

JOURNAL  
OF  
THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY.

---

ART. X.—*Pāli Elements in Chinese Buddhism: a Translation of Buddhaghosa's Samanta-pāsādikā, a Commentary on the Vinaya, found in the Chinese Tripitaka.* By J. TAKAKUSU, B.A.

WHETHER we possess among the numerous Buddhist books preserved in China any text translated from a Pāli original, is a question which has not as yet been quite settled. Several scholars have answered it positively or negatively, but no one until now has brought forward an undeniable fact in support of his opinion. The object of my present note is to decide this point, and to introduce to the Society a text of Pāli origin in Chinese.

The canonical Buddhist books are collectively called by the Japanese, as well as by the Chinese, the San-ts'ang, "Tripitaka" (三藏), though we must never understand by this term what is meant by the term "Piṭakattayaṃ" in Pāli. The former contains, as Professor Rhys Davids has rightly pointed out,<sup>1</sup> a number of works outside of the canon, and even Brahmanical treatises—for instance, the Sāṅkhya-kārikā-bhāṣya (Nanjio's Catal., No. 1300). The Chinese translations of Indian works are arranged in three Piṭakas, Sūtra, Vinaya, and Abhidharma, as in the Pāli.

<sup>1</sup> See Milinda, pt. ii, p. xi, note (S.B.E., vol. xxxvi).

These amount to some 1320 texts, some of which are a second or third translation of one and the same original. Besides these there are the so-called "Indian Miscellaneous Works," numbering 147. That these 1467 texts might include some of the Pāli works now existing in Ceylon, Burma, and Siam, was an opinion advanced by some scholars. We are, however, left ignorant of the names of the dialects from which the translations were made, for no Chinese author mentions them distinctly. The Indian language in general, whether Prākṛit, Pāli, or Sanskrit, is indiscriminately called the "language of Fan,"<sup>1</sup> *i.e.* Brahmins, which is generally understood to be identical with Sanskrit. But there is no reason whatever why it should not mean also any other Indian dialect,<sup>2</sup> for India is called the "Kingdom of Fan," perhaps meant for "Brahma-rāṣṭra."

As to the existence of the Pāli elements in China, Prof. Max Müller says in his "Introduction to the Science of Religion"<sup>3</sup>: "In China, although the prevailing form of Buddhism is that of the Sanskrit canon, commonly called the northern canon, some of the books belonging to the Pāli, or southern canon, have been translated, and are held in reverence by certain schools."

Dr. Eitel, in his "Handbook of Chinese Buddhism" (1870), seems to think, as his preface and the article "Saṃskṛita" show, that the Chinese texts are from Pāli as well as from Sanskrit. He says:<sup>4</sup> "The most ancient Chinese texts seem to be translations from Pāli, the more modern texts from Sanskrit. Hiuen Tshang found (about 635 A.D.) in the Punjab little difference between Sanskrit and Pāli."

I do not know, however, on what ground his conjecture is formed, and I doubt whether Hiuen Tshang really meant Pāli and Sanskrit. It is certain that most of the texts

<sup>1</sup> See Julien, "Méthode pour déchiffrer et transcrire les noms sanscrits," etc. (1861), p. 2 note; p. 8.

<sup>2</sup> Saṃghabhadra actually calls the Pāli text "fan-pên," *i.e.* "Text of the Brahman (language)."

<sup>3</sup> 1873; 2nd ed. 1893, p. 63.

<sup>4</sup> 2nd ed. 1888, p. 144<sup>b</sup>.

which, for instance, Hiuen Tshang or I-tsing had before them were Sanskrit, for their transliterations are so clear and accurate that we can easily trace the words to the original sounds. But in the case of the earlier translators it is by no means easy to form an opinion as to the dialect of the original.<sup>1</sup>

Mr. C. F. Koeppen, in his "Religion des Buddha," says<sup>2</sup> that the Chinese possess, besides Sanskrit texts, a number of Pāli works, which they obtained probably from Ceylon through some of their travellers. His statement, however, rests only on the authority of Gützlaff, who misunderstood almost every Sanskrit transliteration as Pāli, as may be seen in the Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1848, Vol. IX, pp. 199–213. Gützlaff's "List of Principal Works from the Pāli in Chinese Characters" contains some 156 works, not one of which presents the appearance of Pāli origin; among them are even such well-known Sanskrit works as the Vajracchedikā, Amitābha-sūtra, and the like. Afterwards, in 1880, when Chinese Buddhism had been studied with a greater accuracy, Dr. Edkins positively asserted that there are no Pāli books in China.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, in speaking about Koeppen's statement, he says: "Koeppen, saying that the Chinese have also a number of Pāli texts, has been misled by Gützlaff, who, coming to China after having lived in Siam, saw the Sanskrit inscriptions in the island of P'uto and took them to be Pāli. From him the opinion spread; but it is an error. The Buddhists of Burma, Siam, and Ceylon<sup>4</sup> have never spread their religion in China or Japan, or introduced their sacred books into those countries." His was, I think, the last attempt at solution, which aims at

<sup>1</sup> Take, for instance, the "Sha-mên": although it is nearer to Pāli "Samaṇo" than to Skt. "Śramaṇa," yet we have no right to judge from it that the original was Pāli, for we meet with "Sha-mên" also in those texts whose original is Sanskrit. But when we come across the word "Sha-lo-mo-na" (舍羅摩拏), we see at once that it can only be from Sanskrit Śramaṇa.

<sup>2</sup> 1857, vol. i, p. 186 note.

<sup>3</sup> See "Chinese Buddhism," ch. xxv, p. 401.

<sup>4</sup> Compare, however, note 1, p. 419.

the greatest precision among the opinions yet produced. The result of his research was that the early translations were from Prākṛit, and not from Pāli, as Dr. Eitel supposed.

Now as to the third council of the Buddhists under the great Asoka, which is generally believed to be unknown to Chinese Buddhists, Mr. O. Palladji, in his interesting "Historische Skizzen des alten Buddhismus,"<sup>1</sup> drawn up from Chinese sources, mentions at length Asoka's council as well as the two former ones. One may well wonder why Mr. S. Beal, more than twenty years later, informed Prof. Oldenberg that Asoka's council is not found mentioned in the Chinese Piṭaka.<sup>2</sup> It may be due to Beal's oversight, or he may have had some ground for asserting this.<sup>3</sup> He expressed more than once, if I remember well, the opinion that there is a trace of Pāli in the Chinese collection; but on examining the original on which his supposition rests, I found nothing to indicate its Pāli origin.

In the thorough examination of the Tripiṭaka by my friend Bunyiu Nanjio, he found no Pāli text, and traced most of the books to Sanskrit, and compared them with Tibetan texts, the names of which, at any rate, he, when possible, restored into Sanskrit.

