THE LATE KENJIU KASAWARA.

[The following obituary notice of a young Buddhist priest, Kenjiu Kasawara, appeared in the *Times* of September 22. We reprint it here; with a few additional notes of the writer, Professor Max Müller.]

"SIR,—The last mail from Japan brought me the news of the death of my young friend and pupil, Kenjiu Kasawara, and though his name is little known in England, his death ought not to be allowed to pass unnoticed. Does not Mr. Ruskin say quite truly that the lives we need to have written for us are of the people whom the world has not thought of—far less heard of—who are yet doing the most of its work, and of whom we may learn how it can best be done? The life of my Buddhist friend was one of the many devoted, yet unfulfilled lives, which make us wonder and grieve, as we wonder and grieve when we see the young fruit trees in our garden, which were covered with bright blossoms, stripped by a sudden frost of all their beauty and promise.

"Kenjiu Kasawara was a young Buddhist priest who, with his friend Bunyiu Nanjio, was sent by his monastery in the year 1876 from Japan to England, to learn English in London, and afterwards to study Sanskrit at Oxford. They both came to me in 1879, and in spite of many difficulties they had to encounter they succeeded, by dint of hard and honest work, in mastering that language, or at least so much of it as was necessary for enabling them to read the canonical books of Buddhism in the original—that is, in Sanskrit. At first they could hardly explain to me what their real object was in coming all the way from Japan to Oxford, and their progress was so slow that I sometimes despaired of their success. But they themselves

did not, and at last they had their reward. Kasawara's life at Oxford was very monotonous. He allowed himself no pleasures of any kind, and took little exercise; he did not smoke, or drink, or read novels or newspapers. He worked on day after day, often for weeks seeing no one and talking to no one but to me and his fellow-worker, Mr. Bunyiu Nanjio. He spoke and wrote English correctly, he learnt some Latin, also a little French, and studied some of the classical English books on history and philosophy. He might have been a most useful man after his return to Japan, for he was not only able to appreciate all that was good in European civilization, but retained a certain national pride, and would never have become a mere imitator of the West. His manners were perfect—they were the natural manners of an unselfish man. As to his character, all I can say is that, though I watched him for a long time, I never found any guile in him, and I doubt whether, during the last four years, Oxford possessed a purer and nobler soul among her students than this poor Buddhist priest. Buddhism may, indeed, be proud of such a man. During the last year of his stay at Oxford I observed signs of depression in him, though he never complained. I persuaded him to see a doctor, and the doctor at once declared that my young friend was in an advanced stage of consumption, and advised him to go home. He never flinched, and I still hear the quiet tone in which he said, 'Yes, many of my countrymen die of consumption.' However, he was well enough to travel and to spend some time in Ceylon, seeing some of the learned Buddhist priests there and discussing with them the differences which so widely separate Southern from Northern Buddhism. But after his return to Japan his illness made rapid strides. He sent me several dear letters, complaining of nothing but his inability to work. His control over his feelings was most remarkable. When he took leave of me, his sallow face remained as calm as ever, and I could hardly read what passed within. But I know that after he had left, he paced for a long time up and down the road, looking again and again at my house, where, as he

told me, he had passed the happiest hours of his life. Once only, in his last letter, he complained of his loneliness in his own country. 'To a sick man,' he wrote, 'very few remain as friends.' Soon after writing this he died, and the funeral ceremonies were performed at Tokio on the 18th of July. He has left some manuscripts behind, which I hope I shall be able to prepare for publication, particularly the 'Dharma-saṅgraha,' a glossary of Buddhist technical terms, ascribed to Nâgârǵuna. But it is hard to think of the years of work which are to bear no fruit; still harder to feel how much good that one good and enlightened Buddhist priest might have done among the 32 millions of Buddhists in Japan. *Have, pia anima!* I well remember how last year we watched together a glorious sunset from the Malvern Hills, and how, when the Western sky was like a golden curtain, covering we knew not what, he said to me, 'That is what we call the Eastern gate of our Sukhâvatî, the Land of Bliss.' He looked forward to it, and he trusted he should meet there all who had loved him, and whom he had loved, and that he should gaze on the Buddha Amitâbha—*i.e.* 'Infinite Light.'

"*Oxford, Sept.* 20. F. MAX MÜLLER."

