; 106; 135; 151-155, 192; II, 96; 102. (āyatanaŋ), I, 79. (matter), I, 118. °kāyo, I, 183. °nimittaŋ, I, 92. rūpā-rammañatā, I, 57. attato samanupassati, I, 148; 149. rūpassa aniccaṭṭho, &c., I, 131. rūpe aniccañupassanā, II, 186, 187. assādo, ādinavo, nissaraṇaŋ, II, 109, 110. 'rūpāni passatī' vimokkho, II, 38.

Ropanaŋ. buddhi°, II, 115.

Lakkhaṇaŋ. khandhānaŋ, I, 54, 55. jhānaŋ, I, 167, 168. saccānaŋ, II, 108. °suññāŋ, II, 179.

Lahu. °paññā, II, 198.

Lālappo, I, 38.
 Leñaj. aleñō, 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, 166. vimokkho, II, 40.

Vajjañ, I, 122. anavajjo, II, 195
 Vaññā, *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.
 Vasi. vasiyo, *the five*, I, 99. °bhāvo, II, 116, 117.
 -Vādo. sassata°, saññī°, etc., I, 155.
 Vāmo, I, 125.
 Vāhanañ. tadupagaviriyā°, I, 31; 34; 172; II, 93; 232.
 Vikkhambhanañ. °suññaj, II, 179.
 Vikkubbanañ. iddhi, II, 174; 210.
 Viggahito. °mānaso, II, 101.
 Vicāro. rūpa°, I, 186.
 Vicikicchā. sa°, I, 81. nivicikicchā, I, 83.
 Vijjā. *the three*, I, 34; II, 56. °māyo, II, 174; 213. °vimutti, II, 243. udapādi, II, 150 *foll.*; 159.
 Avijjā, I, 26; 31; 50-52; 54-57; 76-78; 102; 138; 162; II, 2; 9; 113; 142; 145; 169; 176. ditthi-tthānañ, I, 138. nirujjhati, I, 192, 193.
 Viññānañ (*khandho*), I, 53 *foll.*; 83; 85; 96; 98; 104; 106; 135; 144; 151; 153-155; 190; II, 67; 102. (*nidānan*), I, 50; II, 113. °kāyā, *the six*, II, 181.
 °cariyā, I, 79-81. °cāyatanañ, I, 36. °tthitiyo, *the seven*, I, 22; 122. °nimittañ, I, 93; cakkhu°, etc., II, 234. mano°, I, 5, 40. attato samanupassati, I, 148. °assa aniccaṭṭho, I, 132. assādo, ādīnavo, nissaranāñ, II, 109, 110. nirujjhati, I, 193.
 Viññātañ. a°, II, 31.
 Viññāpayo. su°, du°, I, 121; II, 195.

Viññū, II, 19; 21.
 Vitakko, I, 36. rūpa°, I, 136. avitakko, I, 35. °vip-phārañ, I, 112. uppādo, upatṭhānañ, atthangamo, I, 178, 179. ditṭhitthānañ, I, 188.
 Veditā, I, 179 *foll.*
 Vidūro, su°, II, 198.
 Vidhūpeti, II, 167.
 Viniggaho, I, 16; II, 119.
 Vinibandho. māna°, I, 155, 156; 158.
 Vinetā, II, 194.
 Vipatti. °bhavaloko, °sambhavaloko, I, 122.
 Vipannaditṭhi, I, 160.
 Vipariñāmo, I, 54; 76, 77; 110. °suññaij, II, 178. avipariñādhammo, I, 109.
 Vipassako, I, 167.
 Vipassanā, I, 28; 57, 58; 64; 67; 70; 74; 181; II, 92, 98; 96; 119. °pubbangamañ, II, 92; 96, 97. °balañ, I, 98; II, 172; 176. °vasena ñāñāni, I, 194. samatha°, II, 92; 97 *foll.*; 119. adhipaññādhammavipassanā, I, 20; 25; 33; 45; 47; 169; II, 11, 13.
 Vipallāso, II, 80.
 Vipāko. kamma°, II, 78. dukkha°, II, 79.
 Vippayutto. °pacayo, II, 73, 74. ñāña°, II, 75.
 Vippalāpo, I, 38.
 Vippahāro. ñāña°, samādhi°, II, 174. nānattekattakamma°, I, 113, 114. vitakkavipphāro, I, 112. vippahārattañ, I, 113.
 Vimutti, I, 22; 34; II, 117; 143 *foll.*; 162. (phalañ), II, 140; 143. ceto°, I, 8; 84; 138; II, 180; 176. paññā°, II, 176. micchā°, I, 107. °raso, II, 88. vijjā°, II, 243. sammā°, I, 107; II, 179. °sukhe ñāñāni, I, 195. vimuttāyatanāni, *the fire*, I, 5.
 Vimutto. a°, I, 113; II, 234. saddhā°, II, 52; 56; 61. suvimuttañtho, I, 18.
 Vimokkho, I, 22; 74; 102; 181; II, 243. *the three*, II, 35. nānākhañe, ekakkhañe, II, 65. *the eight*, I, 35. *list of*, II, 35 *foll.* jhāna°, II, 245. °vivañto,

