

NOTES AND QUERIES
ON PASSAGES IN THE MAHĀVAGGA.

THE publication of Professor Oldenberg's text of the Vinaya-*piṭaka* may be said to have inaugurated a new era in the systematic study of Pāli. With a text and in part also a translation before us, the first ground is fairly broken, and the time seems to have come when special criticism may profitably be applied to particular passages and phrases of these renowned scriptures.

I have responded to an invitation to publish these few notes in the *Journal of the Pāli Text Society*, not so much for the importance of the phrases or words that I have attempted to elucidate—though in several cases this is considerable—but rather because I feel that a Society like ours offers very exceptional opportunities for the interchange of opinions embodying something of the characteristic criticism both of the East and of the West.

In Mahāvagga, Bk. I. Ch. 5 ("Brahmayācana kathā") at the end (§ 12) occurs the following gāthā:

Apārutā tesam amatassa dvārā ye sotavanto
pamuñcantu saddham |
Vihimsasaññī paṅṇam na bhāsi dhammam
paṇitam manujesu Brahme 'ti ||

which is thus translated (Max Müller's "Sacred Books of the East," vol. xiii. "Vinaya Texts," tr. Davids and Oldenberg, p. 88):

‘Wide opened is the door of the Immortal to all who have ears to hear; let them send forth faith to meet it. The Dhamma sweet and good I spake not, Brahmâ, despairing of the weary task, to men.’

The first difficulty of this passage is that, at first reading, the Buddha appears to be made to say ‘let men relinquish faith,’ which of course, in this unqualified form at all events, would be as foreign to the spirit of Buddhist, as of Hindu or Christian, teaching. To obviate this difficulty, the translators attribute to the verb *pamuñcati* a meaning which I venture to think it will be found hard to substantiate. ‘Send forth’ can be easily verified as a meaning for the root, but ‘send forth *to meet*,’ on which the whole point of the rendering depends, is unexampled in either Pâli or Sanskrit dictionaries.

On the contrary, among the examples quoted in Böhlingk and Roth, s.v. (pra-) *muc*, the *literal* usages nearest to the sense of ‘send forth’ are passages where the verb is used, (absolutely, as required, without an ablative case) of ‘*emitting*’ a sound or a fluid. But such ‘sending forth’ is a very different thing from sending forth a kind of despatch or deputation of welcome, which, I take it, is the meaning that most English readers would attach to the phrase employed.

Among the metaphorical usages quoted for *pramuc*, it is curious to observe that in Mahâbhârata III. 10819 we get the diametrically opposite sense of relinquishing sin, in the phrase ‘*sarvam pâpam pramokshyasi.*’

The question thus naturally arises, how can we modify our rendering of *saddham* so as to suit the ordinary meanings of *pamuñcati*?

The solution that originally suggested itself to me was to take *saddham* as equal not to ‘*çraddham*’ ‘faith,’ but to ‘*çrâddham*’ ‘an offering to the Manes.’ But as authority for this I have only Childers’s citations from the *Abhidhânappadîpikâ*, which is a somewhat late authority for the language of so early a book as the *Mahāvagga*. In connexion with this proposal I proceed to the consider-

ation of the first word in the following line, vihiṃsa-saññī, which I would render ‘conscious of the cruelty [of mankind].’ It is almost needless to observe how very characteristic of Buddhist thought is such a use of ‘cruelty’ as typical of all vice or evil; indeed, we may say characteristic of Indian thought in general, comparing passages like Hitopadeṣa 19, 22 (ed. Schlegel), where we find “dharmaçâstrâṇâm ‘ahiṃsâ paramo dharmâ’ ity aikamatyam.” On this showing, the train of thought would be: ‘I exhort the understanding few to relinquish the fleshly and often life-destroying observances of the old religion; to the many I have not [as yet] preached, because I am conscious of their cruelty and wickedness.’ Doubtless, at any time from the days of Āçvalâyana to the present, the çrâddha may well have been selected as one of the most prominent and typical observances of every-day Brahmanism.

I now turn to the explanation of this passage as given in the commentary. As, unfortunately, no English library possesses a Mahāvagga-commentary, I consulted the MS. at Paris, and was subsequently favoured by M. Léon Feer, of the Bibliothèque Nationale, with two very kind and interesting letters, from which I extract all that bears on the passage; venturing at the same time, with some regret, to render it into English, that no point may escape our readers in the East. M. Feer writes:

“I send herewith the commentary on the stanza of the Brahmāyācānagāthā according to the Samanta Pāsādikā (commentary on the Mahāvagga), and according to the Sārattha Pakāsinī (commentary on the Saṃyutta-nikāya), the first represented by two MSS., one Burmese, the other Sinhalese; the second by a single Siamese MS.

