

NOTES AND QUERIES.

BY

THE REV. RICHARD MORRIS, M.A., LL.D.

AKKHAṆAVEDHĪ.

Dhanuggaho Asadiso rājaputto mahabbalo || dūrepâtī akkhaṇavedhī mahākāyappadālano (Jât. ii. p. 91).

For a parallel passage see *Ānguttara-Nikāya*, iii. 131, p. 284:—

Idha bhikkhave bhikkhu dūrepâtī ca hoti akkhaṇavedhī ca mahato ca kāyassa padāletā.

In the *Divyāvadāna*, p. 59, we find *dūre-vedha* and *akshuṇṇa-vedha* ‘an act of throwing the spear so as to graze the mark.’

The Sanskrit *akshuṇṇa* seems to be a mere corruption of the Pāli *akkhaṇa* ‘lightning.’ See the Commentator’s note to the *gāthā* in *Jât. ii. p. 91, l. 11–12*.

AṬṬHIMIÑJĀ.

This word occurs in *Jaina Prākṛit*. Dr. Jacobi, in his translation of the *Ācārāṅga Sutta* i. l. 6 (Sacred Books of the East, vol. xxii. p. 12), says: “I do not know the meaning of this word (*aṭṭhimiñjā*), which is rendered [by the Sanskrit Commentary] *asthi-miñjā*.”

The Pāli *aṭṭhimiñjā*, as is well known, signifies ‘bone-marrow,’ and the latter part of the compound Childers refers to *Sk. majjā* without attempting to show by what steps *miñjā* has grown out of *majjā*.

Dr. Jacobi's quotation of *asthi-miñjâ*¹ is important as proof of a Sk. *miñjâ*, *i.e.* *mriñjâ*, cf. Sk. *mrijâ*, wiping, smearing, from the root *mrij*, of which there was probably a nasalized form *mriñj*, and from which *majjâ*, evidently a *prâkritised* form, could be derived.

Other etymologies of *majjâ* suggest themselves: (1) *majjâ*=by assimilation *mañjâ* from the root *mañj*, to wipe, smear (cf. A.S. *smeru*, fat, smear, with Gr. *σμάειν*, to rub, wipe; Sk. $\sqrt{\text{lip}}$, smear, daub, *lepa*, salve, grease); (2) *majjâ* = *mañjâ* = *marjâ* (cf. *Prâkrit mañjara* for *mârjara*) from the root *mrij*.

I do not think that Pâli *miñjâ* in *aṭṭhi-miñjâ* can be derived from Sk. *majjâ*, but that Pâli and Jaina *Prâkrit* retain an older form.

ARAGHAṬṬA.

Cakkavaṭṭaka, *Cullavagga*, v. 16. 2, in *Vinaya Texts*, pt. iii. p. 112, is neatly rendered by 'wheel and axle.' The translators give *Buddhaghosa's* note, which they describe as 'unintelligible'—*arahatta-ghaṭi-yanta*. The explanation of the Commentator, however, may easily be rendered intelligible by a very slight correction of the manuscript reading. I would propose to amend it to *araghaṭṭa-ghaṭiyanta*. The former part of this compound is the Sk. *araghaṭṭa*, and corresponds exactly to the *Hindî arhaṭ* or *rahaṭ*, 'a well-wheel, the so-called Persian wheel—a string of earthen pots attached to a revolving wheel over a well, which go down empty and come up full, and tilt the water into a trough.' While on the subject of wells it may be noted that *karakataka* (*Cull.* v. 16. 2) cannot be 'a bullock machine,' or a bullock draw-well, but a hook in the form of a crab's claw, to which the 'bucket' was attached instead of to the *tûlâ* or *cakkavaṭṭaka*. The Commentator says that the long ropes used for the purpose of drawing up

¹ I assume that *miñja* is not after all a coinage by the Commentator.

the bucket were worked either by hand (over a wheel) or by a bullock. Compare, too, Buddhaghosa's note on *cammakhaṇḍa* (Vinaya Texts, pt. iii. p. 113):—

Cammakhaṇḍam nāma tūlāya vā karakaṭake¹ vā yojettabbam cammahājanam.

UJJAGGHATI, UJJHAGGATI.

Childers has *ujjhaggikā*, loud laughter, but not *ujjhaggati*. See *Therī-Gāthā*, pp. 131, 183; *Puggala-Paññatti*, p. 67. The simple verb *jagghati*² (not in Childers) is in *Jāt.* iii. p. 223, l. 25. See *Suttavibhaṅga*, i. p. 128; *Āṅuttara*, iii. 67. 5.

UBBANDHATI.

Childers has no record of this verb, which with *rajjuyā* probably means to 'strangle.' See *Jāt.* i. p. 504. In a parallel passage in *Jāt.* iii. p. 345, *rajjuyā* is omitted. See *Sutta Vibhaṅga*, I. p. 73; *Therī-Gāthā*, v. 80, p. 131.

There is a verb *ubbhaṇḍati* (not in Childers) in *Mahāvagga* viii. 13, 1, 'to bundle up, wrap up'; and, with a different meaning, a verb *ubbhaṇḍeti* (*Therī-Gāthā*, p. 204).

ULLOKA.

Ulloka (see *Cilimikā*), 'a cloth placed under the bedstead or chair to keep the stuffing from coming out,' *Cull.* vi. 2. 7, *Mahāvagga* i. 25. 15; 'a cloth to remove cobwebs,' *Cull.* viii. 1. 3. The translators of the Vinaya Texts give no etymology of the word, and seem to look upon it as a corrupt form. May it not be considered a variant of *ulloca* an awning, for the chair during the process of upholstering would be turned up, and the cloth would become, so to speak, 'an awning'? In the *Aupapātika Sutta*, § 32, we find a form *ulloga* = *ulloka*, and *ulloya* = *ulloca*.

¹ MS. *kaṭadakatake*.

² Sk. has no *√jhagg*, *√jaggh*; cf. Sk. *√kakk*, *khakkh*.

USSOḤHIKĀ.

Childers has *Ussōhi*, but not *Ussōhikā*. *Cf.*

Na hi nūn' imassa samanassa || tucchakoṭṭhasmim musikā.

Ussōhikāya naccanti || tenāyaṃ samaṇo sukhī.

(*Samyutta Nikāya*, vii. 1. 10, pp. 170, 171).

EKODI-BHĀVA.¹

“This term has been variously explained by Pāli and Buddhist scholars. Burnouf renders it by ‘unity’ (of mind), Gogerly by ‘purity,’ Prof. Rhys Davids by ‘exaltation.’ Childers defines it by ‘predominance’; but adds that he does not feel competent to give a decided opinion as to the exact meaning of *ekodi-bhāva*. According to a commentary quoted in his dictionary, *EKODI*=*eka+udi* (from *udeti*), and is a synonym (*adhi-vacana*) of *Samādhi*. Prof. Kern, in the introduction to his translation of the ‘*Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka*’ (‘Sacred Books of the East,’ vol. xxi. p. xvii), calls attention to the corresponding term, *ekoti-bhāva* in the ‘*Lalita-Vistara*,’ p. 439, l. 6, which he connects with the *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον* *EKOTI* in the ‘*Satapathabrahmana*,’ xii. 2. 2. 4. Referring to the P. W., *s.v.* *ἔτι*, we find that *EKOTI* (used in the plural) means ‘having the same objects or desires of enjoyment (as food, etc.)’ This use of so rare a term does not help us to explain the Buddhist sense of *ekodi*, nor does the word *ekoti-bhāva* of the ‘*Lalita-Vistara*’ throw any light upon the subject beyond the fact that it does duty for the *ekodi-bhāva* of the Southern Buddhists.

Childers, unfortunately, gives no references for the use of *ekodi-bhāva* except one stock passage descriptive of the four *jhānas*. The following passage goes to show that ‘*ekodi-bhāvo*’ is connected with *Samādhi* (a more advanced state of meditation than *Jhāna*):

¹ See “Academy” for March 27th, 1886, p. 222.

‘Pañcaṅgike samādhimhi sante ekodibhāvite¹
paṭipassaddhiladdh’ amhi,’ etc.

(Thera-Gāthā, v. 916.)

In verse 962 of the ‘Sutta-Nipāta’ we find EKODI uncombined in the phrase ‘ekodi nipako sato,’ *i.e.* intent on one object, wise and thoughtful (see Prof. Fausböll’s translation, ‘Sacred Books of the East,’ vol. x. p. 181). With this compare a similar passage (where the plural is used) in the Samyutta-Nikāya, ii. 2. 1. The commentator explains ekodi by ekaggacitta. The Burmese (Phayre MS.) version has ekodhi, which is probably an attempt to secure a reading that shall be more self-evident and intelligible than ekodi. It nevertheless points, I venture to think, to the real etymology of the word, from eka and odhi (or avadhi= ‘end, point, aim’). The loss of aspiration seen in ekodi is not altogether unknown in Pāli, and may be due to the following aspirate in ekodi-bhāva, for the use of ekodi uncombined is known only to occur in one stock phrase. Ekodi-bhāva will therefore signify concentration (of the mind) on one object, *i.e.* on Arahatsip or Nirvāna, in which there is no mental or bodily disturbance of any kind.² Hence we find, instead of ekodi nipako sato, the phrase (similar in meaning) acapalo nipako samvutindriyo.

It is well known that the Jainas, in their philosophical system, employed many terms in common with the Buddhists; so that we are not surprised to find corresponding closely in meaning to ekodibhāva the terms (used in reference to pure jhāna) egatta-bhāva, egattībhāva=ekāgratā.³ With this compare the Jaina ‘manaso egattibhāva’ (Aupapātika Sutta, p. 59) with the Pāli

¹ Ekodhibhūto occurs in the Satipatthāna-vagga of the Samyutta-Nikāya. See Aṅguttara-Nikāya, iii. 100, 4.

² Cf. Suññato samādhi, animitto samādhi, appanīhito samādhi (Milinda-Pañha, p. 337; Aṅguttara, iii. 163, p. 299).

³ In the Yoga philosophy ekāgratā is defined as ‘fixedness of the thinking principle upon any *sensuous* object to which it may be directed; ekaggatā is never, I think, thus used in Pāli. Certain of the Kammatthāna exercises consisted in fixing the mind on some sensuous object.

‘manaso ekodibhâva’ (Brahmajâla Sutta). The Jainas were not ignorant of the term avadhi, *cf.* ohi-nâna = avadhi-jñâna (Aupapâtika Sutta, §§ 30, 41); but they restricted it to ‘the knowledge of special objects produced by right intuition (samyag-daršana = Pâli sammâ-daṣṣana), etc., as destroying the natural hindrances’ (see *Life and Essays of Colebrooke*, vol. i. p. 445). Prof. Jacobi defines ‘ohi-nâna’ as a sort of supernatural knowledge, and notes that the Jaina theories and terminology, relating to the various degrees of knowledge up to omniscience, differ from those of the Brâhmanic philosophers and Buddhists.¹ It is worth noticing, however, that the Jaina kevala, the highest degree of knowledge, consisting in omniscience, is identical with the Buddhist kevala or Nirvâna (*cf.* kevalî, Thera-Gâthâ, v. 679; Sutta-Nipâta, v. 82; Samyutta-Nikâya, vii. i. 8-9). In the Yoga philosophy kâivalya denoted isolation of the ‘self’ from the phenomenal world, consisting in absolute extirpation of pain. This final deliverance from the bondage of ‘rebirth’ among men or gods was the final reward of meditation (samâdhi), and approximated closely to the Buddhist Nirvâna.