i, 109, 110; ii, 70. *saññāvedayitanirodhasamā-patti*^o, ii, 40.

Vimocayo, i, 191.

Virāgo. *five*, ii, 220 *foll.* maggo, ii, 140. *virāgadhammā*, i, 58; 76; 78. *virāgānupassī*, i, 192. *virāgānupassanā*, ii, 44-47.

Viriyaŋ. *tadupagaviriyavāhanaŋ*, i, 31; 34; 172; ii, 93. *viriyārambho*, i, 103, 104.

Vivatṭanāŋ, ii, 98. *bahiddhavutṭhānavivatṭanāŋ*, i, 66; *dubhatovutṭhānavivatṭanāŋ*, i, 69.

Vivatṭo. *citta*^o, i, 108; 110; ii, 70. *ceto*^o, i, 108; 110; ii, 70. *ñāṇa*^o, i, 109, 110; ii, 70. *vi-mokkha*^o, i, 109, 110; ii, 70. *sacca*^o, i, 110; ii, 70. *saññā*^o, i, 107; 110; ii, 70.

Vivādamūlāni, *the six*, i, 130.

Viveko, ii, 117, 118; 173. *fire*, ii, 220 *foll.*

Visaŋyutto. (vimokkho), ii, 41.

Visāri. *avisaři*, i, 15; 49.

Visineti, ii, 167.

Visuddhi, ii, 3; 116, 117; 244. *the three, in detail*, i, 21; ii, 85; 90. *dassana*^o, i, 105. *paṭipadā*^o, i, 167.

Visodhanaŋ *ādi*^o, ii, 21; 23.

Vihāro, ii, 20. *anupubba*^o, i, 5. *araṇa*^o, i, 97. *ditthadhammasukha*^o, i, 84. *°samāpatti*, i, 91; 93, 94.

Vīmaŋsā, i, 19; ii, 123.

Vuṭṭhānaŋ. *bahiddhāvutṭhāno*, i, 66; ii, 36-38. *du-bhatovutṭhāno*, 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 *foll.* *the three*, i, 22; 122. *°anupassanā*, i, 187; ii, 152, 153; 168; 253. *°kāyā, the six*, ii, 181, 182. *nidānā, &c.*, ii, 112. *°nimittanā*, i, 98. *attato samanupassati*, i, 145. *vedanāya aniccaṭṭho, &c.*, i, 132. *assādo, ādīnavo, nissa-raṇaŋ*, ii, 109, 110. *uppādo, upaṭṭhānaŋ, atthan-gamo*, i, 178. *nirujjhati*, i, 198.

Venateyyaŋ, II, 196.

Vebhabyā, I, 119.

Vesārajjaŋ. catuvesārajjappatto, II, 194.

Vodānaŋ, I, 166.

Vossaggo, I, 109; II, 117, 118; 245. *the two*, II, 24, 25.
indriyānaŋ vossaggo°, II, 223. sammādiṭṭhiyā,
etc., II, 221.

Vyañjanaŋ, 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. °maggio. *See* Maggo (cattāro
maggā).