Apārutā¹ ti vivata || amatassa dvarā ti ariyamaggo ||
so hi amatasankhātassa nibbānassa dvāraṃ² || || Pamuñ-
cantu saddhan ti sabbe attano³ saddham pamuñcantu

¹ Aparutānti, Sinhalese MS. ² dvāraṃ so mayā vivarivā thamito ti dasseti, Siamese. ³ attanā, Siam.

vissajjentu^{1*} || pacchimapadadvaye ayam attho || || Ahaṃ
 hi attano paṇaṃ² suppavatti³ imaṃ paṇitaṃ⁴ uttamaṃ
 dhammaṃ⁵ kāyavâcâkilamattha saññi hutvâ² manujesu de-
 vamanussesu nâbhâsi⁵ ||

You will see that there are slight differences between the two MSS. of the Samanta Pâsâdikâ, and that the Sarâttha-Pakâsinî agrees in effect with the Samanta Pâsâdikâ, notwithstanding certain differences.

There must have existed a various reading for the words pamuñcantu saddham. I do not know whether its trace is to be found in the Pâli canon, but the Tibetan version, the Dulva, reveals it to us; for our stanza is found there. Now the whole pada is there translated as follows :

ñan	par	su	hdod	som ñi	sol cig	dañ
audire	qui	cupit	dubium	purget	atque . . .	
			vel	dubia		

Now som-ñi is the ordinary translation of the Sanskrit kâñkshâ 'desire,' whose Pâli equivalent kañkha is rendered by 'doubt' in Childers. Whether we translate 'doubt' or 'desire' in the passage before us, a satisfactory sense is obtained. But it is evident in my judgment that the translator of the Dulva had before him a text reading kañkham instead of saddham, and a different verb from pamuñcantu. It would have been so easy for him to put down dad pa spon jig, or some analogous expression, that the translator must certainly have worked on a text which did not include the word saddham, and it is inadmissible to suppose that he allowed himself to emend the text.

I think, then, that there are one or more various readings for this pada; only, it would be interesting to discover their trace in Pâli literature. Now, all that we know, whether text or commentary, gives us the reading pamuñcantu

^{1*} Om. Burm.; °jjantu, Siam. ² . . . ² suppavattim pi imaṃ paṇitaṃ uttamadhammak² °artham saññitâ hu°, Sinh. ³ Sampavattitam pi, Siam. ⁴ uttamadh°, Siam. ⁵ . . . ⁵ °vâcâkilapatha saññi hutvâ na bhâsi, Siam.

saddham, as adopted without dispute; only, this reading is a little troublesome to interpret.

I now call your attention to a stanza in Lalita-vistara, Bk. xxv., which corresponds with that before us. It runs thus in the edition of the *Bibliotheca Indica* [p. 520]:

apāvritās teshām amṛitasya dvārā
Brahmann iti satataṃ ye çrotavantaḥ |¹
praviçanti çraddhâ na viheṭhasañjñâ
çriṇvanti dharmam Magadheshu sattvâḥ ||

The last pada has one syllable too few, and the MSS. [at Paris] have between the two last padas, *i.e.* between viheṭhasañjñâ and çriṇvanti, the letters npûnaḥ,² which are embarrassing. But with this difficulty I am not at present concerned, turning rather to the consideration of the words praviçanti çraddhâ, which correspond to pamuñcantu saddham in the Pâli. In the edition of the *Bibliotheca Indica*, çraddhâ is interpreted in a foot-note by çraddhāvantaḥ. But we might read çraddhâm; or again praviçantu and çriṇvantu. Whatever be the conclusion, I direct your attention to this passage, and would further note that the Tibetan translation, which here lacks its usual exactness, and especially disturbs the order of the padas (a tolerably frequent occurrence), unites into a single (Tibetan) pada the Sanskrit words çrotavantaḥ praviçanti çraddhâ. It thus renders them:

rna-ba ldan jiñ dad-pa ldan gyurla
aures habentes et fidem habentes facti
çrotavantaḥ (praviçanti) çraddhâ

The Tibetan version does not authorize the correction of praviçanti to praviçantu; but it gives no indication for or against that of çraddhâ to çraddhâm. It interprets 'having faith,' without giving a special translation of the word *praviçanti*. The writer may perhaps have read *prabhavanti*, and have intended to represent that word by *gyur-la* in the translation.