It is thus well-nigh settled that the Chinese books, on the whole, are translations from the Sanskrit original, and that there is no Pāli work in China, and no mention of the Council of Pāṭaliputta in the Chinese Buddhist books.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Erman's "Russisches Archiv für Wissenschaftliche Kunde" (1856), Band xv, pp. 206 and foll.

<sup>2</sup> See Oldenberg, "Vinaya-piṭakam" (1879-82), vol. i, p. xxxii.

<sup>3</sup> We see with M. Barth the importance of a complete examination of the contents of the Chinese Piṭaka ("Religions of India," Engl. p. 108 note). One can give two or three quite different accounts from Chinese sources, which are a mixture of various elements. Compare, for instance, Wassilief's "Buddhismus," in which many pieces of information from the Chinese are identical with the Tibetan, with Palladji's "Historische Skizzen," which are not very much different from the Sinhalese chronicle.

<sup>4</sup> I should be sorry if I have omitted any later authorities who touched these questions, and would welcome any communications about them.

I for my part doubted from the beginning the idea that there was not a single text in Pāli brought to China by any one of those 173 translators we know of, some of whom came from Southern India, from Ceylon, or from Siam,<sup>1</sup> others of whom are said to have collected books in Ceylon as well as in India,<sup>2</sup> to say nothing of those Chinese travellers who went to Ceylon to search for the law.<sup>3</sup> He who brought a MS. may not have translated it himself, but may have left it behind to his successors to translate. Had there been a MS. there is no reason whatever why they should not translate it, seeing that several Hīnayāna works were interpreted and preserved in the Chinese collection. Resting on this supposition, I have been for some time looking for a text of Pāli origin. My attention was naturally directed to the texts bearing on the Indian Chronology, while perusing many a work without any result. At last I came across a text which contains an account of the third Buddhist Council at Pāṭaliputta under the great Asoka. Besides, this book has the following stanzas, which have been hitherto found only in Pāli and not in Sanskrit books:—

*Pāli.*

Anekajāṭisaṃsāraṃ sandhāvissaṃ anibbisam  
 Gahakāraṃ gavesanto dukkhā jāti punappunam  
 Gahakāraṃ diṭṭho 'si puna geḥam na kāhasi  
 Sabbā te phāsukā bhaggā gahakūṭam viṣaṃkhitam  
 Viṣaṃkhāratam cittaṃ taṇhānaṃ khayam ajjhaḅagā 'ti.

<sup>1</sup> One from Ceylon, three from Siam, four from S. India, and one Javanese. Nanjio's Catal., App. ii, Nos. 92; 101, 102, 107; 111, 131, 150, 153; 138.

<sup>2</sup> *l.c.*, Nos. 137, 155.

<sup>3</sup> *e.g.* Fā-hien and nine of those sixty travellers recorded by I-tsing went to Ceylon. See Chavannes, "Mémoire sur les Religieux Éminents," par I-tsing (Paris, 1894), §§ 20-2, 24, 28, 29, 32, 49, 52.

*Chinese.*

愛	心	碎	一	不	今	更	正	走	流
盡	已	折	切	復	已	生	覓	去	轉
至	離	不	脊	更	見	生	屋	無	非
涅	煩	復	肋	作	汝	辛	住	厭	一
槃	惱	生	骨	屋	屋	苦	處	患	生

A translation from the Chinese :

(I have been) running through the transmigration of many a birth without hate or grief just to seek for the place of the abode (of Corporeity); rebirths (indeed) produce a bitter pain. But now I have seen thy house. Thou shalt not build thy house again. All thy ridge and ribs are shattered, (so as) not to be born anew. The heart has been separated from thirst (passion), and, as all desires have been exhausted, it has reached its Nirvāṇa.<sup>1</sup>

These stanzas are the words which the Buddha is supposed to have uttered at the moment he attained to Buddhahood. The Lalita Vistara does not seem to know these verses—in any case, not as the first words of the founder of Buddhism; for it gives (ch. xxii) quite a different verse as the Buddha's first words: "The vices are dried up; they will not flow again" (śuṣkā āśravā na punaḥ śravanti).<sup>2</sup>

The text which contained those verses appeared to me, at first sight, as if it were a portion of the Dīpavaṃsa or Mahāvāṃsa, inasmuch as it gives the three councils,

<sup>1</sup> The Pāli is to be found in the Sumaṅgala-vilāsīnī (p. 16), in the Samantapāsādikā (but not in Oldenberg's text), Buddhavaṃsa, Dhammapada (Max Müller, §§ 153, 154). Turnour's translation in the J.R.A.S. Bengal, vi, p. 523; Hardy, "Manual," p. 180; D'Alwis, "Nirvāṇa," p. 78; Oldenberg, "Buddha," etc., p. 211 (English, p. 195); Rhys Davids, "Buddhist Birth Stories," pp. 103, 104.

<sup>2</sup> Mr. Mitra's edition, p. 448; Max Müller, "Dhammapada," 39 note (S.B.E., p. 13).

Asoka's devotion to the faith, Mahinda's mission to Ceylon, etc.; besides the periods of the reigns of Indian kings, Chandragupta and others, agreeing on the whole with the Ceylonese Chronicle. But on further perusal I found that the book was a translation of Buddhaghosa's Introduction to the Samanta-pāsādikā, a commentary on the Vinaya-piṭakam,<sup>1</sup> which gives the historical tradition from the Buddha's death to Mahinda's death in Ceylon.

I was glad to find this text in the Chinese Piṭaka, for I thought it might give us the following results, if I were not overestimating the value of its discovery :—

1. It can be no longer disputed that the Chinese Collection contains also Pāli elements.
2. The Council of Asoka, under the presidency of Moggaliputta Tissa, is found mentioned in the Chinese Collection, but as yet only in the books of Pāli origin.
3. Some of the information obtained from Chinese sources, and hitherto considered to be derived from Sanskrit books, may be from Pāli ones.
4. Translations and transliterations of names and words contained in this book may furnish us a key to a further discovery of Pāli texts.
5. In any case it will give us a large Pāli-Chinese vocabulary, as we have the text as well as the translation.
6. It may help us in the collation of Pāli MSS. of the text translated, preserving as it does a tradition of very early date, *i.e.* before A.D. 489.
7. The migration of a work of Buddhaghosa to China in 489 A.D. may serve to confirm the dates of his arrival in Ceylon in about 430, and of his sail to Burma in about 450.

<sup>1</sup> Childers, s.v. Atthakathā; Rhys Davids, "Buddhism," p. 237. A portion of this valuable record was published by Prof. Oldenberg in his "Vinaya-piṭakam," vol. iii (the end).