Sakkāyadīṭṭhi, 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; 185; 158-155; 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-
taŋ, I, 66; 68; 93. °suññaŋ, II, 178. kiŋ-nidāna,
etc., II, 113. attato sammanupassati, I, 147.
sankhārānaŋ aniccaṭṭhaŋ, I, 132. assādo, ādinavo,
nissaraṇaŋ, II, 109, 110. nirujjhati, I, 193.

Sangahavatthūni, *the four*, I, 84.

Sangahito. cattāri saccāni ekasangahitāni, II, 105 *fol.*

Sangaho. sangahabalāŋ, II, 170; 176.

Sangho. sanghānussati, I, 48.

Saŋyutto. (vimokkho), II, 41.

Saiyoyanāŋ, I, 143 *fol.*; 171; II, 92; 94; *the seven*,
I, 130; *the ten*, I, 130. kāmāraga°, patigha°, I,

70; 72, 73; II, 37; 83; 94; 141; 144. *taṇhā°*, I, 127.

Saṇyogo, I, 19. *°ṭṭhitī*, I, 50. *saṇyogābhiniveso*, I, 38; 46, 47; II, 13.

Saccañ, II, 104 *foll.*; 120. *saccapaṭivedho*, II, 57; 61. *saccavivatṭo*, I, 110; II, 70. *ariyasaccāni, the four*, I, 5; II, 14; 19; 225; *in detail*, I, 8, 9; 37; 86; 105; 118, 119; 138; II, 16; 18; 57; 61, 62; 104 *foll.*; 147 *foll.*; 151; 157.

Sacchikiriyā, II, 120; 156. *sotāpattiphalā°*, *etc.*, 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 vedayitāñ*), I, 107; *list of*, I, 32; 45; 47; 49. *°kāyā, the six*, II, 181, 182. *°nimittāñ*, 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. *°vivatṭo*, I, 107; II, 70. *saññāya aniccattho*, 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*, *nissaraṇaŋ*, II, 109, 110. *uppādo*, *upatṭhānaŋ*, *atthangamo*, I, 179. *ditthitṭhānaŋ*, I, 138.

Saññogo. *See* Saṇyogo.

Sati, I, 176, 177; 183; 187. *asati*, I, 54. *ānāpāna°*, I, 166; 172. *ānāpānasatisamādhi*, I, 164, 165; 185, 186; 196.

Satipatṭhānaŋ, II, 85; 90; 120; 161; *the four*, I, 28; 84; II, 14, 15; 18; 56; 86; 166; 174; 225. *kāye kāyānupassanā*, *etc.*, II, 152; 232. *°bhāvanā*, I, 184; 186, 187; II, 232.

Satokāri, I, 175 *foll.*

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.

Sapariyuttāhānaŋ, I, 72.

Sabbaññutā, I, 174. °ñāṇaŋ, I, 131-134; 174.

Sabrahmacāri, I, 19; 21.

Sabhāgo. sabhāgasuññaŋ, II, 181.

Samaŋ, I, 102; 173; 180; II, 281. sa°, I, 173.

Samattho, I, 180.

Samatho, I, 28: 64; 67; 70; II, 92, 93; 96; 119.

°balāŋ, I, 97; II, 172; 176. °vipassanā, II, 92; 97
foll.; 119.

Samanto. °cakkhu, I, 133; II, 31. assamantapaññā,
II, 193.

Samayo. °vimokkho, II, 40.

Samādiññaŋ, 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, āc, 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*
(ariyatāhangiko). sotāpattiphala°, āc, 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. °suññaŋ, II, 180.

Samudayo, I, 55-57, 58; II, 4, 5, 6; 32.

Samodāhanaŋ, 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.

Sampahansā, I, 167.

Samphasso, I, 5; 40; 136. samphassajo, I, 6; 38; 40; 136; 145. ceto°, I, 38.

Sambuddho. sammā°, I, 48; II, 3; 194; 203; 225.

Sammappadhānaŋ. *See* Padhānaŋ.

Sambojjhango. *See* Bojjhango.

Sambodho, II, 109.

Sammasanaŋ, I, 53.

Sammādiṭṭhi, II, 82 *foll.* °samādānaŋ, II, 81. *See also* Maggo (ariyatṭhangiko).

Sarīraŋ, I, 153.