¹ çrotavantaḥ, Cambridge MSS. ² punaḥ, Camb. MSS.

I believe that the compiler of the Lalita-vistara corrected the text of the Vinaya, or else selected a stanza which it had been proposed to substitute for that of the Vinaya. I consider the Tibetan text as a *various reading*, or—which amounts to the same thing—a *very ancient emendation* of the text of the Mahāvagga. The text of the Lalita-vistara I regard as a later various reading, *i.e.* as an *emendation* properly so-called, which arose from the difficulties of interpretation.”

The field of criticism opened to us by this most suggestive letter is very large.

One point, however, seems to come out clearly amid the curious perplexities of the passage, namely, that we have before us the remnant, at all events, of an early and widely diffused utterance of Buddhist teaching, a simple and striking metaphor which one would fain attribute to Gotama himself. This consideration may serve to excuse the development of what was originally intended as a short note into a somewhat lengthy excursus.

First, then, with regard to the Sanskrit of the Lalita-vistara,¹ it seems to me that the variation from the Pāli is due, in part at least, to a cause different from either of those suggested by M. Feer.

In the same chapter, at p. 517 of the printed text, we get, at the beginning of a long passage of verse, the following gāthā:

vādo babhūva samalair² vicintito
 dharmo hy aṣuddho³ Magadheshu pūrvam |
 amṛitam mune tad vivṛiṇīshva dvāraṃ
 ṛiṇvanti dharmavipulam⁴ vimalena buddham ||

I think, then, that the gāthā first quoted is a deliberate *adaptation* from the Pāli, suggested by the language, particularly by the image of ‘opening the door of amṛita’ in

¹ As to the importance of this book in connexion with the study of Pāli, it is hardly necessary to refer to Prof. Oldenberg’s most interesting paper in the ‘Verhandlungen’ of the Congress of Orientalists at Berlin, 1881 (II. ii. p. 115).

² Salilai, Cambridge MSS.

³ ‘mo viṣuddho, *ibid.*

⁴ dharmam vi^o, *ibid.*

the verse (just cited) which had preceded, itself probably founded on the original form of our Pāli gāthā or some saying closely resembling it.

This supposition will account for the presence of the three words *ṣṛiṇvanti dharmam Magadheshu*, which are represented in the other Sanskrit verse, but are not in the Pāli, and form, in fact, the chief discrepancy between the Sanskrit and Pāli.

Unfortunately, the Sanskrit passages, though interesting in themselves, give us no direct help for the interpretation of our chief crux, *pamuñcantu saddham*. It may be observed, however, that the adjective *viheṭhasañjñā* has the ordinary and literal sense, which I would assign to *vihimsasaññī*, in contradistinction to the metaphorical meaning given by the translators, and apparently by the Pāli commentary, though it is in agreement with a different noun.¹

Returning now to the question of more strictly Pāli

¹ Possibly, too, *sañjñā* has acquired the meaning noted by M. Senart for *sañjñin* (Mahāvastu, p. 375).

I add here a few observations on the passages of the Lalita-vistara concerning points that have less bearing on the Pāli text.

The metrical difficulty in *ṣṛiṇvanti* may perhaps be solved by reading or pronouncing *ṣṛiṇvanti*, as if the root ended in a consonant. In the phrase *praviṇanti ṣṛaddhā*, I have no doubt that *ṣṛaddhā* is for *ṣṛaddhayā*. Compare the Vedic usage, e.g. *dhārā* for *dhārayā* in Rīg. ix. 98, 2, and the analogous forms for the locative feminine in *ām* in this gāthā-dialect: e.g. *ratnabhushitām* for *ṭāyām*, cited by Dr. E. Müller in his paper in A. Kuhn's *Beiträge zur vergl. Sprachforschung*, viii. 274.

With regard to the ancient versions, the kind help of Prof. Douglas has enabled me to consult the two Chinese works stated to be translations of the Lalita-vistara. The older of these (No. 160 in Mr. Bunyiu Nanjio's Catalogue) turns out to be not a translation of the Sanskrit text as known to us. The division into chapters is different, and the correspondences of language are only occasional. A case like this should put us on our guard in accepting the statements of Chinese works, such as that cited by Mr. Nanjio, as to supposed translations from the Sanskrit. The second Chinese version (No. 159) of the viith century A.D., though it represents fairly well the Sanskrit of Chapter xxv., curiously enough substitutes a different verse for the gāthā beginning *apāvṛitāh* . . . ; but translates that beginning *vādo babhūva*. Whether this substitution points to the existence of a text anterior to the *adaptation* I have supposed, or is simply due to the difficulty of the verse, it is of course, hard to say.

