

THE BUDDHIST COUNCILS AT
RĀJAGAHA AND VESĀLĪ,
AS ALLEGED IN CULLAVAGGA XI., XII.

By R. OTTO FRANKE

INTRODUCTORY

THE authorities for establishing the historical truth of the three first Buddhist Councils are the xith and xiith Books of the Cullavagga, together with the Northern Buddhist derivatives of these two chapters; besides these the Dipavaṅsa, the Mahāvaṅsa, and, among Buddhaghosa's Commentaries, chiefly the introduction to the Samantapāsādikā. Now the Dipavaṅsa ought, through my inquiry into its origin, published in the Vienna *Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, xxi, pp. 203 ff., to have suffered much in reputation. Besides this, I have there proved a certain assumption to be erroneous—the assumption, namely, that the authors of the Dipavaṅsa, Mahāvaṅsa, and Samantapāsādikā had any chronicles contained in the old Sinhalese Commentary on the Canon (which would mean a chapter of ancient tradition) in their possession. I have tried to show that, on the contrary, the authors of the Mahāvaṅsa and of the Samantapāsādikā wrote out the Dipavaṅsa, but that, in the absence of any sources, the last-named work must be considered as standing unsupported on its own tottering feet. If hereby—and there can be no reasonable doubt about it—

the credibility of the *Dīpavaṅsa* and that of the 'historical sources' derived from it, has been badly shaken, the further question obtrudes itself: Is the historical truth of the Buddhist Councils, as recorded in the above-named works, to stand as sufficiently attested?

This question calls the more impressively for a reply, in that the results of investigations into the Buddhist Canon show in themselves a discrepancy with the theory of the Councils.* It may now be considered as safely established, that the books of the Canon *as a whole* are not authentic; that the Canon was not composed and compiled in one and the same period of time, but that different books came into being at different periods covering a considerable time;† that the contents of each book were not collected, but were composed, each by a separate hand, with more or less reference to pre-existing traditional materials; and that even the first two Piṭakas (to say nothing of the *Abhidhamma*) cannot possibly have been presented as finished before either the 'first' or the 'second' Council, even if these events took place at the intervals assigned to them.‡ But the records of the Councils affirm more or less the opposite on all these points.

I will here, to prove my verdict, add to the evidence brought forward by other investigators some illustrative matter from the Canon. In the *Majjhima Nikāya* i. 82 we read: 'Ahaṇ kho pana Sāriputta etarahi jīṇṇo vuddho mahallako addhagato vayo anuppatto, asītiko me vayo vattati.' ('I am now an old man, Sāriputta; of ripe years, and the path of my life lies behind me; my life is in its eightieth year.') Now, as the Buddha is said to have lived no more than eighty years, this Sutta, if it is to rank

* My conclusion is not based alone on Kern's 'Manual of Indian Buddhism'—*e.g.*, pp. 2 and 109. I propose to give my proofs in a book entitled 'A Critique of the Pali Canon.'

† Rhys Davids has done most to establish this point. See especially his 'Buddhist India,' London, 1903, pp. 176 *ff.*

‡ Else the Buddha must have lived considerably earlier than is supposed. I am bound to confess that, judging by the nature of the sources accessible to us at the present day, there seems to me to be nothing soundly established respecting the date of his death.

as authentic, must have dated from the very last stage of his life. There would certainly be some remark to this effect in the Sutta. There is, however, nothing of the sort. There is, in this connexion, nothing to distinguish it from any other Sutta. On the other hand, we should expect to find in the Gospel of the Decease—the Mahā-parinibbāna-suttanta—some comment on what is stated in Majjhima i. 82; but we do not find it. The sentence quoted, however, does appear in the Mahā-parinibbāna-suttanta (Dīgha xvi. 2, 25 [vol. ii. 100]), with one word altered—it is 'Ānanda' for 'Sāriputta.' Hence, on the face of it, either one text is inauthentic, or both are. Probably, as appears in other passages, the Majjhima has borrowed from the Dīgha.