Salāyatanaŋ, I, 50. 51; II, 113. kijnidānaŋ, &c., II, 112. nirujjhati, I, 193.

Sallino. a°, I, 173. asallīnattāŋ, 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.

Saŋhāni, I, 37.

Sātaŋ. asātaŋ, I, 38.

Sāraddho, I, 165. a°, I, 173.

Sāro, I, 75, 76. sārādānābhiniveso, I, 33; II, 13.

Sāvako, II, 140.

Sigho. sīghapaññā, II, 198.

Sikkhā, II, 119; *the three*, I, 46; 48; 184; 186; II, 56. °padaŋ, I, 43.

Sitisayo. sitisiyāvimokkho, II, 48.

Silaŋ. silāni, *the five*, I, 42 *foll.*; 46. adhi°, II, 243.

Silabbataŋ. sakkāyadiṭṭhivicikicchāsilabbataparāmāso, II, 36; 94.

Sīsaŋ. sama°, II, 230; *the thirteen*, I, 102.

Sukko, I, 80; 82; 83; II, 79.

Sukhaŋ. 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.

Suññaij, II, 100. suññato vimokkho, II, 36; 59-62; 65 *foll.* suññāgāragato, I, 175.

Suññatānupassanā, II, 43; 46, 47; 63.

Suñño, I, 176; II, 177 *foll.* tadanga°, II, 180.

Sutamayo, I, 4; 22; 26, 27, 28; 34, 35; 37; 42.

Suttantiko. suttantikavatthūni, I, 186.

Suppahīnattaij, II, 2.

Subho, II, 39; 80. asubhā, *enumeration of*, I, 49; 95. asubhaj asubhataddasuj, II, 81.

Sekho, I, 42; 61 *foll.*; II, 27 *foll.* sekhabalāni, asekhabalāni, *the ten*, II, 173; 176.

Senāvyūho, II, 213.

Soko. sokasallaŋ, I, 38.

Socittattaij, I, 38.

Sotāpatti. sotāpattiyangāni, *the four*, II, 14; 16. °maggakkhaṇe, II, 217. °maggo. *See Maggo (cattāro maggā).*

Sotāpanno, I, 161; II, 193, 194.

Sotāvadhānaŋ, I, 4; 22; 26, 27, 28; 34, 35; 37; 42.

Hammiyaŋ, I, 176.

Hāso. hāsapāññā, II, 185; 199.

Hiri. °balaj, II, 169; 176.

Hiriyati, II, 169; 176.

Hetu, II, 116-119.

V

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 aggīj jalitāj apāpataj,

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' akkhij va ghattitāj, J. vi., 294.

pārevatakkhi, J. vi., 456.

„ *Aggi*: yo mittānaj na dūbhati . . . aggi yathā
pajjālati, J. vi., 14.

hemantaggi sikhāriva, J. vi., 456.

aggisikhūpamā, J. vi., 537.

kapputthānaggi viya, J. vi., 554.

Under Angāra (2) : *cf.* A. iv., 324.

„ Acci: acci vātena khittā dūrañ gacchati, S. iv., 399.

mañiq accimantañ, J. vi., 279.

„ Aññava (1) : S. ii., 158.

Before 21, Adhikutṭanā.

(1) khandhāsañ, S. i., 128.

(2) khandhānañ, Thig. 58, 142.

Under Andha: andhakāragabbhañ pavitthā 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 hadayañ, J. vi., 549.

Under Assa: assañ va sambandhañ . . . vijjhasi, J. vi., 439.

khalunken' eva sindhavo, J. vi., 452.

„ Ahi: ahī va ucchangagato daseyya, J. vi., 437.

„ Ākāsa: sabbaso ākāsasamena cetasañ viharati, A. iii., 315.

„ Ādāsa: suvaññādāsasadisañ mukhañ, J. vi., 451.

„ Ādicca (5) : = J. vi., 447.

„ Āsīvisa: daññena ghaṭṭitāsīviso viya, J. vi., 456.

„ Īsā (2) : *cf.* J. vi., 488, 490.

„ Ulūka: ulūkañ ñeva vāyasañ, J. vi., 508.

Before 91, Oṭṭha (lip): bimbotṭha, J. vi., 456. *See also* Gīva (addendum).