With the hope of realizing these points, I borrowed the Chinese text of the India Office, and began an examination into its contents last year. As I have other studies on hand, I am not able at present to lay the whole of my examination before the Society. I shall, however, notice in the following pages some of the points which, I think, may give an idea of the nature of the book.

The book in question is called in Chinese, "Shan-chien-p'i-p'o-sha-lü," or "I-ch'i-shan-chien-lü-p'i-p'o-sha" (一切善見律毘婆沙). If I were to translate it quite literally, this would mean "All-good-appearing-vinaya-vibhāṣā."<sup>1</sup> This, it will be at once noticed, is the exact meaning of the Pāli title. The first two characters "i-ch'i" are generally left out, and Nanjio<sup>2</sup> restored "Shan-chien-p'i-p'o-sha-lü" to Sanskrit "Sudarśana-vibhāṣā-vinaya." No Sanskrit book with this title is known to have existed. It is neither found in the catalogues of Sanskrit books, nor is it mentioned by any Sanskrit author, or by any Chinese author writing about Sanskrit Buddhist books. The invention of this new title, therefore, to explain Chinese words which so exactly reproduce the Pāli title, seems to me unnecessary. This book is found also in Julien's "Concordance Sinico-sanskrite d'un nombre considérable de Titres d'Ouvrages Bouddhiques" (J.A. 1849, pp. 353-445), Nos. 55, 55<sup>a</sup>.

The translator, Sêng-ch'ieh-po-t'o-lo (=Samgha-bhadra), was a Sāmaṇa from a foreign country under the Ts'í

<sup>1</sup> This seems to be a translation of "Samanta-pāsādikā" ('pleasing all'). Samanta-prāsādikā (adj.) occurs in the Mahāvastu, p. 3; -tā ('having complete amiability') in the Dharmasaṅgraha, §.lxxiv, p. 57, one of the eighty signs of the Buddha (41); the Chinese being "I-ch'i man-tsu" (I-ch'i=samanta). The Lalita Vistara, vii, p. 122, has this word, the translation of which is "Chien-chê-chieh-shêng-hsi," 'all those who look at him obtain joy.' Asoka is called "Shan-chien" ('good-appearing' meant for Priyadarśin). The translator, not finding a suitable word for "pāsādikā," may have used "Shan-chien." "Vibhāṣā" in a Buddhistic sense means 'commentary.' It ought to be Vinaya-vibhāṣā, not Vibhāṣā-vinaya. Cf. the Chinese Bk. xii, fol. 16a.

<sup>2</sup> In his Catalogue of the Chinese Tripiṭaka, No. 1125 (see p. 248).



dynasty, of the Siao family (A.D. 479–502) (蕭齊外國沙門, 僧伽跋陀羅譯).

The date of the translation is A.D. 489 (=the seventh year of the Yung-ming period of the Emperor Wu-ti) (武帝, 永明七年).

The book is recorded as belonging to the Hīnayāna. It is divided into 18 books, and consists of 440 leaves, each leaf containing about 400 Chinese characters.

It begins with the adoration "Namo sabbesaṃ Buddhānam" (南無諸佛), and an opening verse. The first three books are devoted to the historical introduction; a rough analysis of the whole will be as follows:—

*Bk. i to Bk. iv, fol. 2.* The history from the Buddha's Death to Mahinda's Death. The first section is devoted to the Council of Rājagaha, which took place during the rainy season immediately after the Buddha's death at Kusinārā. 500 Arhats meet under Mahākassapa: Upāli recites the contents of the Vinaya, while Ānanda rehearses the Suttas in answer to the questions of the presiding therā. It lasted seven months.

Next comes the Vajjiputtiya section. In it the "Ten Points" brought forward by the Vajjian Bhikkhus are given, and the Council of Vesālī, which met A.B. 100, is shortly described. The presiding theras of the second council were ten in number, Sa-p'o-chia-mei (Sabbakāmi), Li-p'o-to (Revata), and others, the members in all numbering 700. It ended in eight months.

The third is called the Asokarāja section, which covers some three books and fifty-two folios. It gives the rise of Asoka, his conversion to Buddhism by Ni-ch'ü-t'o (Nigrodha), the building of Saṃghārāmas and medical halls, his invitation of Moggaliputta Tissa, whose life is also given at length, the examination of all Bhikkhus by Asoka, and then the Council of Pāṭaliputta, which lasted nine months, Tissa presiding over 1000 members. Then follow the ordinations of Mahinda and Saṃghamittā, the sending out of the Missionaries, the conversion of Devā-nampiya Tissa, the planting of a branch of the Bo-tree in

Ceylon, the arrival of Saṃghamittā, and lastly, the deaths of Mahinda, Aritṭha, and others.

The whole agrees pretty well with that portion of the Pāli text edited by Prof. Oldenberg at the end of his *Vinaya-piṭakam*, vol. iii.

*Bk. iv, fol. 3 to Bk. vi.* Commentary on the introductory portion of the *Vinaya*, *i.e.* the first part of the *Suttavibhaṅga*.

The *Mahāmoggallāna Khandhaka* (Oldenberg, V.P. iii, 1, p. 7), the *Sāriputta Khandhaka*, and the *Monkey Khandhaka* (*i.e.* p. 23), etc., are explained.

*Bks. vii–xii.* An explanation of the *Pārājikā* rules.

*Bks. xiii–xviii.* The *Saṃghādisesā* rules and other sections are explained.

The last part (*Bk. xviii*) gives some remarks in a very short form about the *Kathina Khandhaka*, *Bhikkhuṇī Khandhaka*, etc., and also thirty-two questions to *Upāli* (*Upāli-pucchā*) by *Mahākassapa*, and the answers as well. It ends with the words: "There are four wrong proceedings in the *Ñatti-kamma*<sup>1</sup> of the special priests [*i.e.* in the *Gaṇa-kamma*], four in the *Ñatti-dutiya-kamma*,<sup>1</sup> and four also in the *Ñatti-catuttha-kamma*<sup>1</sup>; therefore there are three times four, *i.e.* twelve wrong proceedings" (別衆白羯磨中有四非法, 白二羯磨中有四非法, 白四羯磨中有四非法; 三四合十二非法).

The following extracts may perhaps serve to convince my readers of the fact that my identification is not imaginary. For shortness' sake I will omit the Chinese characters.

I. The Chinese text, *Bk. i, fol. 9.* Compare *Sumaṅgala-vilāsinī*, pp. 16, 17, § 47.

What are the *San-Ts'ang*<sup>2</sup> (*Ti-piṭaka*)? They are the *P'i-ni Ts'ang* (*Vinaya-piṭaka*), the *Hsiu-to-lo*<sup>3</sup> *Ts'ang*

<sup>1</sup> See Childers, s.v. *Kammavācā*.