But, again, the passage in both these Nikāyas is contradicted by Saṅgyutta xlvii. 13 (vol. v., p. 161). According to *this* Sutta, Sāriputta died while the Buddha was at Sāvattihī. However shortly his death may have preceded that of the Buddha, it was before the latter's last tour, on which he did not revisit Sāvattihī: 'Ekaṇ samayaṇ Bhagavā Sāvattihīyaṇ viharati . . . tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Sāriputto Magadhesu viharati Nālagāmake ābādhiko dukkhito bāḥagilāno . . . atha āyasmā Sāriputto tena ābādheṇa parinibbāyī . . .' Again, in Saṅy. xlvii. 14, 1 (vol. v. 163) we read: 'Ekaṇ samayaṇ Bhagavā Vajjīsu viharati . . . aciraparinibbutesu Sāriputta - Moggalānesu.' No significance attaches to the fact that, in later Suttas—*e.g.*, xlviii. 44 (vol. v. 220)—Sāriputta is still alive, for the Nikāya is not ostensibly in chronological order. But there is no explaining away the contradiction that, in Majjhima i. 82, Sāriputta is alive in the Buddha's eightieth year, and that in Dīgha xvi. 1, 16 the Exalted One, on his last tour, under taken in the same year, discourses at Nālandā to Sāriputta: 'Atha kho āyasmā Sāriputto yena Bhagavā ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā Bhagavantaṇ abhivādetvā . . . Bhagavantaṇ etad avoca . . . "Uḷārā kho te ayaṇ Sāriputta āsabhī vācā bhāsita . . ."'

It is further worth noticing the relation of Dīgha xvi. 5, 7-18, to xvii. Both passages treat of King Mahā Sudassana; both are put into the mouth of the Exalted One on the identical occasion when he lay a-dying at Kusinārā beneath the twin sāla trees; both are in nearly identical words:

(a) Dīgha xvi. 5, 17 (vol. ii. 146): 'Evaṇ vutte āyasmā Ānando Bhagavantaṇ etad avoca: "Mā bhante Bhagavā imasmiṇ kuḍḍa-nagarake ujjangala-nagarake sākha-nagarake parinibbāyatu. Santi, etc., to karissantīti." "Mā h'evaṇ Ānanda avaca mā h'evaṇ Ānanda avaca kuḍḍa-nagarakaṇ ujjangala-nagarakaṇ

sākha-nagarakan ti. Bhūtapubbaṅ Ānanda rājā Mahā-Sudassano nāma ahosi cakkavattī dhammiko dhammarājā cāturanto vijitāvī janapadatthāvariya-patto sattaratanasamannāgato. Rañño Ānanda Mahā-Sudassanassa ayaṅ Kusinārā Kusāvati nāma rājadhānī ahosi, puratthimena ca pacchimena ca dvādasa yojanāni āyāmena uttarena ca dakkhiṇena ca satta yojanāni vitthārena, etc., to dasamena saddena. Gaccha tvaṅ Ānanda Kusinārāyaṅ pavisitvā Kosinārakānaṅ Mallānaṅ ārocehi." . . .

(b) *Dīgha* xvii. 1, 1 (vol. ii. 169): 'Evaṅ me sutaṅ. Ekaṅ samayaṅ Bhagavā Kusinārāyaṅ viharatī Upavattane Mallānaṅ Sālavane antarena Yamakasālānaṅ parinibbānasamaye. Atha kho āyasmā Ānando yena Bhagavā ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā Bhagavantaṅ abhivādetvā ekamantaṅ nisīdi. Ekamantaṅ nīsinno kho āyasmā Ānando Bhagavantam etad avoca: "Mā bhante Bhagavā . . . sākhanagarake parinibbāyi. Santi, etc., to karissantīti." "Mā h'evaṅ Ānanda avaca kuḍḍanagaraṅ ujjangalanagaraṅ sākhanagarakan ti. Bhūtapubbaṅ Ānanda rājā Mahā-Sudassano nāma ahosi khattiyo muddhāvasitto cāturanto vijitāvī janapadatthāvariya-patto. Rañño Ānanda . . . rājadhānī ahosi. Sā kho Ānanda Kusāvati pacchimena ca puratthimena ca dvādasa yojanāni," etc., to "dasamena saddena. Kusāvati Ānanda rājadhānī sattahi pākārehi parikkhittā ahosi," etc.'