Before taking leave of ekodibhâva, we must bear in mind the fact, pointed out by Prof. Kern (Saddharma-Puṇḍarîka, p. xvi), that certain parts of the Northern Buddhist books, more especially the verses, have been Sanskritized to a very large extent, ‘so that they ought to be restored as much as possible to a more primitive form before a comparison with Pâli can lead to a satisfactory result.’ The Pâli forms, however, may still be allowed to throw some light upon these modernized and altered texts, and ekodî seems to be a case in point. To the Southern Buddhists, ekoti for eka + ūti would be unintelligible, for no known text gives any example of this rare word ūti, which seems to belong only to the Vedic and Brahmana periods; while to the Northern Buddhists the Prâkritized

¹ See an interesting note on ohi-nâna, in Dr. Hoernle’s edition of the “Uvâsagadasâo,” fasc. i. p. 48.

form, ekodi or ekodhi, would be equally perplexing, and would cause them to Sanskritize it as best they could. A very good instance of this Sanskritizing process in the 'Saddharma-Puṇḍarika' (pp. 142, 146, 395), which has escaped the keen eye of Prof. Kern, is seen in syandanika-gûthoḍilla (*var. lect.*—oḍigilla,—oḍigalla), translated by 'gutters and dirty pools.' Prof. Kern acknowledges that his rendering of gûthoḍilla is conjectural. Here we may call in Pāli to throw some light upon the whole compound syandanika°. Not seldom we find the Pāli terms candanikâ and oligalla occurring together (see Aṅguttara-Nikāya, III. vi. 8; Milinda-Pañha, p. 220; Sabbāsava Sutta), the former meaning, according to the Abhidhānappa-dīpikâ, 'a dirty pool at the entrance of a village,' the latter 'a dirty pool near a village.' The Pāli candanikâ is probably to be referred to a more original caṇḍanikâ, from the root caṇḍ, and signifies a turbid pool, or one liable to become so on account of not being inclosed (see Thera Gāthâ, l. 567; Cullavagga, v. 17. 1). Buddhaghosa defines it as asucikalalakûpo. The Sanskrit syandanika, according to the lexicographers, does not mean a tank, well, or pool, but 'a drop of saliva,' and the meaning 'gutter' given to it by Prof. Kern is deduced by him from the root syand (*cf.* syandana, oozing water). It is one of those words that may be restored to its primitive form, since it is in fact a clever Sanskritizing of Pāli candanikâ. Gûthoḍilla should, I think, be rendered 'cesspool,' answering to Pāli gûthakûpo. But the latter part of 'gûthoḍilla = gûthâ+uḍilla' offers many difficulties. Prof. Kern quotes the Pāli oligalla as a parallel form; and, at the first glance, uḍilla (uḍigilla or uḍigalla) looks very much like a Sanskritizing of a more primitive oligalla, with an attempt, perhaps, to connect it with uḍu. All the MSS. I have examined have the dental, and not the cerebral, *l* in oligalla, though Dr. Trenckner finds the word with the cerebral *l* in the Milinda-Pañha. The form uḍilla may point to an older uḍikilla, from avāḍi = avāṭi 'pit, well'; while the Pāli oligalla may stand for a more

original allagalla, from alla 'wet'=(ulla, olla, well-known Prākṛit forms, Sanskrit ārdra) 'swampy, marshy,' and galla = Sanskrit garta, Prākṛit gaḍḍa 'well, pit.'

Prof. Jacobi, in the Glossary to 'Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāshṭrī,' gives us a form 'ullī = schmiere.'

But all this is by way of conjecture. When we have more Buddhist and Jaina texts, we may perhaps be able to solve the difficulties offered by this and numerous other points in Pāli philology."

Prof. Max Müller, on the substance of the above, contributed the following interesting note to the "Academy" for April 3rd, 1886, p. 241:—

"After reading Dr. Morris's suggestive article on 'Ekodibhāva' in last week's 'Academy,' I looked through my Buddhist slips, and found there a note that a MS. of the India Office Library reads Ekoṭibhāva in the 'Lālita-Vistara,' p. 439, l. 5, and that the same reading occurs on p. 147, l. 8, instead of ekābhibhāva. Added to this, I find a query, 'Could it be for ekakoṭibhāva?' I am not certain whether this is my own conjecture, or whether some one else has suggested it before. Of course the meaning of ekakoṭi and ekakoṭibhāva would be clear. It would be the same as ekāgra and ekāgrabhāva. Ekāgra occurs in the very first line of Manu, and is well explained there by vishayāntarāvyākshiptakitta, 'concentrated, his mind not being distracted by any other objects.' Koṭi is used for the two ends of a bow, and particularly in philosophical writings for the two alternatives of an argument. Ekakoṭi would, therefore, mean being absorbed in one view. I do not give much for ekoti in the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa, explained as meaning 'having the same course.' It looks to me like an attempt to explain a Bhāshā word which had ceased to be intelligible. I agree with Dr. Morris that the explanation sent to Childers by his friend Subhūti is likewise very artificial. Schiefner's explanation, too, which Dr. Morris does not mention, namely, that ekoṭibhāva represents ekāvalī- or ekolībhāva, is

not convincing. Dr. Morris proposes *ekâvadhi-* or *ekodhibhâva*, which would give a good meaning, namely, 'absorbed in one limit,' if the transition of *avadhi*, the Jaina *ohi*, into *oḍi*, and, again, the representation of *oḍi* by Sanskrit *oṭi*, could be supported by analogous cases. To take *ekoṭi* as an irregular contraction of *ekakoṭi* is, no doubt, unusual. It reminds us of 'mineralogy' instead of 'mineralology.' But unless something unusual had happened, native commentators would probably have been less at a loss to account for this mysterious word. However, I only mention this derivation. I do not claim either the merit or the responsibility of it."

Prof. Eggeling was kind enough, at the request of Dr. Rhys Davids, to send the following note on *ekoti* :—

"The passage in question (*Śat. Br. K. xii. 2, 2, 4*) runs as follows :— *Prishṭhyâbhiplavau tantre kurvîtetî ha smâha Paingyaḥ ; tayoh stotrâṇi ca śastrâṇi ca samcâraved itî. Sa yat samcârâyati tasmâd ime prâṇâ nânâ santa ekotayaḥ, samânam ûtim anusamcaranti.*

'Let him make the *Prishṭhya* and *Abhiplava* the two tantras,' said *Paingya*; 'and let him make both the *Stotras* and *Śastras* in (or, of) these two run together (? *i.e.* in the same manner).' Now, because he makes them run together (? in the same manner), therefore these vital airs (of man), though being distinct, are *ekoti*, run together along one and the same *ûti*.

The question is, What is here the meaning of *tantra* and *ûti*? Prof. Weber (in *Böttl.-Roth's Dict.*) takes *tantra* in the metaphorical sense of 'normal form, fundamental order'; and *ûti* (from *av* 'to favour') in that of 'striving after a goal, course.' My own interpretation is rather different. I take *tantra* in its original sense of 'warp,' and *ûti* (from *vâ*, 'to weave') in that of 'web, weft.'

He is to make the *Prishṭhya* and *Abhiplava* the warps of two (sacrificial) webs. And because he makes the *stotras* and *śastras* run together therein (? as the woof), therefore these vital airs of man are 'one-webbed,' run along one and

the same web. While I certainly think that this is the meaning of the passage, it seems to be quite possible that a play on the word *ûti* is intended here, viz. that it may have both the meaning of 'web' and 'course.'

Prof. Weber seems to think that the passage (with *ûti*) is corrupt or incomplete; but I have compared the Bodleian MS. of the Kâṇva recension, and find that it has the same rendering of this passage.

Whether this 'ekoti' has anything to do with the *ekotibhâva* of the *Lalitavistara* is very doubtful, at all events I do not think that any chronological (or synchronistic) inferences can be drawn from this coincidence."

OPADHIKA.

"Yajamânaṃ manussânaṃ
puññapekhânapâṇinaṃ
karotam opadhikaṃ puññaṃ
kattha dinnam mahapphalan ti."

(Saṃyutta-Nikâya, vi. 2, p. 233.)

The only meaning that Childers assigns to *opadhika* is 'belonging to *upadhi*'; but this gives no explanation of the word in the *gâthâ* above quoted.

Bearing in mind such phrases as "puññâni anekâni karoti," "puññaṃ anappakaṃ karoti," *opadhika* must mean 'exceedingly great,' and be connected with Sk. *upâdhika*.¹ The Editors of the *Divyâvadâna* register an equally puzzling *aupadhika* (p. 542, l. 17-28).

KUKKUṬA-SAMPÂTIKA.

This occurs in *Ânguttara Nikâya*, iii. 56, with reference to a shower of sparks or of hot ashes.

In the *Divyâvadâna*, p. 316, l. 11, we have *kukuṭasam-*

¹ *Opadhika* cannot be referred to *upadahati* (not in Childers). See *Milinda-pañha*, pp. 108, 109, 164; *Suttavibhanga*, ii. p. 148.

pâta,¹ and in the Index of Words the Editors suggest kukura [? kukûla].

The form kukkuṭa is no doubt correct, being an onomatopoeic word, of which kukkuḷa or kukkula is a variant (see Jâtaka, ii. p. 134 ; Saṃyutta, x. 7, p. 209).

Kukkuṭa also signifies a cock, and from its red comb the cock was used as a symbol of fire. Margaret Hunt, the translator of Grimm's Household Tales, vol. ii. p. 128, says, "I will set a red cock on your roof is the incendiary's threat in Germany, where fire is compared to a cock flying from house to house. Grimm's Deutsche Mythologie, p. 568. Red cock-crawling—a cant term for fire-raising in the south of Scotland."

CILIMIKÂ, CILLAKA.

The word Cilimikâ occurs in Cullavagga, vi. 2. 6. 7, and= cimilikâ in Suttavibhaṅga, ii. 40 (cf. note 5 on Mahâvagga, vii. 1. 5). Dr. E. Müller refers cilimikâ to Sk. cilamilika, cilimilikâ, ciliminikâ 'an ornament,' but the translators of the Vinaya Texts render it 'carpet,' 'rug,' and suggest its connection with cola [? cela]. Buddhaghosa explains cilimikâ as tâlapaṇṇâdîhi katâ. This shows that it was a kind of cloth made from leaves, bark, etc., like the Hindî jhilamilî 'a kind of cloth,' jhilamilâ 'a kind of gauze,' cf. Marâthî jhilamilâ 'ornamental shreds of paper, fringe.' With these forms we must connect Hindî cilavana, cilamana, a kind of gauze used as a Venetian blind. The Pâli cilimikâ may have been applied to a carpet or rug on account of its fringe or edging. Cilimikâ is used by the Commentator to explain ulloka, 'a cloth,' 'duster' (Cull. vi. 2. 7). Here perhaps we should compare Sk. jhilli 'cloth,' jhillikâ 'a cloth or rag used for applying colour on unguents,' from cîra 'rag, cloth.' For the forms with initial jh=c compare Sk. jhiri, jhirika, jhillika 'a cricket,' with cîri, cirika, cilli, cillika 'a cricket.'

¹ Kukkuṭasampâta occurs in Suttavibhaṅga, ii. p. 63.