As to the other version, the Tibetan, I will only call the attention of those who may consult Foucaux's Tibetan text and French translation to the word in the next line: *rtaḡ-tu*, which seems to represent the Sanskrit *satatam*, though the French does not show this.

criticism above raised, I note first that the commentary takes *pamuñcantu*, in its ordinary sense of 'relinquish,' but seems to understand the whole phrase as equivalent to 'let all relinquish the faith that each feels in his own religion.' I confess that this, if I rightly interpret it, seems to me somewhat strained; and I see no sense to be got by connecting *attano* as an ablative with *vissajjentu*.

To M. Feer's note on the Tibetan word *som-ni*, which I have not been able to verify, I will only add a suggestion that if *kañkham* was before the Tibetan translator, the immediate stage between the two readings may have been the form *sañkam*, which approximates to the one word in meaning and to the other in form.

I conclude this note, already too far extended, I fear, by a request that if any reader of this Journal can cite any further authority for *saddha = çrâddha*, he will make it known. For I cannot but think that this interpretation, if it can be substantiated, gives the sense that is at once the most simple and the most consistent and harmonious.

Mahāvagga I. 13, §1. *yonisomanasikâra*. Can any member of the society offer any explanation of the usage of *yoniso* so as to trace it to an intelligible derivation? The account in Childers s.v. is not very satisfactory. Cf. Senart, *Mahāv.* p. 371.

I. 15, §6. *Īṅha tvam . . . anujānāhi agyāgāran.* = "Come now, you grant me . . .". This use of *īṅha* (=agedum) suggests a derivation from the Sanskrit *aṅga*, which occurs as an emphatic vocative particle in Pāṇini and early Sanskrit; and likewise in Buddhist Sanskrit, e.g. in the *Lañkāvatāra*, ch. 1., leaf 9b 5 of the R.A.S. MS., "*Kim aṅga punar dharmādharmaḥ . . . viçesho na bhavati? Bhavatyeva.*" For the sound-changes it will suffice to refer to instances given in Kuhn's *Beiträge zur Pali Grammatik*. Thus we have *i* from *a* before *ṅ* in *mutiṅga* for Sansk. *mṛidaṅga*; for the aspiration, which is rarer for soft than for hard consonants, *siṅghāto* and *siṅghāṭakam*, corresponding to the Sansk. *çriṅgāṭa*.

I. 22, §16. *Bimbisārassa etad ahoṣi: kattha . . . bhagavā*

vihareyya, yaṃ assa . . . divā appākiṇṇam rattim appa-
saddam appanigghosam vijanavâtam manussarâhaseyyakaṃ
paṭisallânasârubbam.

This is translated (Vinaya Texts, I. 143): 'Where may I find a place for the Blessed One to live in . . . by day not too crowded, by night not exposed to much noise and alarm, clean of the smell of men, well fitted for a retired life?'

Though, for the sake of convenience, I have quoted the context, it is of the interpretation of the word vijanavâtam only that I would speak. Like Drs. Davids and Oldenberg, I understand this compound to refer to the atmosphere of the Buddha's proposed dwelling, but I analyze its parts differently. They clearly *construe*, so to say, vi- 'without,' jana-vâta 'people-air,' *i.e.* 'the polluted air of crowded or frequented places.' The notion conveyed in the last expression is familiar enough to those who, like myself, are engaged in large public institutions; but I doubt whether, if this was what the compiler of this early text intended, he would have expressed it by a compound so bald and liable to misconstruction as jana-vâta.

I therefore propose to divide the word not vi-janavâta, but vijana-vâta, and translate accordingly, 'having its air from an unfrequented place,' or 'breathing the wind of the wilderness.'

The meaning thus obtained does not differ widely from that of the published translation (and I trust the learned translators will not consider me hypercritical for calling attention to it), but it seems to me to yield slightly better sense, and likewise to be in far better accordance with the analogy of such compounds. To illustrate the use of each member of the compound as I divide it, I cite a couple of examples taken from Böhlingk and Roth: (1) malaya-vâta 'wind *from* Malaya,' Vikramorvaçî, 25, where vâta is used at the end of an ablatival compound; (2) vijanasevin, Kathâsaritsâgara, 7,195, where vijana is used substantively as the first member of a compound.