It is striking that the same book, professing to give us the words of the Buddha, should twice give the same discourse delivered on a certain occasion; but it is still more striking that the discourse is of such different extent in each passage. In the former the allusion to King Mahā Sudassana is limited to the remark quoted. In the latter the whole Suttanta is occupied with the story of the King—*i.e.*, about thirty pages. One only of the two versions, if either, can be authentic, since truth can have but one shape. From the first our suspicions settle on D. xvii., inasmuch as the thin, artificial, long-winded rigmarole of D. xvii. does not mate with the tone of the Buddha's converse in xvi. and elsewhere; and, further, because it is so highly improbable that the dying Buddha would have delivered a mythical discourse of that length. But our decision here must rest, not on what our feeling and our criticism pronounces to be not genuine, but on the fact that tradition covers both Suttantas with the shield of accepted authenticity. That tradition hereby forfeits for both of them its claim on our recognition.

Another analogous instance is the story of the conversion of

Sundarika-Bhāradvāja. It is related in three versions (three at least, so far as I know) : in M. vii. (vol. i. 39); S. vii. 1, 9 (vol. i. 167-170); and S. N. iii. 4 (pp. 79 ff.) The root idea in all three versions is that moral purity (in M. *suddha*, in S. *suddhi*) is to be won, not through ritual, but through inward cleansing. Cf., e.g., in M. :

Idh' eva sināhi brāhmaṇa,
Sabbabhūtesu karohi khemataṇ;
Sace musā na bhaṇasi, sace pāṇaṇ na hiṇsasi,
Sace adinnaṇ n'ādiyasi, saddahāno amacchari,
Kiṇ kāhasi Gayaṇ gantvā, udapāno pi te Gayā ti.

And in S. :

Dhammo rahado brāhmaṇa sīlatittho
Anāvilo sabbhi sataṇ pasattho
Yattha have vedaguno sinātā
Anallīnagattā va taranti pāraṇ
Saccaṇ dhammo saṇyamo brahmacariyaṇ.

In all three versions the river Sundarikā is mentioned; all three conclude with Sundarika-Bhāradvāja announcing his conversion in the usual formula: 'Abhikkantaṇ bho Gotama!' etc.; and there are besides more detailed points of agreement in the Saṇyutta and Sutta Nipāta versions. All three accounts, however, reveal marked, in part radical, discrepancies. Now, the conversion can only have taken place in one way, hence two of the accounts must be false; probably all three are. But of such variations in one and the same narrative the Canon reveals quite a large number; such tokens of non-authenticity crop up everywhere.

I will only adduce further the beginning of Dīgha xvii. and that of some other Suttas. D. xvii. 1, 1 begins with the usual Evaṇ me sutaṇ, followed by the equally usual Ekaṇ samayaṇ . . .; but this usual commencement is most unfitting for the ensuing narrative, if we make our point of view the mere peephole permitted by the Council-theory. If at the first Council, a few weeks after the Buddha's death, the Suttas were, according to this theory, edited or revised, then this Sutta must have been spoken by the Buddha but a little time previously, from the editors' point of view; but in that case the words ekaṇ samayaṇ ('once upon a time') do not fit the case; therefore, either the Council-theory, or the tradition of the compilation of the Suttas, or both, must be inaccurate.

Equally unsuitable, on the supposition that the Sutta Piṭaka was compiled immediately after the Buddha's parinirvana, is the same opening phrase in S. vi. 2, 5 (vol. i. 157), borrowed entirely from D. xvi. 6, 7 ff. (vol. ii. 155)—'Ekaṇ samayaṇ Bhagavā Kusi-

6 *The Buddhist Councils at Rājagaha and Vesālī*

nārāyaṇ viharati Upavattane Mallānaṇ . . . parinibbāna-samaye'—as well as the same commencement in Anguttara iv. 76, 1 (vol. ii. 79), borrowed from D. xvi. 6, 5, and 6 (vol. ii. 154), and in the Sutta quoted above, S. xlvii. 9 (vol. v. 152), borrowed from D. xvi. 2, 21 ff. (vol. ii.): 'Ekaṇ samayaṇ Bhagavā Vesāliyaṇ viharati Beluvagāmake. . . .'

There are even Suttas, describing matters that took place after the Buddha's death, and which on that account cannot have been collected at the Rājagaha Council, which open in the same way with ekaṇ samayaṇ, a phrase which sets the editing of them back no brief interval after this post-parinirvāna period—*e.g.*, D. x. 1, 1 (vol. i. 204).