There is a Pāli CILLAKA (not in Childers) signifying 'bark cloth.' It occurs in a somewhat difficult passage in Therī-Gāthā, v. 390 :—

Diṭṭhā hi mayā sucittā sombhā dārūka-cillakā navā |
 Tantihi ca khīlakehi ca vinibaddhā vividhaṃ panaccitā
 ||390||
 Tamh' uddhate tanti-khīlake viṣaṭṭhe vikale paripakkate |
 A vinde khaṇḍaso kate kimhi tattha maṇaṃ nivesaye ? ||391||
 Tathūpamaṃ dehakāni maṃ tehi dhammehi viṇā na vattanti
 Dhammehi viṇā na vattanti kimhi tattha maṇaṃ nive-
 saye ? ||392||

"I have seen forsooth a new and beautifully formed figure (or puppet) made up of wood and bark, fastened together by strings and pins, and made to go through various motions (like a *dancer*). But when the pins were pulled out, and both pins and strings detached and scattered about, you would not find (any rūpa or form) in the broken-up figure, (for) on what¹ in that (figure) would you fix the mind (as the real form or rūpa)? The body (with its various limbs) making-up me such a figure (as this dancing puppet) does not exist apart from these conditions (of its several parts, *i.e.* the four dhātus). On what then in that (bodily frame of mine) would you fix the mind (as the rūpa) since without these conditions it does not exist?"

Sombhā (not in Childers) is explained by the Commentary, p. 211, as sombhakā, which really gives us no help to the meaning of the word. It seems here evidently to have the meaning of potthaka (not in Childers) 'a figure made of wood,' 'a modelled figure' *cf.* Sk. pusta, pustaka).

Sombhā must be referred to the √cumbh or √cubh.²

¹ *I.e.* on what particular part of the figure when reduced to fragments.

² Is sobhaṇkaṃ (sobhanakaraṇam) in the Majjhima sīla, rendered 'balls' by Dr. Davids (*Buddhist Suttas*, p. 192), to be referred to sombhā in the passage translated above, and to be rendered by 'puppet shows'?

With regard to cilimika, cillaka and cîra, Sk. lexicographers offer no etymology. I would venture to suggest an onomatopoeic root cir or cil 'to crackle' (*cf.* our 'scrap' from 'scrape'), seen in Hindî ciracirânâ, cilacilânâ 'to crackle'; cîranâ 'to rend, tear'; cîri 'a cut, tear'; jhila-milânâ 'to crackle'; jhirî 'crack, slit, bark.'

CHANDAKA.

Chandakam samharati (not in Childers) seems to mean 'to raise a subscription,' 'make a collection.' *Cf.* Hindî candâ uṭhânâ 'get up a subscription,' 'contribute.' See Jât. i. p. 422; Jât. ii. pp. 45, 196; Suttavibhaṅga, ii. p. 250.

DHAṂSATI.

Childers registers dhamseti 'to fell,' 'destroy,' but not dhamṣati 'to fall,' 'fall away from' (with the ablative). *Cf.* Jât. iii. p. 260, where dhamṣati is explained in the Commentary by parihiyyati; also Jât. iii. p. 457, "saggaṭṭhânâ dhamṣati," explained in the Com. by "âkâsato bhassitvâ paṭhavim pavissati." Dhamṣate occurs in Thera-Gâthâ, v. 225, "sukhâ so dhamṣate," and in v. 610, "dussilo pana mittehi dhamṣate pâpaṃ âcaram."

NIKÛJATI.

Under this head Childers has omitted to register two distinct verbs. The first must be referred to the Sk. nikûj 'to chirp, warble, hum.'

Kânasmiṃ vanasaṇḍacârîṇî kokilâ va madhuraṃ nikûjitaṃ
Taṃ jarâya khalitaṃ tahiṃ tahiṃ saccavâdivacanaṃ anañ-
ñathâ (Therî-Gâthâ, v. 261).¹

The second nikûjati (of onomatopoeic origin with the first) is not found in Sanskrit. It means 'to twang.' *Cf.* Sk.

¹ *Cf.* Khippaṃ giraṃ eraya vaggi vaggum hamsa va paggayha sanikaṃ nikûjama Bindussarena suvikappitena (Thera-Gâthâ, v. 1270).

√çin̄j (weakened form of a root kiñj or kuñj) 'to twang, jingle'; çin̄jinî 'a bow-string'; and √kuñj 'to rustle.'

Yathâ câpo ninnamati jiyâ câpo nikûjati (Jât. iii. No. 397, p. 323, l. 7).

NIKKIṆÂTI.

Childers registers kiṇâti and vikkiṇâti, but not nikkiṇâti, but see Milinda-pañha, p. 284. Does âvapitum in Milinda, p. 279, mean 'to cast off' or 'to give as a present,' "labhati pitâ puttam inatto vâ âjîvakapakato vâ âvapitum vâ vikkin̄itum vâ ti."

NIBBHOGA.

Aññatra oṭṭha-nibbhogâ nâyam jânâti kiñcanan ti (Jât. ii. No. 247, p. 264).

The only meaning assigned to nibbhoga in Childers's Dictionary is 'wretched, miserable,' but in the passage above quoted from the Jâtaka-book nibbhoga signifies 'a distortion'; oṭṭha-nibbhoga=oṭṭha-bhañjana¹ 'making a wry face' (Jât. ii. p. 263, l. 25). Nibbhoga, not used in this sense in Sanskrit, is from nirbhuj, *cf.* Sanskrit oshṭhau nirbhujati 'to distort one's lips, make a wry face,'¹ corresponding to Pâli oṭṭham bhañjati (?oṭṭham bhuñjati), Jât. ii. pp. 263, 264.

PAVECCHATI AND ANUPPAVECCHATI.²

The words pavecchati and anuppavecchati present many difficulties to Pâli scholars, and no satisfactory explanation has, as yet, been given of them.

Dr. Trenckner has pointed out ("Pâli Miscellanies," p. 61) that "pavecchati 'to give,' is traditionally explained by paveseti (as if causal), or by deti, and looks like a

¹ *Cf.* Sk. bhañjana, bhañjanaka 'contortion of the lips, decay of the teeth.'

² See "Academy" for Sept. 26th, 1885, p. 207.

derivative from avikshat; but neither viç nor vish makes good sense. In the meaning it agrees with Sanskrit prayacchati, but the identification presents some phonetical difficulties."

Though pavecchati means 'to give,' the syntactical use of deti is not quite the same; the latter usually takes an accusative and dative, the former an accusative and locative. Childers is altogether silent about this construction; but compare the use of pavecchati in the following passages:

"Âdeyyesu dadam dânam deyyesu na pavecchati."
(Jât. iii. p. 12; see also p. 172.)

"Kâlena tamhi havyam pavecchati."
(Sutta-Nipâta, vv. 463-4, 490.)

"Appasmim ye pavecchanti esa dhammo sanantato."
(Samyutta-Nikâya, I. iv. 2.)

This employment of an accusative and locative seems to indicate that the original meaning of pavecchati was probably not 'to give,' but 'to pour down (on),' and hence to 'bestow, give.'

Instead of referring it to the root viç or vish, it might well be derived from the root vřish ('varsh'), 'to rain,' 'to induce to rain' (causal). Cf. Pâli acchati, from the root âs, through the aorist acchi.

It is worth noting that, traditionally, the meaning of 'give' is assigned to vřish by the Sanskrit lexicographers. But the Sanskrit pra-vřish is represented in Pâli by the verb pavassati, used impersonally, or with 'deva' or 'megha' as subject. Cf. 'pavassa deva' (Sutta-Nipâta, vv. 18, 19, 20); 'mahâmegho pâvassi' (Jât. i. p. 503); see also Samyutta-Nikâya, iii. 3, 4, where abhivassati occurs, and again in viii. 7. See Milinda-Pañha, p. 152.

No examples, however, of such phrases as 'devo pavecchati,' 'megho pavecchati,'¹ have as yet been pointed out; but

¹ The Burmese MSS. read pavacchati and anuppavacchati.

anuppavecchati does occur with deva as its subject in an inedited portion of the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya*, III. 33, p. 135: "devo ca sammādhāraṃ anuppaveccheyya."

"Puna ca paraṃ brāhmaṇa etarahi manussā adhammarāgarattā . . . tesam adhammarāgarattānaṃ . . . devo na sammādhāraṃ anuppavecchati, tena dubbhikkhaṃ hoti" (*Ib.* III. 56, p. 160). See *Divyāvadāna*, pp. 25, 437; *Milinda-Pañha*, p. 375.

There is no very great change of meaning between 'to cause to rain,' 'to pour down,' etc., and 'to give.' Even in our own language we are not altogether unfamiliar with such phrases (used devotionally) as 'to shower down,' 'to pour down,' and 'to shed,' in the sense of 'to give,' 'bestow,' etc. There is a somewhat difficult passage in the *Sutta-Nipāta* (vv. 208, 209), where anuppavecchati¹ occurs in the sense of deti, but where the original meaning, perhaps, is implied in the metaphor employed in v. 209:

- "(208) Yo jātaṃ ucchijja na ropayeyya
jāyantam assa nānuppavecche
tam āhu ekaṃ muninaṃ carantaṃ
adakkhi so santipadaṃ mahesi.
(209) Saṅkhāya vatthūni pamāya bijaṃ
Sineham assa nānuppavecche."

Prof. Fausböll translates the foregoing verses as follows:

"Whosoever after cutting down the [sin that has] arisen does not let [it again] take root, and *does not give way to it* while springing up towards him, him, the solitary wandering, they call a Muni: such a great Isi has seen the state of peace.

"(209) Having considered the causes [of sin and] killed the seed, *let him not give way to desire for it.*"

Anuppavecchati cannot mean 'to give way to,' nor does *assa* (v. 208) mean *towards him*; the dative must be

¹ Childers, in the Addenda to his Pāli Dictionary, explains anuppavecchati by 'to enter,' from √viç; but this gives no sense.

here used to express 'to' or 'for' (the sake of) as in v. 209 and in the second quotation from the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya*.

There is a great difficulty in the reading *jāyantam* (in v. 208), the present participle of *jāyati*; what we require, as seen in v. 209, is a noun of some kind in the accusative. At first sight one is tempted to read *yāpanam* 'sustenance,' or *pānīyam* 'water,' corresponding to *sineham* in v. 209; but, bearing in mind the use of *deti* in the sense of 'allow,' 'permit,' we might, without much violence to the original reading, substitute the infinitive of *jāyati*, that is to say, put a verbal noun instead of the present participle, and then we should get the following *grammatical* rendering :

"Whosoever, after having uprooted the [sin that has] arisen would not replant it, and *would not allow it to grow up* [again], him, the solitary wandering," etc.

The next verse (209) reads very awkwardly in its English dress, and there seems a want of balance in the first part of it, 'having considered . . . *having killed*'; but this could easily be got rid of by taking *pamāya* as equivalent to *paminitvā*, signifying 'having discerned,' *cf.* 'Yo c'idha kammaṃ kurute pamāya,' etc. (*Jât.* iii. p. 114).

The meaning of the foregoing passage might be expressed in the following terms :

"Having considered the causes [of sin, *i.e.* having got at the *root* of sin], having discerned the *seed* [*i.e.* having having found out the *germs* of sin], let him not allow any desire for it [to arise again, whereby the sin shall be enabled to grow up and come to maturity]."