After Kadali. Kaddamañ : paradārañ vivajjeyya dhota-pādo vā kaddamañ, J. vi., 240.

Before 107, Kañikāra: kañikāra va samphullā, J. vi., 188.

kañikāra va nivātapupphito, J. vi., 269.

Under Kadali: kadali va vātācchupitā, J. vi., 590.

„ Kali: ayam eva mahantaro kali, A. ii., 3.

„ „ pubbe kali duggahito va, J. vi., 234.

„ Kāka: ledduñ gahetvā kāko viya . . . palāpessāmi, J. vi., 399 ; *cf.* 428, 443.

After 120: Kānana: kānanaŋ va . . . (aggo), Thig. v. 254.
 „ 124: Kālā (kālā) kālā taruṇā va uggatā, J. vi., 269.
 „ 128: Kīto. kīto va aggiŋ jalitaŋ apāpataŋ, J. vi., 234.

Under Kukkuṭa: baddhakukkuṭā viya, J. vi., 406.
 „ Kukkuṭī: pahaṭakukkuṭī viya, J. vi., 565.
 „ Kuñjara (4): cf. J. vi., 443.
 „ Kuṇapa: rajjasiriŋ kunapaŋ viya chaddetva, J. vi., 18.

Before 145: Kurarī. kurarī hatachāpā va, J. vi., 189; = 500.

„ Kūṭāgāra: Kūṭā. kūṭaŋ gaṇhanti viya, J. vi., 478.

After 158: Khomā. khomā va tattha padumā, J. vi., 534.
 Before 169: Gādha. See Uda kaṇṇava.

Under Gīva: attālakā otṭhagīviyo, J. vi., 269.
 „ Guhā: sīharakkhitā guhā viya, J. vi., 395.
 „ Go: carantaŋ gonaŋ paharantaŋ viya, J. vi., 225.

After 176: Goṭavisa. yathā goṭaviso tathā, J. vi., 225.
 „ 179: Cakkavāka. cakkavākīva pallalasmīŋ anūdake, J. vi., 189; = 501.

Under Cakkhu: dvīhi cakkhūhi visālaŋ 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 pākaṭo, J. vi., 470.

After 185: Camma. yathāpi āsabhaŋ cammaŋ . . . san-kusamāhataŋ, 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 nāgadantaŋ kharena, J. vi., 261.

After 189: Chakalī. chakalī va . . . nikkhāmiŋ, J. vi., 559.

Under Chatta. 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 : satarajṣīva tārakā, J. vi., 448.

„ Tittha : (3) kalyānatitthaṇ supipiṇi . . . rahadūpamaṇi, J. vi., 526.

„ Tulā : (2) tulā yathā paggahitā . . . unnameti, J. vi., 235 ; cf. 292.

„ (3) hatthena tulento viya, J. vi., 372.

„ Deva (6) : devaputtā va Nandane, J. vi., 449.

(7) : devarājaliḥāya, J. vi., 450.

„ Dhanka (4) : hajṣarājai yathā dhanko anujavai, J. vi., 452.

„ Dhaja : (3) dhammadhajo dhammaketu, A. iii., 150.
: (4) dhajo rathassa paññāṇaṇi bhattā . . . itthiyā, J. vi., 508.

„ Dhana : (2) kotṭhe ṭhapitadhanaṇi viya khepetvā, J. vi., 362.

„ Dhūma : (6) dhūmo paññāṇaṇi 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 . . . atibhāraṇi . . . avasīdati, J. vi., 234.

(14) yānanāvā ca me hotha, J. vi., 546.

„ Nikkha (4) : cf. J. vi., 290; 574.

„ Nigrodha (3) : = S. i., 207.

(4) bhūtappubbai . . . Supatiṭṭho nāma nigrodharājā ahosi, A. iii., 369.

„ Nidhi (5) : nidhi va udakantike, J. vi., 237.

„ Nemi : rathacakkaṇi viya vajṣai ghaṭento, J. vi., 96.

„ Pakkhī : (1) pakkhiva 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 Pañña. *See also Sijsapā*.

„ *Patta*. *See Paduma, Pavāla*.