<sup>2</sup> Those in italic are translations and not transliterations. "Ts'ang," 'store' stands for "Piṭaka."

<sup>3</sup> *Saṃghabhadra* here used an earlier transliteration from *Skt. sūtra*, hence "Hsiu-to-lo."

(Sutta-piṭaka), and the A-p'i-t'ang *Ts'ang* (Abhidhamma-piṭaka). Of what does the Vinaya-piṭaka consist? It consists of—

- a. Two Po-lo-t'í-mu-ch'a<sup>1</sup> (Pāṭimokkha). (Sum. vil. 2 Pāṭimokkhas, 2 Vibhaṅgas.)
- b. 23<sup>2</sup> Chien-t'ó (Khandhaka). (Sum. vil. 22 Khandhakas.)
- c. The Po-li-p'ó-lo (Parivārā). (Sum. vil. 16 Parivārās.)

What is the Sutta-piṭaka? It consists of—

- a. The long A-han (Dīgha-āgama),<sup>3</sup> in which there are 44 suttas, beginning with the *Fan-wang king* (Brahma-net sutta=Brahmajāla). (Sum. vil. 34 suttas.)
- b. The middle A-han (Majjhima-āgama), 252 suttas, beginning with the *Mou-lo-po-li-yeh* (Mūlapariyāya). (Sum. vil. 152.)
- c. The *Sêng-shu-to* A-han (Saṃyutta-āgama), 7762 suttas, beginning with the *Wu-ch'ieh-to-lo-a-p'ó-t'ó-na* (Oghatara-apadāna).
- d. The *Yang-chüeh-to-lo* A-han (Aṅguttara-āgama), 9557 suttas, beginning with the *Chê-to-po-li-yeh-t'ó-na* (Cittapariyādāna-sutta).
- e. The *Ch'ü-t'ó-chia* A-han (Khuddaka-āgama), 14 divisions of which are—
  1. The *Fa-chü*, *i.e.* verses on the law (Dhammapada).
  2. The *Yü*, *i.e.* parables (Apadāna).
  3. The *Wu-t'ó-na* (Udāna).
  4. The *I-ti-fu-to-ch'ieh* (Itivuttaka).
  5. The *Ni-po-to* (Nipāta).
  6. The *P'i-mo-na* (Vimāna-vatthu).
  7. The *Pi-to* (Peta-vatthu).

<sup>1</sup> From Skt. "Prātimoksha": see the last note.

<sup>2</sup> It may be meant here that the Khandhakas with the Parivārā are 23. The Mahāvagga had 10 Khandhakas and Cullavagga 12: see the Vinaya texts, iii, S.B.E. vol. xx, pp. 415-417.

<sup>3</sup> Agama is another name of the "Nikāya": see Childers, s.v.

8. The T'i-lo (Thera-gāthā).
9. The T'i-li-ch'ieh-t'ou (Therī-gāthā).
10. The *Pên-shêng*, i.e. Original Births (Jātaka).
11. The Ni-t'i-sha (Niddesa).
12. The Po-chih-san-p'i-t'ou (Paṭisambhidā).
13. The *Fo-shung-hsing*, i.e. Buddha's Genealogy or Clan (Buddhavaṃsa).
14. The Jê-yung<sup>1</sup> *Ts'ang* (Cariyā-piṭaka).

(Sum. vil. 15 divisions with the Khuddaka-pātha. Childers seems to have had a MS. which, like Saṃghabhadra's, omits the 15th book: see his Pāli Dictionary, p. 508a, line 10.)

What is the A-p'i-t'ang *Ts'ang* (Abhidhamma-piṭaka)? It consists of—

1. The *Fa Sêng-ch'ieh* (Dhamma-saṃgaha, sic sum. vil.).
2. The P'i-pêng-ch'ieh (Vibhaṅga).
3. The T'ou-tou-chia-t'a (Dhātu-kathā).
4. The Ya-mo-chia (Yamaka).
5. The Pa-ch'a (Paṭṭhāna).
6. The Pi-ch'ieh-lo-fên-na-ti (Puggala-paññati).
7. The Chia-t'a-po-t'ou (Kathā-vatthu).<sup>2</sup>

II. a. The Chinese text, Bk. i, fol. 21; the Pāli (Oldenberg, Vinaya, vol. iii), p. 299.

“During four years after the death of King Pin-t'ou-sha-lo (Bindusāra), A-yuk (Asoka) killed all his brothers, leaving only a brother of the same mother. After four years he crowned himself and became king. It was 218 years since the Buddha's death that King Asoka took sole command of the land of Jambudīpa (Yen-fu-li).”

The Pāli: “Te sabbe Asoko attanā saddhim ekamātikam Tissakumāram thapetvā ghātesi. Ghātentō cattāri vassāni

<sup>1</sup> “Jak-yo” according to the Japanese pronunciation. It stands for “Cariyā.”

<sup>2</sup> For all these names see Turnour, Mahāvamsa, p. lxxv; Rhys Davids, “Buddhism,” pp. 18–21, where an account of these books is given in a clear form; and Childers, s.v. Tipiṭakam.

anabhisitto 'va rajjam kāretvā cattunnaṃ vassānaṃ accayena tathāgatessa parinibbānato dvinnaṃ vassasatānaṃ upari aṭṭhārasame vasse sakala - Jambudīpe ekarajjābhisekaṃ pāpuṇi."

b. Ch. Bk. i, fol. 23; Pāli, p. 300.

"During three years following his enthronement he was a follower of the heretical doctrine; it was during his fourth year that he inclined his heart to the Buddha's law [through Ni-ch'ü-t'ō (Nigrodha)]."

The Pāli: "Rājā kira abhisekaṃ pāpuṇitvā tīni yeva saṃvaccharāni bāhirakapāsaṇḍaṃ parigaṇhi, catutthe saṃvacchare buddhasāsane pasīdi."

c. Ch. Bk. ii, fol. 1; Pāli, p. 306.

Mo-shên-t'ō (Mahinda) received his Upasampadā when he reached his full 20 years of age, his Upajjhāyā being Ti-shu, son of Mu-chien-lien (Moggaliputta Tissa), his Ācariyā Mo-ho-t'i-p'ō (Mahādeva) and Mo-shan-t'i (Majjhantika). Sêng-ch'ieh-mi-to (Saṃghamittā) received his Pabbajjā ordination in his 18th year under Upajjhāyā T'ang-mo-po-lo (Dhamma-pāli) and Ācariyā A-yu-po-lo (Āyupāli). These incidents happened in the sixth year after Asoka ascended to the throne (*i.e.* 10 years after Bindusāra's death).<sup>1</sup>

d. Ch. Bk. ii, fol. 9; Pāli, p. 312.