Sineha (*sneha*) does not only mean 'desire,' but, in regard to *seed*, signifies (fructifying) *moisture*, as in the following passage from the *Samyutta-Nikāya*, v. 9 :

"Yathā aññataram bījaṃ khette vuttam virūhati patha-vīrasañ cāgamma sinehañ ca tad ubhayam evaṃ khandhā ca dhātuyo cha ca āyatanā ime hetum paṭicca sambhutā hetubhaṅgā nirujjhare."

"As some seed cast into a field grows up by reason of the earth's sap and the [life-giving] *moisture* [in the earth]

[and] by both of these, so the elements of being, the senses and the objects of sense, spring up by reason of a cause, and by the destruction of a cause are annihilated.”

If, however, we are to take *pamâya* in the sense of ‘having killed,’ for it can be so translated, then *saṅkhâya* must be referred not to the Sanskrit *saṅkhyâ*, but to the causal of *saṅkṣi*, and may be rendered ‘having destroyed,’ *i.e.* “the sage *having* once *destroyed* the root, and *having killed* the germ of human passion by leading a solitary life, is not to revive it by going back to his former association with the world and worldly pursuits.” This interpretation fits in well with v. 207, the commencement of the *Munisutta*:

“From intimacy [with the world] arises fear, from household life arises defilement; the homeless state, freedom from association [with the world]—this is, indeed, the view of a Muni.”

PAMUÑCATI SADDHAM.

In *Mahāvagga*, i. v. 7, *Saṃyutta*, vi. 1, 2 *Brahmâ Sahampati* entertains the Buddha to open the door of the Immortal (*i.e.* of *Nirvâna*), and to let those who were able to understand, hear the doctrine the Blessed One alone had discovered. In answer to this request, Buddha repeated the following stanza:

“*Apârutâ tesam amatassa dvârâ || ye sotavanto pamuñ-*
cantu saddham ||”

This is rendered by the translators of the *Vinaya Texts* (*Sacred Books of the East*, vol. xiii. p. 88) as follows:

“Wide open is the door of the Immortal to all who have ears to hear; let them send forth faith to meet it.”

Mr. Bendall, in the *Journal of the Pâli Text Society* for 1883 (pp. 77–85), draws attention to the translation of *pamuñcantu* by ‘send forth to meet it,’ and points out that it would be difficult, if not impossible, to verify this sense of the verb. He suggests that *saddham* in the stanza quoted above is not ‘faith,’ but ‘an offering to the manes,’ representing the older Brahmanical faith, and that *pamuñcantu*

signifies 'let them relinquish.' But the thought of Brahmâ Sahampati, on hearing the Buddha's reply to his request, does not support either the translation given by Dr. Oldenberg and Prof. Davids or that suggested by their critic :

"Then Brahmâ Sahampati understood 'the Blessed One grants my request that he should preach the doctrine.'"

As the gâthâ stands translated no such request is granted. We must therefore endeavour to look at the Pâli a little more closely.

Tesam I take to refer to those whose mental eyes were clear, and who were able and willing to receive the teaching of the dhamma; sotavanto does not, I think, here mean 'having ears,' though this sense is supported by the Tibetan version of the Sanskrit equivalent of the Pâli original. In Sanskrit sota signifies not only the ear, but conversancy with Vedic revelation and sacred lore, so that sotavâ, in a Buddhistic sense, might be almost equivalent to Pâli tevijjo. It would be here only applicable to Buddha, who claimed to have acquired, as the result of long meditation, a new way to Nirvâna, self-revealed, and at first known only to himself. To saddham I would give its ordinary meaning of *faith*.

The next difficulty is with pamuñcantu. The translators of the Vinaya Texts seem to have overlooked a use of the verb pamuñcati in the sense of 'utter,' 'declare.'

"Vâcam pamuñce kusalam nâivelam "

(Sutta Nipâta, v. 973).

Fortunately we have an example of the use of pamuñcati with saddham, where the meaning seems tolerably clear.

"Yathâ ahu Vakkali muttasaddho

Evam eva tvam pi pamuñcayassu (? pamuñcassu) saddham."

(Sutta-Nipâta, v. 1146.)

This is translated by Prof. Fausböll (Sacred Books of the East, vol. x. p. 213) as follows :—"As V. was delivered

by faith, so shalt thou let faith deliver thee." Prof. Rhys Davids, in his Hibbert Lectures, gives a different rendering, but both are open to great objections.

Muttasaddho does not mean delivered by faith, for that is expressed by the familiar term saddhâvimutto. I would suggest the following alteration:—"As V. was one by whom the faith was proclaimed, so shalt thou proclaim the faith."

Now in v. 1131 Pīngiya, to whom the words in v. 1146 are addressed, says, "Pārāyanam anugāyissam" I will proclaim the way to the further shore (*i.e.* Nirvāna). Taking sotavanto, pamuñcantu, etc., in the senses already suggested, the stanza from the Mahāvagga might be rendered thus:—

"Wide ope to them are now Nirvāna's gates,
Let them who know the truth the faith declare."

Of course Buddha was the only one *conversant with the truth* (sotavā), and so Brahmā Sahampati understood it, and departed, knowing full well that his request was granted.

Professor Kern has found the same difficulty in the translation of the verb pamuñcati. He says:—"I do not understand this pamuñcantu 'let them cast off, loose or emit.' Perhaps we have to read payuñjantu 'let them produce.'" (Saddharma-puṇḍarīka, p. xii, note 6.)

PASSA.

Childers has not registered this word, which occurs in Thera-Gāthā, v. 61, p. 9.

Passati passo passantam apassantañ ca passati
Apassanto apassantaṃ passantañ ca na passatī ti.

With the above quotation compare Upanishad, pt. ii. Sacred Books of the East, vol. xv. p. 345, where Prof. Max Müller quotes from the Chhândogya Upanishad the following lines:—

Na paśyo mṛityuṃ paśyati na rogaṃ nota duḥkhatāṃ
Sarvaṃ ha paśyaḥ paśyati sarvaṃ āpnoti sarvaśaḥ.

PUNARABHISHEKA.

Punarabhisheka is mentioned in the Aitareya Brâhmaṇa, 8. 5. i. (ed. Aufrecht, p. 214), and is alluded to in the Vaḍḍhakisûkara Jâtaka (No. 283, ii. p. 409), translated by the present writer in the Folk Lore Journal, vol. iv. pt. i. pp. 48-52.

The Jâtaka story says, "They made kings sit in a fine chair made of Udambara wood, and consecrated him with three shells."

BHASTÂ.

The only meaning assigned to bhastâ in Childers is 'bellows,' but it occurs in the sense of (1) 'goat' (=aja), Jât. iii. p. 278; (2) 'leathern bag,' 'a skin,' Jât. iii. p. 346; Thera-Gâtha, vv. 1134, 1138; Therî-Gâthâ, p. 202, l. 19.

MAKKAṬIKA.

In Jât. ii. p. 70, mukha-makkaṭikaṃ karoti means 'to make monkey-faces,' 'to make grimaces,' *cf.* makkavi-kâraḍîni karoti (Jât. ii. p. 447); and makkaṭiyâni karoti (Jât. ii. p. 448).

In the first gâthâ to Jât. No. 299, ii. p. 448, okkandikaṃ kîlati seems to be equivalent to makkaṭikaṃ karoti. The Com. explains okkandikaṃ by "migo viya okkandikatvâ." If okkandikaṃ kîlati signify 'to cut capers,' 'gambol,' it is to be referred to the $\sqrt{\text{skand}}$; or if it be the same as 'kikiṃ karoti' (see Jât. ii. p. 71), then we should have to refer it to the $\sqrt{\text{krand}}$.

MOKKHACIKA.

This word occurs in the Majjhimasîla. Dr. Rhys Davids, translating Buddhaghosa's note, explains it by 'tumbling.'

Childers renders it 'tumbling, acrobatic feats.' Turning summersaults is certainly one part of the amusement expressed by mokkhacika (see Vinaya Texts, pt. ii. p. 184), but how is the word to be etymologically explained?

The first part of the term—mokkha from $\sqrt{\text{muc}}$ —may mean ‘tumbling, falling,’ but what is cika? I take it to mean ‘turning’ from a root cik, a weakened form of $\sqrt{\text{cak}}$ ‘to turn, whirl’ (*cf.* Sk. cakita ‘shaking,’ cak-ra ‘a wheel’; Hindi cakcaka ‘flashing’), a nasalized form of which we have in Sk. cañc-ala; Hindî cañcala ‘lightning,’ cañc-anânâ ‘to thrust, shoot.’

For weakened forms like cik¹ from cak, compare the Sk. roots aṅg and iṅg; çam and çim; ças and çis. Not only have we in Pāli traces of a root cik from cak, but also a root ciṅg ‘to turn or go round’ (not found in Sansk.), in ciṅgulaka ‘a mimic windmill made with palm leaves.’

Ciṅgulaka was probably an old game of ‘whirligigs.’ In Jain Prākṛit it is called vaṭṭa-kheḍḍa (see Aupapātika-sutta, § 107, p. 77).²

There must have been a noun ciṅg-ula ‘a wheel,’ for we find in the Aṅguttara-Nikāya iii. 15. 2, the denominative ciṅgulāyitvâ ‘causing a wheel to go round.’ This root ciṅg in the sense of ‘to jump,’ explains Sk. ciṅg-aṭa (a prawn, shrimp), which the Sanskrit lexicographers have not ventured to refer to any root.

LAṄGHAKA.

Laṅghaka (not in Childers) is an ‘acrobat.’ See Milinda-pañha, pp. 34, 191, 331; Jât. i. 431. Laṅghanasippa = ‘the art of jumping over swords or knives,’ Jât. i. p. 430.

Cf. “laṅghana-dhāvana-gīta-naccādini” (Jât. ii. 431); laṅghî (Jât. ii. p. 363; Jât. iii. p. 226).

LOCANA.

The only meaning given to locana by Childers is ‘eye,’ but there is another locana in the phrase kesamassulo-

¹ *Cf.* Hindî cikalanâ ‘to chew slowly’; cikanânâ ‘to rub, polish.’

² In this section of the Aupapātika Sutta we find daṇḍa-yuddha and nāḷiyā-yuddha. See note on Daṇḍa-yuddha in the “Journal of the Pāli Text Society,” 1884.

cana (Puggala-Paññatti, p. 55; Aṅguttara-Nikāya, iii. 151; Jât. iii. pp. 74, 235). Here locana has the sense of the Sanskrit luñcana 'pulling or tearing out,' and is a derivative of a verb loceti (not in Childers), the causative of luñcati.

locana : loceti :: mocana : moceti.
loceti : luñcati :: moceti : muñcati.

The usual causative of luñcati is luñceti (not in Childers), *cf.* kese luñcetvâ (Therî-Gâthâ, Com. p. 186):—

Te sâdhû ti tassâ tâlaṭṭhinâ kese luñcetvâ pabbajesuṃ.

But locayati occurs once in our printed texts:—

Pañcapaññâsa vassâni rajojallaṃ adhârayiṃ
Bhuñjanto mâsikam bhataṃ kesamassuṃ alocayim.
(Thera-Gâthâ, v. 283.)

VALETI.

Childers has no examples of the verb valeti 'to twist, wring,' *cf.* gîvaṃ valeti 'to wring the neck' (of a bird), Jât. i. p. 436. In Jât. i. p. 452, we find the expression 'sâtake valeti,' where valeti may perhaps mean to fold?

VIKAṆṆAKA.