I may add that I possess an English translation of I-tsing's Nân-hâi-ki-kwêi-nêi-fâ-ḳwhân, made by Kasawara, during his stay at Oxford. It is not complete, and he hoped to finish it after his return to Japan, where a new edition of the Chinese text is now being published from an ancient Corean copy, collated with several Chinese editions. With the help, however, of Mr. Bunyiu Nanjio and some other scholars, I hope it will be possible before long to publish Kasawara's translation of that important work.

When I said that the Dharmasaṅgraha was ascribed to Nâgârǵuna, I ought to have added that Nâgârǵuna's authorship of the book rests only on the title at the end of the two MSS. which exist in Europe. There we read, Iti Nâgârǵunapâdaviraḳitâyâṁ Dharmasaṅgrahaḥ samâptaḥ. This is evidently a wrong, or, at all events, an imperfect title. It would be easy to correct it into viraḳito 'yaṁ Dharma-

saṅgraha*ḥ*, but that would make Nâgâr*g*una responsible for a number of technical terms of which it is very doubtful whether they could have existed at so early a date. It is true we could say that terms of a decidedly modern character might have been added to the Dharmasaṅgraha from time to time. There are differences between the two MSS. of the Dharmasaṅgraha, and they show that words and even classes of words were added at a later time. There is, besides, the Chinese translation by Sh'-hu (A.D. 980-1000), in which several sections of the Sanskrit text are wanting, while other sections are found there which do not occur in our text (see B. Nanjio, Catalogue, No. 812).

What is still more important is that Nâgâr*g*una is not mentioned by the Chinese translator as the author of this Buddhist glossary.

It was Mr. Kasawara who, after copying long extracts from the Pra*gñ*â-pâramitâ and its commentary by Nâgâr*g*una, suggested to me that our list of terms might have been collected from Nâgâr*g*una's commentary, and that the title might have been originally intended for something like Iti Nâgâr*g*unapâdavira*ḥ*itâṿâm Pra*g*nâpâramitâv*ṛ*ittau Dharmasaṅgraha*ḥ*. He adds, "This conjecture is very weak, and not worth mentioning." I think, on the contrary, that it is a conjecture of which many a scholar might be proud.

Our great difficulty is the exact age of Nâgâr*g*una. There is Nâgâr*g*una, the Bodhisattva, called Luṅ-shu, *i.e.* dragon-tree, the fourteenth patriarch, whose life was translated by Kumâra*g*îva, about 400 A.D. (B.N. Cat. 1461). Among the 21 (not 24) works ascribed to him the Dharmasaṅgraha is not mentioned. But there is a curious letter of his, called Arya-Nâgâr*g*una-bodhisattva-suh*ṛ*llekha, which ought here to be mentioned. It was translated three times, first by Guṇavarman, A.D. 431; secondly by Saṅghavarman, A.D. 434 (not 534); and thirdly by I-tsing, A.D. 700–712. I-tsing says that the Buddhists in the five parts of India commit these lines to memory when they begin to study their religion. He adds that the letter was addressed by the Bodhisattva Nâgâr*g*una to his old patron (Dânapati), a great

king of the South, who was called So-to-pho-hân-na, *i.e.* Sadvâhana, and whose proper name was Sh'-yen-töh-*k*iâ or Shân-tho-*k*iâ.

Here is the translation of the letter, as taken from I-tsing's Chinese translation, made during his stay at Tâmralipti :—

"O thou of complete virtue, I shall explain the law of suchness (tathâtvam), to acquire holy merit (on my part). I shall expound the truest goodness; listen to me with full attention. This verse will be called the Noble Gîtâ.

As an image, whatever its materials be, when carved, is worshipped by all the wise, so, despite of my verse so unskilfully made, let it not be slighted, for the meaning is in accordance with the good law.

Although thou, O King, hast already been acquainted with the law of suchness (tathâtvam), yet hear further the words of Buddha, so that thou mayest increase thy understanding and excellence. As a wall well painted is brighter still when illumined by the moon, is not the beauty of a thing increased, when it meets with one still more beautiful?'

(Adoration to) the Buddha, the Religion, and the Community! All who keep the precept of generosity, the gods, who respectively accumulate their virtuous actions—they should always be intent on the teaching of Buddha.

In the practice of the virtuous actions of ten kinds (Dasakusalakarmapatha), the body, speech, and mind[1] are the most essential (actors). Let us refrain from all kinds of spirituous liquor (which lead the body, etc., to insanity), so that we may live a pure life.

Know that treasures are not constant—such is their state; and give them, as of right, to holy men. All, both poor and twice-born, will (thereby) be intimate friends in the coming births.