Prior to the great Council at Po-ch'a-li-fu (Pāṭaliputta) Asoka summons several Bhikkhus and questions one after another:—

Asoka: "What, sir, was the law of the Buddha" (大德, 佛法云何; Kimvādi bhante sammāsambuddho 'ti)?

Bhikkhu: "The Buddha was one who held the doctrine of Distinction" (佛分別說也; Vibhajjavādi Mahārājā 'ti).

Asoka, turning to Thera Tissa: "Was the Buddha one who held the doctrine of Distinction" (大德, 佛分別說不; Vibhajjavādi bhante sammāsambuddho 'ti)?

Tissa: "Just so" (如是; Āma, Mahārājā 'ti).

<sup>1</sup> Compare Dīpav., vi, 24; Oldenberg, Vinaya, i, p. 1.

Asoka, seeing that Religion had been purified, said to the Bhikkhus: "Let us, sirs, hold the Uposatha to expound the morality [sīla]" (Suddham bhante dāni sāsanaṃ, Karotu bhikkhusaṃgho uposathan ti). Thereupon Moggaliputta Tissa becomes the president of the Assembly, which consists of 1000 chosen Bhikkus. He then refutes the opinions of all those adhering to heretical doctrines and wrong views. Here there is a difference between the Chinese and the Pāli. The words, "Tasmim samāgame Mogalliputta-Tissatthero parappavādaṃ maddamāno Kathāvatthuppakaraṇaṃ abhāsi"<sup>1</sup>—"In this assembly, Moggaliputta Tissa, refuting the opinions of the other parties, propounded the work Kathāvatthu"—are not well traceable in the Chinese. At any rate, the name Kathāvatthu is not mentioned there, though it is given in the list of the books in the Kuddakanikāya, as we have seen above.<sup>2</sup>

### III. Ch. Bk. ii, fols. 12-17; Pāli, pp. 316-319.

The Buddhist missionaries sent out after the Council of Pāṭaliputta are as follows:—

1. Mo-shan-t'i (Majjhantika) to Chi-pin and Ch'ien-t'o (Kasmīragandhāra).
2. Mo-ho-t'i-p'o (Mahādeva) to Mo - hsi - sha - man - t'o-lo (Mahisa- or Mahīpsakamaṇḍala).
3. Lo-ch'i-to (Rakkhita) to P'o-na-p'o-ssū (Vanavāsi).
4. Tan-wu-tê (for Dhammagutta, but the Pāli has Dhammarakkhita) } to A-po-lan-to (Aparantaka).

<sup>1</sup> Compare Mahāv., p. 42; Dīpav., vii, 40. The Kathāvatthu is very likely Tissa's own compilation. See, however, Childers, s.v. Tipitakam (p. 507<sup>b</sup>), and Max Müller, Dhammapada, xxvi, xxvii.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 426.

5. Mo-ho-tan-wu-tê (for Mahā-dhammagutta, but the Pāli has Mahādhammarakkhita) } to Mo-ho-lo-ch'a (Mahāratt̥ha)
6. Mo-ho-lo-ch'i-to (Mahā-rakkhita) } to Yü-na (Yona).<sup>1</sup>
7. Mo-shih-mo (Majjhima), Chia-shê (Kassapagotta), T'i-p'o (Deva), and Tun-t'i-pi-shu (Dundubhissara) } to the Border of the Snow Mountain (Himavanta).
8. Shu-na-chia and Yü-to-lo (Sonaka and Uttara) } to the Kingdom of the Gold Earth (Suvanṇa-bhūmi).
9. Mo-shên-t'o (Mahinda), I-ti-yü (Iddhiya or It̥thiya) Yü-ti-yü (Uttiya), Po-t'o-sha (Bhaddasāla), San-p'o-lou (Sambala), Hsiu-mo-na (Sumana), and P'an-t'ou-chia (Bhaṇḍuka) } to the Island of Lion (Simhala, Ceylon).<sup>2</sup>

IV. The chronological table given in the Chinese Bk. ii, fol. 18<sup>b</sup>, does not exactly agree with that of the Samantapāsādikā (p. 320), or of the Mahāvamsa. The period, 236 years, between the Buddha's death (=the 8th year of Ajātasattu's reign) and Mahinda's mission to Ceylon (=the 18th year of Asoka's reign), is filled up by the following list of kings:—

<sup>1</sup> "Yonaka," the land of the Greeks, *i.e.* Bactria. The Chinese is 與那 Yü-na, but a Korean text and the new Japanese edition have 史那, Shih-na, and explain it as 漢地也 *i.e.* China. A scholar said that China received Asoka's mission. His assertion probably rests on this misinterpretation of the Korean text.

<sup>2</sup> For all these geographical names see Rhys Davids, "Buddhism," p. 227 note; Dīpav., viii, 4-12; Mahāv., xii (Turnour), pp. 73, 74.

KINGS.	REIGN.
A-shê-shi (Ajātasattu) . . . . .	24 years. <sup>1</sup>
Yü-t'ò-yeh-po-t'ò-lo (Udayabhadrā or Udāyibhaddaka) . . . . .	16 years. <sup>2</sup>
A-t'u-lou-t'ò (Anuruddha) } Min-ch'u (Muṇḍa) } each <sup>3</sup> . . . . .	8 years.
Na-chia-tai-sha-chia (Nāga-dāsaka or -dassaka)	14 years. <sup>4</sup>
Hsiu-hsiu-na-chia (Susunāga) . . . . .	18 years.
A-yü (or A-yuk, i.e. Chia-lo-yü; Kālāsoka) .	28 years.
10 sons of the last . . . together . . . . .	22 years.
Mei-nan-t'ò (for Chiu-nan-t'ò) <sup>5</sup> . . . . .	22 years.
Chan-t'ò-chüeh-to (Candagutta) . . . . .	24 years. <sup>6</sup>
Pin-t'ou-sha-lo (Bindusāra) . . . . .	28 years.
[The interregnum between the death of the last and the enthronement of Asoka]	4 years.
A-yü (or A-yuk; Asoka) . . . . .	18 years.
(when Malinda was sent out).	
	234 years.

We have thus an anachronism of only two years in the list (compare Turnour, *Mahāv.*, p. xlvi, "6 years"). But this gap would be filled up if we read "18 years" for the reign of Anuruddha and Muṇḍa instead of "each 8 years."

<sup>1</sup> He reigned 32 years; the Buddha died in his eighth year.