This word (not in Childers) occurs in Jât. i. p. 227, l. 27; p. 228, ll. 2, 7, and signifies a harpoon for *spearing* a crocodile. The Com. explains vikaṇṇaka by vikaṇṇakasalla.

VIDAṂSAKA.

Danta-vidamsaka, 'a harsh grating laugh,' literally gnashing of the teeth' (Aṅguttara-Nikāya, iii. 103, p. 261, l. 4; Jât. iii. p. 222, l. 7).

VIDDHA.

In the following passage viddha seems to mean 'open, clear':

“Seyyathâpi nâma saradasamaye viddhe vigatavalâhake deve âdicco nabham abbhussukkamâno¹ sabbam âkâsagatam tamam abhivihacca¹ bhâsate ca tapate ca virocate ca, etc.” *Anguttara-Nikâya*, iii. 92, 2, p. 242; *Samyutta-Nikâya*, ii. 3, 11, p. 65.

VETI.

Veti=Sk. vy-eti ‘waned,’ does not occur in Childers’ dictionary. Cf. Udeti âpûrati veti cando (*Jât.* iii. p. 154, l. 6).

SAÑKASÂYATI.

Sañkasâyati ‘to be dejected’ is not in Childers, but see *Anguttara*, ii. iv. 8, p. 69; *Samyutta-Nikâya*, p. 202.

SAÑKOCANA.

Mukha-sañkocana ‘contortion of the mouth, wry face’ (*Jât.* iii. p. 57. See note on NIBBHOGA).

SAMADHIGANĦÂTI.

Pâli, in common with Sanskrit, employs the term samadhigacchati (see *Thera-gâthâ*, v. 4, p. 2), but samadhigriṇhâti does not appear in the Sanskrit dictionaries. We find, however, this verb in Pâli with the meaning of ‘to get,’ ‘obtain,’ probably through confusion with samadhigacchati.

“Atthi kho mahârâjâ eko dhammo yo ubho [atthe] samadhiggayha tiṭṭhati ditṭhadhammikañ c’eva attham samparâyikañ câ ti (*Samyutta-Nikâya*, iii. 2, 7, p. 86).

In the *gâthâ*, p. 87, to the foregoing passage adhigriṇhâti (not in Sanskrit) is used in the sense of samadhigriṇhâti.

“Appamatto ubho atthe adhigriṇhâti pandito.”

¹ Not in Childers.

In the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya*, v. 31, *adhigaṇhāti* seems to mean 'to surpass.' "Yo so Sumane dāyako so amuṃ adāyakaṃ devabhūto samāno pañcahi ṭhānehi adhigaṇhāti dibbena āyunā," etc.

SĀKAṬIKA.

Childers gives *Sākaṭika* as an adjective, but it occurs in the *Saṃyutta Nikāya* ii. 3. 3. p. 57, in the sense of 'a carter.'¹ See *Jāt.* iii. p. 104. The *Milinda Pañha*, pp. 66, 194, has the same gāthā in a more correct form :—

Paṭigacc' eva taṃ kayirā yaṃ jaññā hitam attano :
Na sākaṭikacintāya, mantādhīro parakkame
Yathā sākaṭiko nāma samaṃ hitvā mahāpathaṃ
Visamaṃ maggam āruya akkhacchinno va jhāyati.

SĀRADDHA.

Childers has a form *sāraddho*, which he explains as *su-āraddho*, but this does not apply to *asāraddho* in the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya* iii. 40-1, p. 148; 128. 2, which must be referred to *saṃrambhāti*. Cf. *Pāli sārambha*.

SINGI.

Āṅguttara-Nikāya, iv. 26 :

"Ye te bhikkhave bhikkhū kuhā thaddhā lapā siṅgi unnaḷā asamāhitā na me te bhikkhave bhikkhū māmakā."²

Childers has no such form as *siṅgi*, nor is it found in the *Sanskrit Dictionaries*.

The Commentary has the following note :

"Siṅgi ti tattha katamaṃ siṅgaṃ? Yaṃ siṅgaṃ siṅgaratā cāturiyaṃ parikkhatatā parikkhattiyaṃ ti evaṃ vuttehi siṅga-sadisehi pākātakilesehi samannāgatā."

Lapa is not in Childers, but the Commentary explains it by *upalapaka* 'a fawner, intriguer.' See Childers, *s.v.* *lapako*.

¹ Cf. *sākuntika* (not in Childers) 'a fowler, bird-catcher' (*Therā-Gāthā*, v. 299).

² kuhā thaddhā lapā siṅgi carissanty ariyā viya (*Therā-Gāthā*, v. 959, p. 87).

SOTTI.

Sotti (Āṅguttara-Nikāya, iii. 70, 5, p. 208) stands for kuruvindakasotti, and is the same as kuruvindakasutti in Cull. v. 1. 3. Dr. Oldenberg gives Buddhaghosa's explanation of kuruvindakasutti, which may be compared with the commentator's note on sotti :—

“kuruvindakasuttiyā ti kuruvindakapāsānacunṇāni lābhaya (*sic*) bandhitvā katakuḷika-kalāpako vuccati, taṃ ubhosu antesu gahetvā sarīraṃ ghaṃsanti” (Cullavagga, p. 315).

“Sottin ti kuruvindasottim kuruvindakapāsānacunṇehi saddhim lākhā yojetvā maṇike katvā vijjhivā sutte āvutivā taṃ maṇi-kalāpa-pantim ubhato gahetvā piṭṭhim ghaṃsenti” (Com. to Āṅguttara-Nikāya).

Sotti is therefore a 'back-scratcher,' made after the fashion of a string of beads. Lābhaya in Dr. Oldenberg's note must be a blunder for lākhāya.

SELETI.

Gāyanti selenti ca vādayanti ca (Buddhavaṃsa, i. 36, p. 3).¹ See Sutta-Nipāta, v. 682, p. 128, where the Editor prints seleti, but the Commentary to the Buddhavaṃsa does not support the cerebral *l*.

Childers makes no mention of the verb seleti 'to shout,' but records the derivative selanaṃ (with dental *l*) 'noise,' 'shouting,' without giving any information as to the etymology of the word. The Commentary to the Buddhavaṃsa defines selenti by “mukhena selita-saddaṃ karonti.”

The etymology of the verb seleti is doubtful. If we read seleti, it might be connected with Sk. svarati, Pāli sarati; but if seleti is the true form, then it ought perhaps to be referred to the root ḷāgh 'to praise,'

¹ Cf. Aupapātika Sutta, p. 56 :

Gāyantā vāyantā naccantā taha hasanta-hāsantā (? -bhāsantā).

‘applaud.’ Cf. the Prâkrit *salaha*, a substitute for *çlâgh* (Hemacandra, iv. 88).

Pâli has the verb *silâghati*, Sk. *çlâghati*; but *seleti* may possibly be a contracted causative, and represent a Prâkrit *salhayati* (*silhayati*) for *salahayati* (*silahayati*).

Dr. E. Müller (Pâli Grammar, p. 7) wrongly explains *seleti* as *çâḍayati* ‘to fall off,’ and adds that *usselheti* (Cullavagga i. 13, 2=Suttavibhaṅga i. 1, 80—“*usselhenti pi appoḥenti pi*”) is a compound of this verb *seleti*, and does not mean, as the translators of the Vinaya Texts affirm, ‘to exhibit signs of anger.’

Usselheti, I venture to think, is connected with *seleti* from the $\sqrt{\text{çlâgh}}$, and signifies ‘to shout out,’ a meaning that suits the sense of the context in the passage referred to.

SÛPÎ, SÛPEYYA.

Childers has *sûpa*, but not *sûpî* (=sûpasampanna), Jât. iii. p. 328, or *sûpeyyapaṇṇa* ‘curry-leaf,’ ‘curry-stuff’ (Jât. i. p. 99).

EMENDATIONS.

I.

Vilumpat’ eva puriso yâvassa upakappati
Yadâ c’aññe vilumpati so vilutto vilumpati

(Jât. ii. No. 240, p. 239.)

In a parallel passage in the *Samyutta-Nikâya* iii. 2. 5, p. 85, we find the following additional lines:—

Ṭhânamhi maññati bâlo || yâva pâpaṃ na paccati ||
Yadâ ca paccati pâpaṃ || atha bâlo dukkhaṃ nigacchati ||
Hantâ labhati hantâraṃ || jetâraṃ labhati jayaṃ ||
Akkosako ca akkosam || rosetârañ ca rosako ||
Atha kamma-vivattaṇa || vilutto vilumpatî ti ||

The verses as they stand in the Jâtaka text do not make very good sense.

“A man e'en plunders as long as it is profitable to him, (but) when others plunder (him, then) the plunder'd plunders.”

The additions of the Saṃyutta seem to show that, since the *slayer* meets a slayer (*i.e.* is slain), etc., we ought to alter the text of the Jātaka verse so as to translate ‘the plunderer is plundered,’ instead of ‘the plunder'd plunders.’

The note in the Commentary to the Jātaka verses is as follows :—

So vilutto vilumpatî ti atha so vilumpako aññehi vilumpatî, vilumpate¹ ti pi pâtho, ayaṃ ev' attho . . . evaṃ vilumpako puna vilumpaṃ pâpuṇâtî ti.

If we read “so vilutto viluppati,” it makes sense “he being plunder'd is grieved,” but the true reading is perhaps “so viluttâ vilumpate” ‘the plunderer is plundered.’

Viluttâ would represent a Sk. vilopṭri ‘a plunderer,’ ‘spoiler,’ and correspond to the nouns hantâ and jetâ in the Saṃyutta gâthâs.

II.

Balañ ca vata me khīṇaṃ, pâtheyyaṃ ca na vijjati
 Sañke pâṇuparodhâya, handa dâni vajâm' ahan ti
 (Âsaṅkâ Jātaka, No. 380, p. 249.)

The Commentary explains sañke by âsaṅkâmi. I propose to read ‘âsanke pâṇuparodham,’ etc., for sañke pâṇuparodhâya.” The sense seems to require it, and it would not be against the metre.

The king mentioned in the story is trying to guess the name of the girl he wishes to marry. At the end of his speech he says, “sañke, etc.” Whereupon the girl says, “O king, you know my name; you have just spoken it.” As the maiden's name is Âsaṅkâ, the king most probably said “Âsañke pâṇuparodham.” *cf.* tass' uparodham parisankamâno (Jât. iii. p. 210).

¹ For vilumpate see Jât. iii. p. 513.

III.*

“Samkhâya lokasmim parovarâni
yassa jitam n'atthi kubiñci loke
santo vidhûmo anigho mirâso
atâri so jâtijaran ti brûmîti.”

(Sutta-Nipâta, v. 1048, p. 191.)

This verse occurs in the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya* iii. 32, p. 133, from which Prof. Fausböll gives Dr. Trenckner's quotation. Here again the reading is inaccurate:—“Samkhâya lokasmim parovarâni yassa jinam (or yasmimñitam) n'atthi,” etc.

The translator, of course, deals with what he finds in his text, and renders the foregoing verse as follows :

“Having considered everything in the world . . . he who is not *defeated* anywhere in the world, who is calm without the fume of passion, free from woe, free from desire, he crossed over birth and old age, so I say.”