Every virtue has its stand on Sîla, as all things prosper on (good) soil. Let us practise with constancy, as we are taught by Buddha.

---

[1] See Cowell, Journal of Philology, vol. iii. p. 215; Dhammapada, v. 96; Sacred Books of the East, vol. x. p. 28.

Generosity, good conduct, forbearance, energy, meditation and wisdom are ineffable and incomparable. Let us practise these, because they alone enable us to attain that shore. He is a Buddha who has crossed over the sea of births."

So far the letter. But who is the King to whom it is addressed? It is natural to suppose that he was a Śâtavâhana, a king in Southern India, and belonged to the Andhrabhṛitya dynasty. On referring, however, to the names of the sovereigns of that dynasty, as given in the Purâṇas, there is no name like Sh'-yen-töh-kiâ, or Shân-tho-kiâ. One might have thought of that corrupt name Kivilaka or Vivilaka, but the more authoritative reading is Ivîlaka or Apitaka (see Vishṇu. Pur. transl. by Wilson, ed. F. Hall, vol. iv. p. 196).

Fortunately we are now in possession of far more trustworthy documents on the Śâtavâhana dynasty, thanks chiefly to the labours of Pandit Bhagvânlal Indraji. But on referring to his last essay on "Nasik, Pându Lena Caves," in the Bombay Gazetteer, we look again in vain for anything corresponding to the Chinese name. It cannot be Śâtakarṇi, or, in Pâli, Sadakâṇi, unless the Chinese transliteration is supposed to be very corrupt. The only Sanskrit names that one might guess at under the strange Chinese disguises are Gi-in-ta-ka or Gñâtaka, possibly Getṛika or Dhyâtṛika.

Hiouen-thsang confirms the tradition of Nâgârguna having been the friend of Śâtavâhana. When speaking of Kośala (I. p. 185), he says that at a small distance, south of the town, there was an old monastery built by Aśoka, and that later Nâgârguna established himself there, patronized by King Śâtavâhana. He adds that the famous Bodhisattva Deva came from Ceylon to see Nâgârguna and learn from him. In another place (I. p. 274) Hiouen-thsang speaks again of Nâgârguna as the contemporary of Deva, and alludes to the "Four Suns," Nâgârguna in the West, Deva in the South, Aśvaghosha in the East, and Kumâragiva in the North, as if they had lived at the same time. Lastly, he returns more fully to the same subject in vol. iii. p. 95, and we there learn from his translation of the name Śâtavâhana by

In-ching, "he who leads the good," that he probably read the name as Sadvâhana.

In conclusion, I may notice two traditions, one, first mentioned by Wilson (Works, vol. iii. p. 181), that *S*âtavâhana is a synonym of *S*âlivâhana, the enemy of Vikramâditya, and another, first noticed by Colebrooke (Misc. Essays, ii. p. 89), that Hâla, the name of the collector of the 700 popular verses (Saptasatakam), is a known title of *S*âlivâhana (see also Weber, Saptasataka, p. 2). On the real date of Nâgâr*g*una, as the contemporary of Kanishka, I have touched in my Lectures on "India, what can it teach us?" p. 304.

I am afraid I have rather wandered away from the chief subject of this notice, but as I and Kasawara had often discussed these questions together, I leave what I have written, hoping that I may soon find time to arrange all the materials which we collected for an edition of the Dharmasaṅgraha, and to publish them as a lasting monument of my late friend and pupil, Kenjiu Kasawara.

Oxford, 5 *Nov.* 1883. F. Max Müller.

Note.—I have just time to add that the Tibetan translation of Nâgâr*g*una's letter, which I asked Dr. Wenzel to examine for me, gives the King's name as Utrayana, a Tibetan corruption for Udayana (see Târanâtha's Geschichte des Buddhismus, übersetzt von Schiefner, p. 2, n. 2; p. 71). This Udayana, as we learn from the same Târanâtha, p. 303, was also called Ântivâhana, which Schiefner doubtfully identifies with the Greek name Antiochos, but of which there is a various reading, *S*ântivâhana (l.c. p. 304). What is most satisfactory is that, according to Târanâtha, Udayana, when a boy, was called *G*etaka (l.c. p. 303). This shows again the great value of the Tibetan translation of Buddhist texts, which, as a rule, are far superior to the Chinese translations. I hope that my young friend, Dr. Wenzel, will soon give us some more of the results of his valuable researches in Tibetan literature.