<sup>2</sup> Ajātasattu and Udāyibhaddaka are omitted in Bk. ii, fol. 18<sup>b</sup>, perhaps by the copyist's mistake, but we can see from fol. 18<sup>a</sup> that Udāyibhaddaka reigned more than 15 years, and I put here 16 years from the Pāli. [The copyist seems to have jumped from A of Ajātasattu to A of Anuruddha while copying.]

<sup>3</sup> Not "collectively" as in Turnour's *Mahāvamsa*, p. xlvi. *Samantapāṣ.* (p. 320) has 18 years (Anuruddho ca muṇḍo ca Atthārāsa).

<sup>4</sup> *Samantapāṣ.*, 24 years.

<sup>5</sup> Mei (玫) seems to be a misprint. There is no corresponding sound in the Pāli. It is, I think, a mistake for Chiu (玖), which is sometimes used for another "Chiu" (九) meaning "nine," and the "nine nanto" for the Pāli "nava nandā." In one of my slips from the new Jap. edition of the Chinese *Piṭaka* I note, "玫 mei for 玖 chiu?"; but I do not remember whether it is my conjecture or that of the Japanese Editors. Anyhow, it is pretty certain that it must be "Chiu" nine.

<sup>6</sup> Not 34 as in the *Mahāvamsa*, which is an error.



I do not know whether the difference in figures between the Pāli and the Chinese texts is to be attributed to various readings in the original, or simply to a mistake on the part of the Chinese translator or copyists.

V. From the commentary itself, I shall notice only a point or two. In explaining "Ariyakam" in the Pārājikā, Buddhaghosa says :

- a. "Ariyakam nāma Ariyavohāro Magadhabhāsā. Milakkhakam nāma yo koci Anariyako Andhadamiḷādi," etc. The Chinese: 善語者, 何謂爲善語; 所以善人所行, 是摩竭國語。若邊地, 安陀羅彌國語, etc. "Now, as to the 'good language.' What is called the 'good language'? What is in use among the 'good' men. This is the language of the kingdom of Mo-chieh (Magadha). In case of the border lands, (there are) the language of the kingdom of An-t'o-lo-mi (Andhadamiḷa)," etc. (Ch. Bk. vii, fol. 13<sup>b</sup>.)

Next, under the Saṃghādisesā, Buddhaghosa says as to 'Ādi' and 'Sesa' :

- b. "Imam āpattim āpajjitvā vuṭṭhātukāmassa yantam āpattivuṭṭhānam. Tassa ādimhi c'eva parivāsadanatthāya ādito sese majjhe mānattadānatthāya . . . avasāne abbhānatthāya ca saṃgho icchitabbo" (Sam.-pās., fol. ne). The Chinese: 此比丘已得罪, 樂欲清淨。往到僧所。僧與波利婆沙, 是名初。與波利婆沙竟, 次與 . . . . 摩那埵, 爲中。殘者與阿浮訶那。 "The Bhikkhu, having become guilty, wishes to be purified, and goes to the place of the Saṃgha. The Saṃgha confers on him the Po-li-p'o-sha (parivāsa) —this is called the first. After having conferred the Parivāsa (the Saṃgha) next confers the Mo-na-to (Mānatta), which is the middle. Last of all, the A-fu-ho-na (Abbhāna) is conferred on him." (Ch. Bk. xii, fol. 18<sup>b</sup>.)

Although the Chinese translation is not always literal, yet it is not so free that we cannot recognize the original in the Pāli text. Several points seem to have been omitted, when probably the translator's knowledge of Chinese failed to interpret them, while many words seem to have been added to make the sense of the original clearer. For instance, as to some medical herbs, Saṃghabhadra adds whether they are found or not in Tong-king and Canton, and in some cases gives Cantonese names besides the Indian (see e.g. Bk. xv, fol. 19<sup>b</sup>).

It is probable that the translator dictated the meaning of Buddhaghosa's commentary from a MS., while the Chinese assistants wrote it down, and fashioned it into a Chinese composition. There are some passages so free and incorrect, that we can hardly attribute the version to anyone understanding the Pāli language.

VI. I shall notice one more point about the verses quoted by Buddhaghosa from the "Ancient Historical Records" in the Siṅhalese Aṭṭhakathā. The verses in the Samantapāsādikā seem to consist of the three elements: (1) The verses composed by himself or by an unknown author. (2) Those taken from the ancient Aṭṭhakathā, which are indicated by the words: "Tenāhu porāṇā" ("Therefore have the ancients said"). (3) Those from the Dīpavaṃsa, which are often preceded by the words: "vuttam pi etaṃ Dīpavaṃse" ("It is said in the Dīpavaṃsa as follows"). The first is called in Chinese simply "Chi" (偈) which had been meant originally for Skt. gāthā, hymn, verse, but later became a general name for any religious verse, whether a śloka or any other metre. The second is called "Wang-hsi-chi" (往昔偈), "Verses from Past Ages" or "Ancient Verses." The third, which is taken from the Dīpavaṃsa, is called "Wang-hsi-chi-tsan" (往昔偈讚), "Praise-Songs from Past Ages" or "Ancient Praise-Songs." Saṃghabhadra must have understood that the Dīpavaṃsa was nothing but a version of the ancient Siṅhalese Records, made specially

for chanting or recitation.<sup>1</sup> The name "Dīpavaṃsa" is not traceable in Chinese, but it is possible that the original had "Dīpavaṃse," and Saṃghabhadra translated it by the "Ancient praise-songs," in order to show what relation it had to the ancient historical record which he called simply the "ancient verses."<sup>2</sup>

In the introductory part of the Chinese text of the Samanta-pāsādikā there are more than seventeen verses from the Dīpavaṃsa (also found in the later work Mahāvāṃsa), though some of them widely differ from those found in the existing texts of the two books.

The above will, I think, suffice for our present purpose, and will, I hope, leave no doubt as to the existence, at any rate, of the book in question. There is only one other possibility, and it is this. The Chinese translation may be from the original of Buddhaghosa, *i.e.* the *Sinhalese* Aṭṭhakathā, seeing that the date of the translation is as early as 489 A.D. But it would take us too far to discuss this point now.

---

We have then before us a translation of the Samanta-pāsādikā (and under the same title) into the language of China, where the name or fame of Buddhaghosa had never reached.<sup>3</sup> A MS. of his work, however, must have reached

<sup>1</sup> Compare Mahāv., p. 257: "And that he might promulgate the contents of the Dīpavaṃsa, distributing a thousand pieces, he caused it to be read aloud thoroughly." The fact that the Dīpav. is called here the "Ancient praise-songs" may in a way help Prof. Oldenberg's opinion that the work "Porāṇehi kato" mentioned in the Mahāv., i, p. i, may refer to the Dīpav. (Oldenberg, Dīpav., p. 9).