The translator takes yassa jitan n'atthi to mean, literally, ‘to whom there is no *defeat*,’ jitan being here used as a noun. But jitam, I venture to think, is never employed in the sense of *defeat*—*cf.* jitam apajitam kayirâ, etc.=victoriam . . . cladem facere potest (*Dhammapada*, v. 105). The usual term for *defeat* is parâjayo in contradistinction to jayo and vijayo (*Jât.* iii. pp. 6, 7; *Dham.* v. 201). Yassa jitam is here plainly a scribal blunder (*cf.* *Dham.* v. 179).

The editor gives the variant reading yassañhitam probably for yassa 'ñgitam, and this again for ‘yass' ingitam,’ which gives good sense.

It seems that the older copyists had some difficulty with this verse, for the Sinhalese MSS. of the *Āṅguttara-Nikāya* (*Devadûtavagga*, iii. 4. 2) that I have consulted, read yasamsi-jitam (or yasmsi-jitam), whilst the Burmese (*Phayre*) MS. has yassiñcitam, from which it is not

* For III. IV. V., see “Academy” for Sept. 19th, 1885, pp. 189, 190.

difficult to see that the true reading is *yass' iñjitaṃ*. 'Iñjitaṃ' or 'ingitaṃ' means 'motion,' limited often to 'evil affections' (see *Dhammapada*, v. 255, 'N'atthi Buddhānam iñjitaṃ' = 'Non est Buddharum motus'; cf. *Thera-gāthā*, v. 386; *Sutta-Nipāta*, v. 1041; *Samyutta-Nikāya*, v. 5).

A copy of the Commentary to the *Anguttara*, prepared for me by the learned Buddhist priest Subhūti, reads *yass' iñjitaṃ*, and says that the *satta injitāni* by which an Arahāt is unmoved are *rāga*, *dosa*, *moha*, *māna*, *diṭṭhi*, *kilesa*, *duccarita*. *Buddhaghosa's* reading is of course the true one, and must be admitted into the text.

IV.*

"Aññāya sabbāni nivesanāni
anikāmayam aññataram pi tesam
sa ve muni vītagedho agidho
nāyūhati parāgato hi hoti."

(*Sutta-Nipāta*, v. 210, p. 37.)

This is rendered as follows in the "Sacred Books of the East" (vol. x. p. 34):

"He who has penetrated all resting-places (of the mind and) does not wish for any of them, such a Muni indeed, free from covetousness and free from greediness, *does not gather up (resting places)*; for he has reached the other shore."

Prof. Fausböll has translated *nāyūhati* (not in Childers) as if it were *nāvyūhati*. The word *âyūhati* does not mean 'to gather up,' but to 'strive,' 'use exertion,' 'endeavour.' In Buddhistic phraseology he who has gone to the *further shore* has reached *Nirvāna*. An Arahāt is free from passion, and has no internal struggles (see *Sutta-Nipāta*, v. 177).

In the *Samyutta-Nikāya*, I. i. 1, Buddha, in answer to the question how he crossed the stream, replies:

(a) "Khvāham āvuso appatiṭṭham anāyūham ogham atarin ti."

(b) “Yadâ svâham âvuso santittihâmi tadâssu
saṃsîdâmi yadâ svâham âvuso âyûhâmi
tadâssu nibbuyhâmi.”¹

i.e. “I indeed, *not* (now) *exerting myself*, crossed the shoreless stream.” [The commentary explains anâyûham by avâyamanto.]

“When, sir, I remained quiet, then, in fact, I sank; (but) when I exerted myself, then, indeed, I reached the shore.”

This notion is referred to again in the Saṃyutta-Nikâya, II. i. 5 :

“yâva na gâdham labhati
nadîsu âyûhati sabbagattehi jantu
gâdhañ ca laddhâna thale ðhito so
nâyûhati pâragato hi so ti.”

“Until a man gets a firm footing (on the land) he *strives* with all his might and main² in the stream; but, when he has gained a firm footing, and stands on *terra firma*, he *no longer strives*, for he has reached the further shore” (see Saṃyutta-Nikâya, ed. Feer, p. 53).

The Pâli root yûh corresponds to Sanskrit √ûh;³ *cf.* viyûhati (or vyûhati), ‘to dig or gather up sand or dust,’ and see Suttavibhaṅga, part i. p. 48: “*pamsum viyûhanto,*’ Com. to Ambavatthasutta.

V.*

“
munim moneyyasampannam tâdisam yaññam âgatam
bhakutim vinayitvâna pañjalikâ namassatha
”
(Sutta-Nipâta, v. 484, p. 85).

In the translation (p. 79) the phrase bhakutim vinayitvâna is altogether disregarded, and there is no note to inform the reader that anything is missing.

¹ Nibbuyhati is not in Childers’ Dictionary (see Therî-Gâthâ, v. 468).

² Literally ‘with all his limbs.’

³ See Milinda-Pañha, pp. 108, 110.

“The Muni who is endowed with wisdom, such a one who has resorted to offerings,¹ him you should worship.”

Bhakutiṃ vineti is to be compared with bhakutiṃ karoti in the Jâtaka book (*cf.* bhṛikuṭiṃ kṛitvâ Divyâvadâna p. 625), and bhâkuṭikabhâkutika in the Vinaya Texts (see “Notes and Queries” in the Pâli Journal for 1884, p. 90). Bhakutiṃ vineti means to put away frowning, hence, to have a calm, unruffled countenance, to put on a smiling face.

VI.

Madhû 'ti maññamânâ ye taṃ viṣaṃ samâsâsisuṃ
tesaṃ taṃ kaṭukam âsi, maraṇam ten' upâgamuṃ.

(Jât. iii. No. 366, p. 201.)

The metre of the first line is irregular; for samâsâsisuṃ we ought perhaps to adopt the reading of Cs. samâsisuṃ from the root aḥ ‘to eat.’² Bâ. reads akhâdisu.

TRACES OF JÂTAKA STORIES IN THE EXTENDED MEANINGS OF WORDS.

The Hindî ûd (=Pâli udda) not only signifies ‘an otter,’ but also ‘a disputed point’ (“this sense,” says Platt, “arises from a story of otters disputing over a distribution of their prey”).

The story here referred to is the Dabbhapuppha-Jâtaka, No. 400, iii. p. 332, translated by the present writer in the Folklore Journal, vol. iv. pt. i. pp. 52-54. An inferior version occurs in Ralston's “Thibetan Tales,” No. xxiv. p. 332, in which the names of the otters are omitted, and the jackal's name Mâyâvî is changed to Mukhara.

The Moral of the story is omitted in the Thibetan version :—

¹ Should it not be “such a one who has attained to offerings,” *i.e.* by his merits as a sage?

² *Cf.* âsissam in Thera-Gâthâ, v. 223, p. 29, and asita in Milinda-Pañha, p. 375.

Evam evaṃ manussesu vivādo yattha jāyati
 Dhammatṭhaṃ paṭidhāvanti, so hi nesam vināyako,
 Dhanāpi tattha jiyanti rājakoso ca vaḍḍhatīti.
 (Jât. iii. p. 336.)

“ Thus when disputes 'mong men arise,
 To law they have recourse.
 The judge their suit full soon decides
 (And fees they have to pay),
 And though their means grow less and less,
 The king's chest fuller gets.’

The only meaning Childers gives to vināyaka is ‘a spiritual teacher or leader, a Buddha,’ (Thera-Gâthâ, v. 288), but here vināyaka = vinicchayasāmika ‘the judge by whom disputes are settled.’

PARTICIPLES IN *A* AND *TĀ*.

In Prākṛit we find vaṃdittā = vanditvā (see Hemacandra, ed. Pischel, pt. ii. p. 82), and desittā = deçayitvā (*Ib.* p. 26).

In Pāli we have similar forms, laddhā = labhdhvā is of course well known, but *cf.* anuṭṭhitā (Saṃyutta-Nikāya, xi. 1, 2), sinātā (*Ib.* vii. 2, 11).

For Sk. *ya* we find by assimilation *a*, as in manta (Sutta-Nipāta, v. 455, p. 80), āmanta, explained by āmantetvā in the Commentary, Jât. iii. p. 209.¹ *Cf.* ajjhosa (= ajjhosāya, Milinda, p. 69), Thera-Gâthâ, v. 794, p. 77.

Prof. Fausböll quotes the form datṭhu = disvā, but probably this is like Jain Prākṛit katṭu, where the infinitive is used for the gerund.

¹ Forms like okkamma, etc., are, of course, common enough, but those like manta, etc., are rare.

DEVADÛTÂ.—(DEATH'S MESSENGERS.)

[AN OLD STORY WITH MODERN VARIATIONS.]

The term Devadûtâ occurs in the Mahâdeva Jâtaka, No. 9, i. p. 73.

Uttamaṅgarukâ mayhaṃ ime jâtâ
Pâtabhûtâ devadûtâ pabbajjâsamayo mamâ ti.

“These grey hairs that have come upon my head are *Death's-messengers* appearing to me, etc.”

Dr. Rhys Davids, in his translation, p. 17, of this Jâtaka, renders devadûtâ by ‘*Angel-messengers*’ instead of ‘*Death's-messengers*.’

Devadûtâ = Yama-purisa or Yama-dûtâ. The Com. to the Jâtaka explains deva by maccu. Cf. the following verse (235) from the Dhammapada:—

Paṇḍapalâso va idâni 'si,
Yamapurisâ pi ca taṃ upatthitâ.

“Thou art now [grey-haired] like a sear leaf, and *Death's messengers* have e'en waited on thee.”

We find a curious modern parallel to the moral of the Buddhist verses, in which grey hairs are spoken of as the messengers of death. A modern divine, addressing his youthful hearers, says: “*The first grey hair upon our heads is Death's finger laid upon our brow; the first failure in our agility or our sensational acuteness is Death's message to us*” (Dr. Jessopp's Norwich School Sermons, 1864, p. 169).

The messengers of Death are three¹—Old Age, Sickness and Death. When an evil-liver in word, deed and thought, says Buddha, disappeared from this world, and underwent re-birth in Hell, he was brought before Yama who sharply interrogated and questioned him, ‘Did you see Death's first messenger?’ he asked. ‘I did not,’ replied

¹ Tīṇ' imāni bhikkhave devadûtāni (Aṅguttara-Nikāya, iii. 35, p. 138).

the sinner. 'What! did you never see an old man or woman bent down with age, palsied, wrinkled and grey-headed?' 'I have seen such a one,' answered the man. 'Did not you, a man of mature age and intelligence, take note that you were subject to old age, and would not escape it; and did you thereupon determine to conduct yourself well in word, deed and thought?' 'Through remissness, I did not take note of this,' replied the man. Then Yama questioned the culprit as to Death's *second* messenger (the sight of a man or woman suffering from sickness and disease, or bed-ridden), and lastly, as to the *third* messenger—a dead man or woman in various stages of corruption. In each case the offender had to confess that, through negligence, he had not applied the sickness and mortality of his fellow-creatures to his own case. For his remissness he was condemned by Yama to the severest tortures, and handed over to hell's warders to undergo the sentence uttered against him (see *Āṅguttara Nikāya—Devadūta Vagga*, iii. 35, pp. 138–142). The account of Buddha's 'drives' previous to the "great renunciation"¹ points the same moral lesson—namely, that old age, sickness and death remind us that we are mortal (see *Āṅguttara*, iii. 38, 39).

