Lexicon *sub voc.* and reff.). But it is well known that the Buddhist Sanskrit has the word *pāramī* in the same sense (see the indexes to Cowell and Neil's *Divyāvadāna* and M. Senart's *Mahāvastu*), and the same word is frequent in the Pali books. Instances from the former are—

Mahāv., i, 215, l. 4: rūpapāramigatasya.

ii, 29. 8: lakṣaṇapāramiprāpta.

Divyāv., p. 637, l. 5: mantrāṇām pāramiṃ gata.

Childers' statement (*sub voc.*) is as follows:—"Of these nouns the first is a feminine derivative of *parama*, and the second is *pāramī + tā*; they both have the same meaning, but the form *pāramitā* is generally used at the end of a compound."

This seems to me to put the matter in exactly the right light. *Pāramī* is an old noun (which may have had a by-form *paramī*) denoting 'the highest point.' From this we get such compounds as *dānapāramī*, 'the highest point of liberality.' The possession of this as a quality (perhaps *viā* a *Bahuvrīhi*) is *dānapāramitā*. Referring to this in comparison with *śīlapāramitā*, etc., we get the 'six *pāramitās*,' and the uncompounded word is started on an independent career.

I may suggest also that what Childers says under the head of *tathāgata* seems well worthy of attention. Do both this word and *sugata* originally mean merely the 'blest,' i.e. 'departed'?

F. W. THOMAS.

June, 1904.

NOTE ON THE INVENTION OF RAG-PAPER.

With reference to my paper on this subject published in the *Journal* for 1903, p. 663, it may be of interest to mention that Professor Wiesner's Report on Dr. Stein's paper-fragments, referred to in my note 2 on p. 672, has now been published in the *Sitzungsberichte der Kais. Akademie der*

Wissenschaften in Wien, Phil.-Hist. Klasse, vol. cxlviii, No. 6, under the title *Ein neuer Beitrag zur Geschichte des Papiers*. It fully confirms the results of Professor Wiesner's previous investigations, which I have explained in my paper. Only on one point—the history of the method of rendering paper inscribable (*ante*, pp. 677, 678)—has additional light been thrown. Originally all paper appears to have been 'running,' and incapable of taking writing, except with viscid ink. The first attempt to remedy this drawback consisted in giving the paper a coating of gypsum. Then followed the attempt to 'size' or to glue the paper with gelatine made from lichen (*ante*, p. 674, note 1). Next came the impregnation of paper with raw dry starch-flour, apparently first resorted to in Tibet; later on the dry starch-flour was mixed with thin starch-paste, until it was discovered that for the purpose of sizing the sole use of starch-paste was the most suitable. The great majority of the ancient Chinese papers have been made fit for writing in this way, and it seems that every other method was soon abandoned in its favour (see p. 25 of the Report).

There is, however, one point which calls for a remark. The oldest paper in my collection is a Chinese document dated 768 A.D. Among the papers of Dr. Stein's collection there are two Chinese documents, dated 782 and 787 A.D. respectively, found in Dandan Uiliq. Prof. Wiesner appears to believe that the latter collection includes two manuscripts found in Endere, which are older than any of the other three. They are supposed to be referable to the "first half of the eighth century at the latest," and to have been written "probably before 719 A.D.," the date of a Chinese graffito also found in Endere (see pp. 8 and 24 of the Report). In proof Professor Wiesner refers us to Dr. Stein's statements on pp. 418 and 419 of his *Sand-buried Ruins of Khotan*. The statements, however, hardly bear out his conclusion. In the first place, the date of the graffito is not absolutely certain; it may be 719 or 791, though the earlier date seems to be the more probable. In the second place, according to Dr. Stein, it is "quite certain" that the date

of the graffito precedes the deposition of the manuscripts, that is, that deposition occurred later than 719 A.D., if that be really the correct date. There is nothing to show when the manuscripts were *written*; there is only some vague evidence of the date when they were *deposited*. Dr. Stein considers that the interval between the incision of the graffito and the deposition of the manuscripts cannot have been "many years." But according to his own showing it may have been sixty or seventy years; for at some time between 781 and 791 A.D. the Tibetans would seem to have possessed themselves of the country about Endere. It does not necessarily follow that the abandonment of the Endere shrine coincided with the Tibetan conquest, though it is perhaps very probable. Anyhow the deposition of the two manuscripts—only one of which, by the way, is written in Tibetan characters—must have occurred before the abandonment of the shrine. But for the date of the latter we have for the present no conclusive evidence; it may have occurred as late as 791 A.D. It follows that we really know nothing about the exact date when the manuscripts were deposited, still less about the date when they were written. It may be anything up to 791 A.D., possibly—at least so far as the Tibetan manuscript is concerned—even later. For the present there is nothing that militates against Dr. Stein's view (p. 419 of his book) that "the second half of the eighth century" is the latest possible time for the production of the Tibetan as well as the other manuscripts found in Endere. I say "for the present," because it is possible that we may be furnished with more exact and conclusive evidence regarding the date of the graffito, as well as of the manuscripts of Endere, in Dr. Stein's forthcoming detailed official report.

A. F. RUDOLF HOERNLE.

Oxford, 24th June, 1904.