<sup>2</sup> There are similar cases: whenever the Pāli text has "Tambapaṇṇī" or "Laṅkā," he translates it by the "Island of Lion" = Sīhala, the object being to make it clear to the Chinese readers.

<sup>3</sup> But it is possible that some Buddhist book may refer to him under another name. No Chinese travellers known to us mention his name. In Fa-hien's time (A.D. 399-414) Buddhaghosa must have been very young and still in India. As the Hinayāna faith was looked upon as heretical by Hiuen Tshang (A.D. 629-645), Buddhaghosa's fame seems to have escaped his notice. I-tsing (A.D. 671-695), though a follower of the Hinayāna, says nothing of that great Buddhist writer.

there soon after its compilation, probably brought by the translator himself, who may have been a direct disciple, or, at all events, a young contemporary, of Buddhaghosa.

Buddhaghosa, a young Brahman of Magadha, who was born "Bodhimāṇḍasamīpaṇhi," is said to have been converted by Revata, a Buddhist priest. The latter further instigated the young convert to go to Ceylon, pointing out that the Sinhalese Aṭṭhakathā were genuine, being composed by Mahinda, and a translation of them into the language of Magadha would be a work conducive to the welfare of the whole world.<sup>1</sup> Buddhaghosa then came to Ceylon in the reign of Mahānāma (A.D. 410–432)<sup>2</sup>—strictly speaking, at the end of his reign, about 430 A.D.<sup>3</sup>—and succeeded in carrying out his literary undertaking, during his stay there in the Mahāvihāra of Anurādhapura. The Samantapāsādikā must have been compiled at this time. He is said to have sailed to Burma about 450 A.D., taking with him all the works of his compilation.<sup>4</sup>

We cannot trace him further than this, but his fame, and perhaps his works also, seem to have reached Siam, Kamboja, and even Campā (Cochin China, now French). According to Dr. Bastian, Campā was once a Buddhist country,<sup>5</sup> its Buddhism having been derived from Ceylon, and being generally connected with the name of Buddhaghosa. Had his Aṭṭhakathā made their way to Campā it would not have been very difficult for them to have reached Canton, the place of this translation, in South China. But this does not seem to have been the case. We have no reliable record as to the fact that Kamboja or Campā were Buddhist countries in *the fifth century*.

<sup>1</sup> Turnour, *Mahāv.*, p. 251.

<sup>2</sup> *l.c.*, p. 252. Compare Kern, "Buddhismus," p. 477; Max Müller, "Dhammapada" (S.B.E.), p. xii; Lassen, *Ind. Alt.* iv, p. 285.

<sup>3</sup> Rhys Davids, "Buddhism," p. 236; "Buddhist Birth Stories," p. lxxiv.

<sup>4</sup> Rhys Davids, "Buddhism," p. 236; Lassen and Burnouf, "Essai sur le Pāli," also quoted by Turnour, *Mahāv.*, p. xxx. Compare also Bishop Bigandet, "Life of Gaudama" (1866), p. 392.

<sup>5</sup> This is confirmed by I-tsing (A.D. 671–695), who says that Campā mostly belonged to the Sannūtiya school, while there were a few adherents of the Sarvāstivāda school.

Siam is said to have received Buddhism first in 638 A.D.,<sup>1</sup> though there are some traces of the existence of Buddhism at an earlier time.<sup>2</sup> In any case it is reasonable to suppose that the conversion to Buddhism of the whole area from the western coast of Burma to the north limit of Cochin China, and with it the migration of the Sacred Books, would have taken a longer time than thirty-eight years (489-450=38).<sup>3</sup>

The only other possibility as to how this MS. got to China at so early a date is by way of the sea. Either a Sinhalese or a Burmese who might have known Buddhaghosa, personally or by name, may have secured a copy of the *Aṭṭhakathā* and sailed to China, possibly stirred up by the missionary spirit which might have prevailed during or after the time of the great commentator. Suppose that man were a direct disciple or an admirer of Buddhaghosa; he would have simply followed the brilliant example of his teacher, who made for the eastern peninsula with his Buddhist works, as we have seen above. The voyage over the Indian Ocean would have been no difficulty before 489 A.D., for, as we know, Fa-hien returned home in 414 by a merchant ship which sailed between Ceylon and China by way of Java.

The man who brought the book is no other than the translator himself, *i.e.* Saṃghabhadra. Unfortunately we have no means of ascertaining *his* nationality. He is said to have been a *samaṇa* of the *Western Region*,<sup>4</sup> a name often used for "India," of course including Ceylon. The use of the name Hsi-yü (Western Region) is very vague, and there is no reason why Burma should be excluded from it. So we have no guide at all in it. Still, it is more probable that he was a Sinhalese. The voyage from Burma to China must have been more difficult than that from

<sup>1</sup> Rhys Davids "Buddhism," p. 238, quoted from Crawford, "Journal of the Embassy to Siam," p. 615.

<sup>2</sup> Three priests from Siam came to China between A.D. 503-589. See above note 1, p. 419. I-tsing says there was no Buddhism in his time, but there was before a wicked king of that country persecuted the Buddhist priests.

<sup>3</sup> But Buddhism may have been established in Asoka's time in Burma (two missionaries went to *Suvanna-bhūmi*).

<sup>4</sup> See Nanjio, Catalogue, App. ii, 96.

Ceylon to China in his time. For the latter we have the witness of Fa-hien; but for a communication by the sea between Burma and China we have no record in so early a time, and the discovery of the Malacca Strait seems to be very late. But we have no positive proof that he came from Ceylon,<sup>1</sup> and at present we must rest satisfied with the result that he must have come from some country where the orthodox Buddhism prevailed. He seems to have been a Hīnayānist, for his translation, which is closely connected with the tradition about him given below, is recorded as a Hīnayāna work. He came to Canton and never proceeded to the North, and he brought with him the same tradition as the Siṅhalese or Burmese about the date of the Buddha's death. These points can be seen from the following interesting tradition about his life in China:—

“In 534 A.D. (中大通六年) an ascetic, Chau P'o-hsiu (隱士趙伯休), visited the temple on the mount Lu (廬山), met a samāṇa called Kung-tu (弘度) there and obtained from him a historical record named

‘A Dotted Record of many Sages’ (衆聖點記).