Many a modern preacher and moralist has made use of this illustration without knowing how old the story and its application are. The following is a nineteenth-century parallel by the late Headmaster of one of our public schools:—

"Death, says the story, and a certain man once made a bargain, the man stipulating that Death should send him so many warnings before he came. And one day, years thereafter, to his great amazement the King of Terrors stood before him. He had broken the bargain, so said the man, while he clung eagerly to life. Death, he alleged, had sent him no warnings.

'No warnings!' was the answer; 'his eyes were dim, and

¹ See *Buddhist Birth Stories*, pp. 76, 77; Max Müller's *Selected Essays*, vol. i. p. 537, ii. p. 197.

his ears dull of hearing, his gums were toothless, and on his bent and palsied head his grey locks were all but gone, these, the *Heralds of Death*, had come to him, but their voices had been unnoticed." ("Some Help for School Life," by J. Percival, M.A., LL.D., 1880, pp. 121, 122.)

It is worth noting that both Dr. Jessopp and Dr. Percival refer only to *one* messenger—old age—leaving out the fact that the sickness and death of others are equally "Heralds of Death." The Buddhist story is much more telling and effective than its modern representatives.

A variant of the 'story' to which Dr. Percival refers occurs in L'Estrange's Fables,¹ No. CCCL., entitled "An Old Man that was willing to put off Death." "There goes a story that Death call'd upon an old man, and bad him come along with him. The man excus'd himself that t' other world was a great journey to take upon so short a warning, and begg'd a little time only to make his will before he dy'd. Why (says Death) you have had warning enough one would think to have made ready before this. In truth, says the Old Man, this is the first time that ever I saw ye in my whole life. That's false says Death, for you have had daily examples of mortality before your eyes, in people of all sorts, ages and degrees; and is not the frequent spectacle of other peoples' deaths a *memento* sufficient to make you think of your own? Your dim and hollow eyes methinks, the loss of your hearing, and the faltering of the rest of your senses, should mind ye, without more ado, that Death has laid hold of ye already; And is this a time of day, d' ye think, to stand shuffling it off still? Your peremptory hour, I tell ye, is now come, there's is no thought of a reprieve in the case of Fate.

[Moral.] "Want of warning is no excuse in the case of Death; for every moment of our lives either is or ought to be a time of preparation for 't."

L'Estrange's version is translated from the 149th fable in

¹ London, 1694.

the Æsop of Abstemius (ed. Massarius, Venice, 1519), entitled "De sene Mortem differre volente."¹

"Senex quidam Mortem, quæ eum è vita ereptura advenerat, rogabat vt paululum differret, dum testamentum conderet, et cætera ad tantum iter necessaria præpararet. Cui Mors, cur non inquit, hactenus præparasti, toties a me admonitus. Et quum ille eam nunquam a se visam amplius diceret, quum inquit, non æquales tuos modo, quorum nulli ferè iam restant, verum *etiam* iuvenes, pueros, infantes quotidie rapiebant, non te admonebam mortalitatis tuæ? Cum oculos hebescere, auditum minui, cæterosque sensus in dies deficere, corpus ingravescere sentiebas, nonne tibi me propinquam esse dicebam? et te admonitum negas. Quare ulterius differendum non est.

"Hæc fabula indicat ita viuendum, quasi mortem semper adesse cernamus."

La Fontaine's fable of "La Mort et le Mourant" (Bk. viii. fab. i.) may be compared with the above, together with the following metrical Latin fable, entitled "Senex et Mors"² :—

"Annos homo centum qui fere compleverat
Demum advenire Mortem sensit; et, nimis
Properanter illam sic agere secum, querens,
Oravit, ut ne priùs obire cogerit,
Perfecta quàm essent sua quædam negotia :
Saltem expectaret, dum ex nepote filii
Brevi futuras conclusisset nuptias;
Factoque rite testamento, ab omnibus
Remotam rixis familiam relinqueret :
Quòd si migrandum hinc sibi fuisse tam citò
Præmonitus esset . . . Hic senem ultra Mors loqui
Non passa : Funeris habet mille nuntios
Senectus longa, dixit; et prædam abstulit."

¹ See also No. 99 in "Mythologia Æsopica," by Neveletus (Franc. 1610).

² See Fabulæ Æsopica, by F. J. Desbillons, Bk. vii. No. xxiii. (Manheim, 1768). Cf. "L'Heure de récreation," p. 195, by Lodovico Guicciardini (Venice, 1580), or "Heures de récreation et après disnées," by L. G. 1605, p. 139.

Desbillons refers to "Pilpay, p. 153," without mentioning any edition. This reference may be to the French translation of the *Anwâr-i-Suhailî* by David Sahid of Ispahan, under the title of "Livre des Lumières ou la conduite des Royes composé par le sage Pilpay" (Paris, 1644).

I can find nothing in the *Anwâr-i-Suhailî* except the following verse, referring to "grey hairs" as "Death's messenger" (see the quotation from the *Jâtaka* book at the beginning of this article):—

"When the changing watch of age strikes the drum of deep distress,
The heart grows cold to joyous things, to mirth and happiness.
*The white hair comes, its message gives from Fate and terror's king,
And the crooked back and stooping form Death's salutation bring*" (Eastwick's Translation, p. 72).

This story, as Grimm has pointed out, was known in Europe as early as the thirteenth century, but does not occur in the Greek or Roman fable-poets.

Grimm's tale of "Death's Messengers" bears a close resemblance to the Latin story in the *Aesop* of Joach. Camerarius, No. 484 (1564, pp. 347, 348), entitled "De Mortis nuntiis."

"Cum Hercules reliquisset superatum Letum ad bustum Alcestidos, vbi illud jaceret anhelans et exanimatum, misertum illius quendam Pheræum qui transiens aspexisset, recreasse ipsum et perfecisse ferunt, vt vires pristinas recuperaret. Ob hoc beneficium Letum promississe illi memoriam à se grati animi, et cum non prorsus parcere ei posset, non tamen se oppressurum esse de improviso benefactorem suum, sed missurum prius qui monerent quique indicarent quòd appropinquaret Letum. His pollicitis Pheræus elatus, animo securo vitam egit, cumque minimè metueret, Letum ad se auferendum adesse cognovit. Questus igitur ille grauissimè perhibetur, se circumuentum fraude arripi, et Lete vanitatem accusasse: neminem enim prænuntiasse aduentum ipsius. Cui Letum narrant demonstrasse,

plurimos à se nuntios ad eum peruenisse. Nam et annos ante sex febrī, et post duos rursum, grauedine ac destillationibus eum laborasse. Intereaquē sæpe cum tussi, sæpe capitis doloribus confictatum, proximè etiam anhelasse. Quibus omnibus ut accedentis Leti nuntiis non longissimè illud abesse commoneri debuerit. Quin etiam, inquit, paullo ante adventum meum, germanum fratrem ad te misi, veterosum illum soporem, in quo aliquantisper pro mortuo iacuisti. Ita probata fide sua, quodque promissum fecisset, Pheræum lamentantem et muliebriter eiulantem abripuit.

“Decemur de valetudine imbecillitate et morbis cognoscendam mortalitatem, neque mortem omnibus necessariò oppetendam, nimium perhorrescendam esse.”¹

The following is Grimm's tale, No. 177, Death's Messengers.

“In ancient times a giant was once travelling on a great highway, when suddenly an unknown man sprang up before him, and said ‘Halt, not one step further!’ ‘What!’ cried the giant, ‘a creature whom I can crush between my fingers wants to block my way? Who art thou that thou darest to speak so boldly?’ ‘I am Death,’ answered the other. ‘No one resists me, and thou also must obey my commands.’ But the giant refused, and began to struggle with Death. It was a long, violent battle; at last the giant got the upper hand, and struck Death down with his fist, so that he dropped by a stone. The giant went his way, and Death lay there conquered, and so weak that he could not get up again. ‘What will be done now,’ said he, ‘if I stay lying here in a corner? No one will die now in the world, and it will get so full of people they won't have room to stand beside each other.’ In the meantime a young man came along the road, who was strong and healthy, singing a song, and glancing around on every side. When he saw the half-fainting one, he went compassionately to him, raised him up, poured a strengthening draught out of his flask for him, and waited till he came round. ‘Dost thou know,’ said the stranger, whilst

¹ The above is from the edition of 1571 (Lug.), p. 465.

he was getting up, 'who I am, and who it is whom thou hast helped on his legs again?' 'No,' answered the youth, 'I do not know thee.' 'I am Death,' said he, 'I spare no one, and can make no exception with thee,—but that thou mayst see that I am grateful, I promise thee that I will not fall on thee unexpectedly, but will send my messengers to thee before I come and take thee away.' 'Well,' said the youth, 'it is something gained that I shall know when thou comest, and at any rate be safe from thee for so long.' Then he went on his way, and was light-hearted, and enjoyed himself, and lived without thought. But youth and health did not last long, soon came sicknesses and sorrows, which tormented him by day, and took away his rest by night.' 'Die, I shall not,' said he to himself, 'for Death will send his messengers before that, but I do wish these wretched days of sickness were over.' As soon as he felt himself well again, he began once more to live merrily. Then one day some one tapped him on the shoulder. He looked round, and Death stood beside him, and said, 'Follow me, the hour of thy departure from this world has come.' 'What,' replied the man, 'wilt thou break thy word? Didst thou not promise me that thou wouldst send thy messengers to me before coming thyself, I have seen none!' 'Silence!' answered Death. 'Have I not sent one messenger to thee after another? Did not fever come and smite thee, and shake thee and cast thee down? Has dizziness not bewildered thy head? Has not gout twitched thee in all thy limbs? Did not thine ears sing? Did not toothache bite into thy cheeks? Was it not dark before thine eyes? And besides all that, has not my own brother Sleep reminded thee every night of me? Didst thou not lie by night as if thou wert already dead?' The man could make no answer; he yielded to his fate, and went away with Death." ("Grimm's Household Tales," translated by Margaret Hunt, 1884, vol. ii. pp. 277, 278; 456, 457.)

I now add two English poetical versions, the first from Arwaker's "Select Fables" (Lond. 1708), based on Abstemius' version, the second from "Mrs. Piozzi (Thrale's), Autobiography" (ed. Hayward, Lond. 1861), vol. ii. p. 165.

I.

Fable xiv. Bk. iv.

THE OLD MAN LOTH TO DIE,

or,

CONSIDER YOUR LATTER-END.

“ A Wretch, that on the World's uneasy Stage
 Had acted long, ev'n to decrepit Age,
 At the last Scene, thought he too soon had done ;
 And when Death call'd him, begg'd he might stay on.
 He said, His greatest Bus'ness was to do
 And hop'd the Fates wou'd not surprise him so ;
 But spare him, that he might provision make
 For that long Journey which he was to take.

Death ask'd him why he had that Work deferr'd,
 Since he had warn'd him oft' to be prepar'd.
 He answer'd, He had never seen his Face,
 And hop'd he would allow him Days of Grace.
 But Death reply'd ; You often saw me near,
 My Face in sev'ral Objects did appear ;
 I have not only your Coevals slain,
 'Till but a few, a very few remain ;
 But Young-men, Children, New-born infants too,
 And all to caution and admonish you :
 All to remind you of your Mortal State,
 And that my Coming wou'd be sure, tho' late.

When you perceiv'd your Eye-balls sink away,
 Your Hearing fail, and ev'ry Sense decay ;
 When you discern'd your Teeth forsake their Place,
 Your wrinkl'd Forehead, and your meagre Face ;
 Then you my Visage, in your own, might see,
 Which every Day was representing Me.