„ *Paduma* : padumaj yathā hatthagataj . . . mu-
khaij, J. vi., 187; = 263; cf. 578.
padumapattato udakam iva, J. vi., 331.
S. īsakapoṇe paduminipatte udakaphusi-
tāni pavattanti, M. iii., 300.

„ *Pannaga* : (2) peṭābaddhaj va pannagaj, J. vi.,
443.

„ *Pabbata* : (19) pupphābhikinnaj Himavaj va, J.
vi., 272.

: (20) pabbatamatto soko, J. vi., 385.

: (21) setaj kelāsasadisaj, J. vi., 490.

„ *Pallanka*. S. gahapatissa . . . pallanko, A. iv., 231.

„ *Pavāla* : (3) vedhaj assatthapattaj va, J. vi., 548.

After 321 : *Paṭhīna*. paṭhīnavāṇṇā nettijsā, J. vi., 449.
„ 325 : *Pāda*. *See Kaddamaj*.

Under Pāvaka : bhasmācchanno va pāvako, J. vi., 236.

„ *Pītā* : sakij pītā va māṇavā, J. vi., 528.

After Purejavaŋ : *Peta*. yathā petaj susānasmij, J. vi.,
464.

„ *Phālāpācana, Phāleti*. udaraj phāletva . . .
viya, J. vi., 384.

Under Balisa : (3) cf. [J.] vi., 432.

Before 361 : *Bhattapātī*. bhattapātiyaj kacavaraj
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.

„ *Makkata* : (6) dhanuj gahetvā makkato viya, J. vi.,
899.

„ *Magga* : (12) ujumaggaj avahāya kummaggaj, J.
vi. 234.
icchā . . . kummaggo ujumaggo ca
sajyamo, J. vi., 252.

Under Maccha (2) : = J. vi., 236.

(8) maccho va maraṇaij attānaij, 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) dohaṭāyasi . . . Mālutaŋ, J. vi., 263.

„ Miga: migaij pathānupannaij va, J. vi., 416.

migachāpā va, J. vi., 456.

migo kūṭe va ohito, J. vi., 437.

migā viya ukkanṇā, 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 rajjaŋ phalitarukkhasadisaij,
pabbajjā nipphalarukkhasadisā, J.
iii., 377; = vi., 45.

(29) yathā rukkho tathā rājā, yathā sākhā,
tathā ahaŋ, J. vi., 18.

(30) yathā ambo phalī hato, J. vi., 61.

(31) sālā va . . . mālutenā pamadditā,
J. vi., 189.

(32) acchechchuij . . . rukkhaij . . . yathā
Vessantaraŋ . . . pabbajenti, J. vi.,
502.

„ Latṭha: (2) bhujalatṭhīva . . . tanumajjhimā,
J. vi., 456.

„ Vaccha: (after 4) vacchadantamukhā senā, J. vi.,
448.

vacchā bālā va mātaraij, J. vi.,
557.

„ Vadhaka: (4) S. ukkhittāsike vadake, A. iii., 443;
= iv., 52.

„ Vana: (8) sālavanaŋ viya nirantaraŋ, 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., 108 ; cf. i., 164

: (14) *thānā vāto va dharanīruhaj*, J. vi., 482.

After 465 : *Vāyaso*. *See* *Ulūka*.

„ „ *Vāraṇo*. *kesarasihena 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) *suvaṇṇavālukaj uddharaj viya*, J. vi., 363.

„ *Vijju* (4) : cf. vi., 278 ; 313.

(5) *kañcanapattena . . . vijjuvaṇṇinā*, J. vi., 217.

(6) *vijju v'abbhaghanantare*, J. vi., 449. *See also* *Sateratā (addendum)*.

„ *Visa, after (12)* : *kammānaj phalaŋ . . . dutṭhavisaj yathā*, J. vi., 237.

After Visa : *Visāṇa*. *See* *Go*.

„ 483 : *Veluriya*. *veluriyavaṇṇasannibhaj*, J. vi., 534.

Velli. *vellīva tanumajjhimā*, J. vi., 456.

Under Vyaggha : (2) *Indasadisehi vyaggheh' eva surakkhitaj*, J. vi., 125.

(3) *viyaggharajassa nihinajacco*, J. vi., 291.