A tradition about the Record—

*After the Buddha's death, the venerable Upāli collected the Vinaya-piṭaka. On the 15th day (Punṇamadivase) of the 7th moon (Assayuja) he held the Pavāraṇā ceremony, as it was the closing day of the Vassa (the Rain-Retreat). Upāli then marked the Vinaya-piṭaka<sup>2</sup> with a dot, and did the same every*

<sup>1</sup> The following fact may perhaps help us. When the Pāli has various readings, as noted in Oldenberg's Samantapās., the Chinese has the same readings as the Burmese MS. (E.). Whether this tendency is found throughout the commentary, I am not at present able to state. If this be proved to be the case, we can see at least that the Burmese MS. keeps the readings of 489 A.D., not long after Buddhaghosa.

<sup>2</sup> It seems from this as if the Vinaya existed in book. But we need not understand it literally. Compare Turnour, Mahāv., p. 207: the Vinaya was not in writing till the time of King Vaṭṭa Gāmani, i.e. 88-76 B.C. But some seem to believe that it was written down in book in the first council.—Bigandet, “Life of Gaudama,” p. 350. Has the custom of marking the sacred years ever existed in Ceylon or in Burma?

following summer. After Upāli's death this method was carefully kept up, handing it down from teacher to pupil, until at last it came to the hand of Saṃghabhadra, the translator of the *Vinaya Vibhāṣā*, who brought that *Vinaya-piṭaka* to Canton. He held the *Vassa* in Canton (廣州) A.D. 489 (齊永明七年), and when he finished the *Pavāraṇā* ceremony he added a dot to the *Vinaya-piṭaka*. At that time the number of dots was in all 975 (the Buddha's death therefore falls, according to this Record, in the year 486 B.C.).<sup>1</sup> The ascetic Chau asked the *samaṇa* Kung-tu why the Record was not kept up after 489 A.D., the time of Saṃghabhadra. Kung-tu answered: 'In former ages there were many *Ariya-puggalas* who themselves marked the Record with dots. We are only common men, whose duty it is to keep and guard this Record, not to mark it.' The ascetic Chau continued the marking till A.D. 535 (大同之初), when there were 1020 dots.'"<sup>2</sup>

Saṃghabhadra's date of the Buddha, B.C. 486, was not quite unknown to the Buddhist writers in China, but was never considered as authoritative. Perhaps it did not seem "ancient" enough to the Chinese Buddhists, who would have claimed a greater antiquity for the founder of their religion than that of Confucius. Prof. Max Müller told me that he noticed some years ago the "Dotted Record" in the *Academy*, as he was informed of it by his pupil Kasawara. I failed to find the Number of the *Academy*, but I do not think that there is any difference between Kasawara's information and mine, except in wording, for the source from which we derived it is in all probability one and the same. Now that we have identified Saṃghabhadra's translation with the *Samanta-pāsādikā*, the above tradition about him turns out to be more important than curious, and I did not think it superfluous to give it here.

<sup>1</sup> The Sinhalese date of the Buddha's death, 543 B.C., wants a curtailment of at least about 60 years, as pointed out by Turnour, which would bring us to 483 B.C., not to speak about a further curtailment made by Max Müller, Rhys Davids, and others. The anachronism seems to have been introduced after Saṃghabhadra's time.

<sup>2</sup> 486 B.C. + 535 A.D. = 1021; perhaps the year 535 was not marked.

In conclusion, I may add, that I am still comparing the Chinese with the Pāli and translating it, when I can spare time. I have already collected some 800 names and words, whose Sanskrit equivalents are not to be found in Eitel's Sanskrit-Chinese Dictionary, or in Julien's "Méthode pour déchiffrer et transcrire les noms Sanskrits qui se rencontrent dans les Livres Chinois," but whose Pāli equivalents are found in Childers' Pāli Dictionary, or in the Mahāvamsa. I strongly hope that this book will serve as a key to lead us to a further discovery of Pāli works, which might have found their way into the Chinese Tripiṭaka. Mr. Palladji may have known our work, for his "Historische Skizzen des Buddhismus" give an account which, on the whole, agrees with that of our book, though there are many points whose sources are not ascertainable.<sup>1</sup> There must be some more Pāli works in China if we only look for them. This line of research is, I think, very important for the study of the Chinese Piṭaka, which is nothing but a mixture of all sorts of books coming from various sources. It may contain books compiled in the council of Asoka as well as those in the so-called council of Kanishka. There must be in it some elements from Sanskrit, Pāli, Tibetan, or Prākṛit, as Dr. Edkins thinks, and further, it is possible that there is a trace of Mongolian or some dialects of Further India. It may seem to be impossible at first to recognize the elements from all those languages under the dress of Chinese, but when we have the texts in both languages before us, our work is comparatively simple and easy.<sup>2</sup> When, for instance,

<sup>1</sup> Above note 3, p. 418. First I thought that Palladji might have drawn his materials from Pāli sources. There was in his time Turnour's "Epitome of the Pāli Annals" (1837). But the names which Palladji gives, e.g. Rihata for Revata (p. 212), Kāmadeva for Devānampiyā (p. 220, Ch. T'ien-ai, "Heaven-love"; he translated this into Skt. Kāmadeva), made me think that his account was from Chinese sources.

<sup>2</sup> A comparative study of the Sanskrit and Chinese texts is also very important. Without this even the interpretation of a Chinese text becomes impossible or unsuccessful. We often run the risk of thoroughly misunderstanding the Chinese translators. Compare, for instance, Beal's Fo-sho-hing-tsan-king (S.B.E., vol. xix), §§ 564-568 (=Ch. Bk. ii, fol. 11<sup>a</sup>), and my rendering in Heinrich Lüders's paper, "Zu Asvaghōṣa's Buddha-carita," p. 2, note 2, and Tokiwai's in Leumann's note, p. 8 (Göttingen, Phil.-histor. Klasse i, 1896).



the whole of the Pāli Piṭaka is published, we can easily compare the contents of both.<sup>1</sup> Then we shall see, at least, whether they agree or not. To do such work we must begin with the Vinaya works, Tibetan, Chinese, and Pāli, which in substance agree with one another.<sup>2</sup> Prof. Oldenberg encourages the students of Chinese Buddhism to make a careful examination of the important literary documents of the Vinaya.<sup>3</sup> I wish with him that Chinese scholars who are interested in the study of Buddhism, will pay attention to those texts preserved in the Lü-ts'ang, which is as yet almost an unbeaten track of Chinese literature.

<sup>1</sup> The whole Vinaya edited by Oldenberg; many texts from the other Piṭakas in the Pali Text Society's publication. We have also the whole Piṭaka of a Siamese edition.

<sup>2</sup> See Oldenberg, Vinaya, p. xl; the Vinaya of different schools is based upon the same fundamental redaction. (Compare Wassilief, "Buddhismus," p. 38; the Vinaya was the same in all schools.)

<sup>3</sup> *I.e.*, p. xliii.