When you observ'd your Blood begin to freeze,
 Your bowing Body, and your bending Knees ;
 While scarce your feeble Legs your Weight cou'd bear,
 Did not these Symptoms tell you I was near ?
 And can you yet pretend to be surpriz'd ?

Then Die, your Folly shou'd be thus chastis'd.
 If 'till to-morrow, I your Life reprieve,
 You 'till to-morrow will deferr to Live:
 As you have done, still you, from Day to Day,
 Repentance and Amendment will delay.

THE MORAL.

Since we must Die, but where, is not declar'd,
 We shou'd for Death's Approach be still prepar'd :
 Our Life's uncertain : Time shou'd so be pass'd,
 As if each Minute was to be our last :
 Since on the Way in which our Lives we spend,
 Our future Joys, or Miseries, depend ;
 They best for Heav'ns reserv'd Abodes prepare,
 Who Living, keep their Conversation there.

They who in Endless Pleasures wou'd on High
 For ever Live, to Sin must daily die.
 If our Repentance we procrastinate,
 Our good Desires at last, will be too late.
 Virtue has got the Start in Life's swift Race,
 And, to o'ertake her, we must mend our Pace ;
 Else, what we shou'd obtain, we ne'r shall find,
 While she still keeps before, and we behind."

II.

THE THREE WARNINGS.

A Tale.

"The tree of deepest root is found
 Least willing still to quit the ground ;
 'Twas therefore said by ancient sages,
 That love of life increased with years.
 So much, that in our latter stages,
 When pains grow sharp, and sickness rages,
 The greatest love of life appears.
 This great affection to believe,
 Which all confess, but few perceive,
 If old affections can't prevail,
 Be pleased to hear a modern tale.

When Sports went round, and all were gay,
On neighbour Dobson's wedding-day,
Death call'd aside the jocund groom,
With him into another room :
And looking grave, You must, says he,
Quit your sweet bride and come with me.
With you, and quit my Susan's side ?
With you ! the hapless husband cried ;
Young as I am ; 'tis monstrous hard ;
Besides, in truth, I'm not prepared :
My thoughts on other matters go,
This is my wedding-night you know.
What more he urged, I have not heard,
His reasons could not well be stronger,
So Death the poor delinquent spared,
And left to live a little longer.
Yet calling up a serious look,
His hour-glass tumbled while he spoke,
Neighbour, he said, farewell ! No more
Shall Death disturb your mirthful hour,
And further to avoid all blame
Of cruelty upon my name,
To give you time for preparation,
And fit you for your future station,
Three several warnings you shall have,
Before you're summoned to the grave :
Willing, for once, I'll quit my prey,
And grant a kind reprieve ;
In hopes you'll have no more to say,
But when I call again this way,
Well pleas'd the world will leave.
To these conditions both consented,
And parted perfectly contented.
What next the hero of our tale befell,
How long he lived, how wise, how well,
How roundly he pursued his course,
And smok'd his pipe and strok'd his horse
The willing muse shall tell :

He chaffer'd then, he bought, he sold,
Nor once perceived his growing old,
Nor thought of Death as near :
His friends not false, his wife no shrew,
Many his gains, his children few,
He pass'd his hours in peace ;
But while he view'd his wealth increase,
While thus along life's dusty road,
The beaten track content he trod,
Old Time, whose haste no mortal spares
Uncall'd, unheeded, unawares,
Brought him on his eightieth year.
And now one night in musing mood,
As all alone he sate,
Th' unwelcome messenger of fate
Once more before him stood.
Half stilled with anger and surprise,
So soon return'd ! old Dobson cries.
So soon, d'ye call it ! Death replies.
Surely, my friend, you're but in jest ;
Since I was here before
'Tis six-and-thirty years at least,
And you are now four-score.
So much the worse, the clown rejoin'd,
To spare the aged would be kind ;
However, see your search be legal,
And your authority—Is't regal ?
Else you are come on a fool's errand,
With but a secretary's warrant.
Besides, you promised me three warnings,
Which I have looked for nights and mornings ;
But for that loss of time and ease
I can recover damages.
I know, cries Death, that at the best,
I seldom am a welcome guest ;
But don't be captious, friend, at least ;
I little thought you'd still be able
To stump about your farm and stable ;

Your years have run to a great length,
 I wish you joy tho' of your strength.
 Hold, says the farmer, not so fast,
 I have been lame these four years past.
 And no great wonder, Death replies ;
 However, you still keep your eyes,
 And sure to see one's loves and friends,
 For legs and arms would make amends.
 Perhaps, says Dobson, so it might,
 But, latterly, I've lost my sight.
 This is a shocking story, faith,
 Yet there's some comfort still, says Death ;
 Each strives your sadness to amuse,
 I warrant you have all the news.
 There's none, cries he, and if there were,
 I've grown so deaf, I could not hear.
 Nay then, the spectre stern rejoined,
 These are unjustifiable yearnings ;
 If you are lame, and deaf, and blind,
 You've had your three sufficient warnings ;
 So come along, no more we'll part ;
 He said, and touched him with his dart ;
 And now old Dobson turning pale,
 Yields to his fate—so ends my tale."

In this last version of an old Oriental fable the changes are remarkable ; not only does the story carry us from the East to the West, from India to England, but actually removes the locality from the gloomy abode of Hell to a festive scene on earth.

With La Fontaine's fable of "La Mort et le Mourant" compare the following old French version from "Trois cent soixante et six APOLOGUES d'Esopé" par G. Haudent, 1547 (ed. Lorimer, Rouen, 1877), Part II. No. 156 :—

D'UN VIEIL HOMME & DE LA MORT.
 Comme la mort adiournait vn vieillard
 Et pretendoit le naurer de son dard
 Il luy pria qu'en ce val transitoire

Elle voulsist le laisser viure encoire
 Veu qu'il n'auoit adonc testamenté
 Aussi qu'en riens ne s'estoit dementé
 De preparer ce qu'appartient de faire
 Ainsque venir en tel cas & affaire
 Luy requerant fort d'auoir patience
 Que de son ame & de sa conscience
 Eust a penser, auant que le saisir
 Et qu'a son corps faire aulcon desplaisir,
 Mais ceste mort luy demanda, pourquoy
 Il n'auoit eu de ce regard en soy
 Quand il voyoit chascun coup de ses yeulx
 Qu'elle prenoit aultant ieunes que vieulx
 Et qu'il n'y a plus aucun personnage
 Qui a present soit viuant de son eage
 Qui estoit bien assez pour l'aduertir
 Qu'il se debuoit a mourir conuertir,
 A quoy ne sceust ce vieillard contredire
 Mais s'excusa tant seulement par dire
 Qu'il n'auoit veue oncques icelle mort
 Insinuant quau vray auroit grand tort
 D'ainsi le prendre, a la quelle replicque
 A lheure mesme icelle mort replicque
 Quand de ton corps la force decliner
 T'apparoisoit & tes sentz definer,¹
 N'estoit ce pas chose a toy bien certaine
 Que ie venoye et estois fort prochaine
 Ouy pour tout vray pourtant estime & croy
 Que ie n'auray en riens pitié de toy
 Ains te feray mourir presentement
 Malgré ton veul & ton consentement.

¹ Cf. the following passage from the sermons of J. Gerson, Antwerp, 1706. Vol. III. Col. 914 :—

“Vides signa iudicii tui per vniversum corpus tuum et animam tuam: caput tuum floret et fit canum lumen oculorum debilitatur memoria deficit, ingenium induratur.”

Bot I rede a man he amende hym here,
 Or þe dede [Death] come, or his *messangere* ;

His messangere may be called sekness.

(Hampole's Pricke of Conscience, p. 56, ll. 2020, 2024.)

Le Moral.

La fable nous peult demonstrer
 Qu'ayons a viure en telle sorte
 Que nous estimons rencontrer
 Tousiours la mort en nostre porte.

It seems very probable that "Death's Messengers" is one of those Buddhist stories, not met with in the Jâtaka book, or in the Kalilag and Damrag literature, which found its way into Europe through various channels, and became very popular in the Middle-ages. See "Buddhist Birth Stories," p. xlix, §§ 5, 6; Crane's "Italian Popular Tales," pp. 351-360; Keith-Falconer's "Kalilah and Dimnah," pp. xiii-xvi; Max Müller's "Selected Essays," vol. i. pp. 500-548.

PARALLEL PASSAGES.

I.

The Bhisapuppha Jâtaka, No. 392, vol. iii. p. 307, contains an amusing story about *stealing a smell*. A shorter form of this incident, containing all the gâthâs of the Jâtaka tale, occurs in the Paduma-puppha sutta of the Saṃyutta-Nikâya, ix. 14, pp. 204, 205.

II.

The gâthâs 291, 294 in Therî-Gâthâ, p. 34, may be compared with verses 175, 176 in the Gajakumbha Jâtaka, No. 345, iii. p. 139.

III.

With Therî Gâthâ, vv. 488-492, p. 171, compare a prose passage in Aṅguttara-Nikâya, v. 76 (see Jât. ii. v. 23-24, p. 313, Suttavibhaṅga, ii. p. 134).

For "aṭṭhi-kaṅkâlasannibhâ"¹ (Therî-Gâthâ, v. 488) the Aṅguttara has "aṭṭhi-kaṅkalûpamâ."²

¹ The Burmese MSS. read -kaṅkala°.

² The Copenhagen MS. reads kaṅkhalûpamâ.

Kaṅkāla (not in Childers) signifies 'a skeleton.'

For aṭṭhi-kaṅkāla we sometimes find aṭṭhi-saṅkhalikā = aṭṭhi-saṅghāta (Suttavibhaṅga, i. pp. 105, 272-3, and cf. Thera-Gāthā, v. 570, p. 60.

The form "aṭṭhi-saṅkalikā occurs in Mahāvastu, pp. 22, 24.

The Editor thinks¹ that saṅkhalikā (Jât. i. p. 433, l. 17) ought to be corrected to saṅkalikā. But a *chain of bones*, like our 'bag of bones,' may well express the notion of a bony skeleton, not a mere *heap* of bones, as suggested by saṅkalikā.

IV.

Andho' haṃ hatanetto 'smi, kantâraddhâna pakkhanno
Sayamâno pi gacchissam na sahâyena pâpenâti.

(Thera-Gāthā, v. 95, p. 14.)

With the above compare the following :—

Handâhaṃ hatacakkhu 'smi kantâraddhânam âgato,
Semâ na gacchâmi n'atthi bâle sahâyatâ.

(Dhammapada, p. 86.)

For "semâ na gacchâmi" we must either read "sayamâno pi gacchâmi," or "semânako pi gacchâmi," as in Thera-Gāthā, v. 14, p. 3.

V.

Pattam gandhacunṇehi ubbaṭṭetvâ, etc.

(Jât. i. p. 238, l. 7.)

Pattam gahetvâ gandhehi ubbaṭṭetvâ, etc.

(Samanta-Pâsâdikâ in Suttavibhaṅga, i. p. 329.)

Childers has ubbaṭṭana 'shampooing the body,' and ubbatteti, 'to draw out, root out,' but not ubbaṭṭeti, 'to rub clean, cleanse.' Cf. Divyâvadâna, pp. 12, 36.

Though Pâli discriminates between ubbatteti and ubbaṭṭeti, both are from the root vṛit with ud.²

¹ Mahāvastu, p. 387.

² See Jacobi's Aus. Erz. in Mâhârâshtri, p. 59, l. 35.