„ *Sakuna* : *sakunī mānusinīva*, J. vi., 590.

After 487 : *Sakkabhavana*. *Sakkabhavanaŋ viya alankata-patiyattan*, J. vi., 46.

Under Sangāma : (1) = *M. iii., 67*.

(3) *yathā āgantvā sangāmanay ayuddho*, J. vi., 524.

After Sañcaya : *Sateratā*. *sateratā abbham iva*, J. vi., 281.

Under Sappa: (6) *uddhatadathā viya sappā*, J. vi., 389.
 (7) *sappadaṭṭhaŋ va māṇavaŋ*, J. vi., 585.
 „ *Samudda*: (17) *samuddo viya ajjhottharanto*, J. vi., 404.
 „ *Sāgara*: (3) *velantam iva sāgaro*, J. vi., 226.
 (4) *yaŋ udadhiŋ . . . so sāgaro . . .*
 velaŋ na ucceti mahāsammuddo,
 J. vi., 358.
 (5) *parivarayissaŋ . . . Jambudipan va*
 sāgaro, J. vi., 464.

After Sāgara: *Sāna*. *See Vāka* (*addendum*).

Under Sārathi: (11) *aniddhināŋ . . . damet' assaŋ 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) *vijambhissāŋ sīhavijambhitāni*, J. vi.,
 373; *cf.* 404.
 (24) *sīho viya asambhīto*, J. vi., 396; 404.
 (25) *sīhī vāmisagiddhinī*, J. vi., 559.
 (26) *sīhā bilā va nikkhānā*, J. vi., 574. *See*
 also Guhā.
 „ *Sukka*: (2) *M. i.*, 319; *A. iii.*, 406.
 (4) *akanhaŋ asukkaŋ nibbānaŋ abhijāyati*,
 A. iii., 387.
 „ *Sunakha*: (2) *dadhīŋ pātuŋ āraddhasunakho viya*,
 J. vi., 358.
 „ *Suriya*: (10) *suriyo va patito chamā*, J. vi., 89.
 (11) *dohaṭāyasi suriyaŋ*, J. vi., 268.
 (12) *gaganamajhe suriyaŋ utṭhāpento*
 viya, J. vi., 376.
 (13) *Rāhugahitāŋ va sūriyaŋ*, J. vi., 443.
 „ *Hatthi*: *hatthi kantavīṇāsarena paluddhā . . .*
 viya, J. vi., 262. *See also Nāga*.
 „ *Hansa*: (10) *hajṣā 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 . . . jhānakko*, S. v., 6.
- (5) *avihīṇsāsāritakkho*, 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* vīsañvassasatiko.

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* Pit.

p. 74, l. 24, *for* although *read* because.

p. 77, l. 7, *read* Māhākāśyapa.

p. 78, l. 1, *after* pitaka *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.

1. Journal.
2. *Buddhavaṇsa* and *Cariyā Piṭaka*.
3. *Āyāranga*.

1883.

1. Journal.
2. *Thera-therī-gāthā*.
3. *Puggala-Paññatti*.

1884.

1. Journal.
2. *Saṅyutta*, Vol. I.

1885.

1. Journal.
2. *Anguttara*, Part I.
3. *Dhamma-Saṅgaṇi*.
4. *Udāna*.

1886.

1. Journal.
2. *Sumangala*, Vol. I.
3. *Vimāna-Vatthu*.

1887.

1. Journal.
2. *Majjhima*, Vol. I.

1888.

1. Journal.
2. *Saṅyutta*, Vol. II.
3. *Anguttara*, Part II.

1889.

1. Journal.
2. *Dīgha*, Vol. I.
3. *Peta-Vatthu*.

1890.

1. Journal.
2. *Saṅyutta*, Vol. III.
3. *Itivuttaka*.

1891.

1. Journal, 1891–1893.
2. *Mahā-Bodhi-Vaṇsa*.

1892.

1. *Dhātu-Kathā*.
2. *Therīgāthā* Cy.

1893.

1. *Saṅyutta*, Vol. IV.
2. *Sutta-Nipāta* Glossary.

1894.

1. *Peta-Vatthu* Cy.
2. *Kathā-Vatthu*, Vol. I.

1895.

1. *Anguttara*, Part III.
2. *Kathā-Vatthu*, Vol. II.

1896.

1. Journal, 1893–1896.
2. *Yogāvacara's Manual*.
3. *Majjhima*, Vol. II., Part 1.

1897.	1903.
1. Attha-Sālinī.	1. Dīgha, Vol. II.
2. Sāsana-Vaṇsa.	2. Journal, 1902-1903.
1898.	1904.
1. Sañyutta, Vol. V.	1. Sañyutta, Vol. VI. (Indexes).
2. Majjhima, Vol. II., Part 2.	2. Vibhanga.
1899.	1905.
1. Anguttara, Part IV.	1. Patisambhidā, 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 Comy, I.
1901.	1907.
1. Vimāna-Vatthu Cy.	1. Journal, 1906-7.
2. Journal, 1897-1901.	2. Patisambhidā, Vol. II.
1902.	1908.
1. Netti-Pakaraṇa.	1. Journal, 1908.
2. Majjhima, Vol. III., Part 3.	2. Mahāvaṇsa.

Total, 26 years; 46 texts; 63 volumes; 17,600 pages.

II.—INDEX TO TEXTS.

NAME.	Net Subscription Price.	£	s.	d.
1. Anāgata-Vaṇsa (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-Vaṇsa (together with No. 7) ...	0 14 0			
7. Cariyā-Piṭaka (1882)	0 14 0			
8. Cha-kesa-dhātu-Vaṇsa (in <i>Journal</i> for 1885)				

II.—INDEX TO TEXTS—*continued.*

NAME.	Net Subscription Price. £ s. d.
9. Dāthā-Vaṇsa (in <i>Journal</i> for 1884)
10. Dhammapada Commentary, vol. 1 (1906) ...	0 10 6
11. Dhamma-Saṅgāṇī (1885)	0 10 6
12. Dhātu Kathā (1892)	0 10 6
13. Digha-Nikāya, 2 vols. (third nearly ready) ...	1 1 0
14. Duka-Paṭṭhāna (1906)	0 10 6
15. Gandha-Vaṇsa (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. Mahāvaṇsa (1908)	0 10 6
22. Mahā-Bodhi-Vaṇsa (1891)	0 10 6
23. Majjhima-Nikāya, 3 vols.	1 11 6
24. Mūla-Sikkhā (in <i>Journal</i> for 1883)
25. Netti-Pakarāṇa (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. Sañyutta-Nikāya, 6 vols.	3 3 0
33. Sad-dhamma-sangaha (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-Vaṇsa (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-katāha-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-Vaṇja. Index to the Gandha-vajsa (1896). Index to Pali words discussed in Translations (1901). Early Pali Grammarians in Burma (1908).

Carpenter, J. E. ; ed. of Dīgha and Sumangala-Vilāsinī.

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 Sañyutta, 5 vols; and of Pañca-gati Dipana.

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 *Mahāvāyasa*.

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 *Mahāvāyasa* (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-vanśa* (1885), *Anāgata-vanśa* (1886), *Gandha-Vanśa* (1886), *Sīmā 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-vanśa*, *Cariyā-pitaka*, *Puggala-paññatti*, and *Saddhammopāyana* (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-sangani*, 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, Abhidhamma-tha-sangaha, Dāthā-Vaṇya, 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 Saṃyutta (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 Vaṇya.

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 Paṭṭakopadesa, 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 Devavanya 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 Riddings	...	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
		<hr/>	<hr/>	<hr/>
		£829	4	0

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-sangāni*, the *Vibhanga*, and the *Pattihāna*, I.

STATEMENT OF ACCOUNT FOR 1907.

RECEIPTS.	£	s.	d.	EXPENDITURE.	£	s.	d.
Balance at Bank January, 1907	550	3	8	Printing
By Subscriptions	190	12	6	Publisher's Charges
" Donations	...	5	5	Insurance of Stock
" Sale of Back Issues	42	17	0	Yearbooks
" Returned Insurance	0	7	10	Stationery, Typing, Loss by Exchange,
, Interest at Bank	36	8	6	Binding, Postage
				Transferred to Dictionary account
				Balance at Bank December 31, 1907	588	7	5
					£825	14	6