But all this is merely provisional and far from adequate evidence for my argument. I need not have adduced any of it, had there been sufficient space to bring forward my more genuine proofs.

The northern Buddhists' records concerning Councils cannot, as I shall point out later on, be taken into account.

The question which we have undertaken to discuss is, therefore, to be thus put: 'What judgment can we arrive at concerning the Councils reported in Culla-vagga, xi. and xii.? Are these reports, at least, historically sound?'

There is some temerity involved in expressing an individual judgment as to the Councils, in view of the inquiries already published by not a few eminent scholars; the more so if the judgment be based exclusively on materials already known and used, and on the excellent work of certain among those scholars, against whose conclusions the said judgment takes its stand. No discussion of the Councils, for example, can ignore Oldenberg's fine edition of the Vinaya Piṭaka and his treatment of its literary position and of the Councils, or put on one side Rhys Davids's and Oldenberg's joint translation and treatment of the Vinaya. Oldenberg, too, was the first to point out the close connexion between the Mahā Parinibbāna-Suttanta and Culla-vagga xi., which is the base and corner-stone of investigations into the account of the Councils. To Kern also and to De la Vallée Poussin I owe gratitude, both for incitement and sustained interest. Vincent A. Smith's

views deserve considerable attention.* I shall do my utmost, in the course of my inquiry, to make scrupulous acknowledgment wherever I have adopted from their writings, or have found myself in line with them. Such courage as I feel moving me to take a view divergent from theirs I derive from the consideration, that this problem of the Councils is one of sufficient complexity to leave scope for luck in hitting on some conclusion, and to make it explicable why the cogitations of distinguished scholars should not have chanced upon that direction which seems to me to be correct.

By far the most important fact, I repeat, for the understanding of Culla-vagga xi., xii. is the connexion between these chapters and the Mahā Parinibbāna-Suttanta (D. xvi.). This fact has hitherto only so far been dealt with, that it was held not entirely to upset the question of the Councils as a historical problem. It is this view of the matter—as a historical problem—which has been the connecting principle in all explanations hitherto given of C.V. xi., xii., however widely some of these explanations may seem at first sight to differ. At bottom they only differ in what they suffer to stand as historically true. For even the more sceptical deny the historical truth of these chronicles either in part only, or only in the sense that they represent some latent historical fact. Curiously enough, no one seems to have lit on the explanation (or at least on the thoroughgoing explanation) that one of the two texts might be, as literature, dependent on the other, and concocted out of it.† This explanation is, after all, in such cases of textual agreement, the first

* I could find but little to help me in Minayeff's 'Recherches sur le Bouddhisme' (*Annales du Musée Guimet, Bibliothèque d'Études*, iv.).

† Oldenberg, in the *Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft*, 52, p. 623, does account for the coincidences between C.V. xi. and the M. Parinibbāna S. by the influence of the latter; but he merely believes that the narrative of the Councils has taken a few data from the M. Pari. S. and grouped these data, or the constructions based upon them, round the principal facts.

to suggest itself. And anyway it is the view put forward in the following inquiry, as that which alone commends itself to me.

I shall first quote the equivalent passages in the two works, which Oldenberg and other scholars have already dealt with. It is essential to the clearness of my argument that this evidence should plainly and fully meet the eye.

I. PUBLISHED DISCUSSION ON THE PARALLEL PASSAGES IN
DĪGHA-NIKĀYA XVI. AND CULLA-VAGGA XI.

The whole of the first two sections of C.V. xi. is derived from D. xvi. 6, 19, 20 (ii. 162).^{*} There are a few changes in the derived text; some of them not without significance for the critic. The sentence, 'Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo bhikkhū āmantesi,' occurs, in the Dīgha, almost at the end of section 20. The Culla-v. has transferred it to the beginning, making the entire borrowed portion into the speech of M. Kassapa. The second alteration follows from the first. The opening words of the Dīgha section (19): Tena kho pana samayena āyasmā M. Kassapo Pāvāya Kusināraṇ . . . become, in the C.V., 'Ekaṇ idāhaṇ āvuso samayaṇ Pāvāya Kusināraṇ . . .,' with the further use of the first instead of the third person—ahaṇ, etc. Thirdly, the compiler of the Culla-vagga has substituted for Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo bhikkhū āmantesi, the words: 'Atha khv āhaṇ āvuso te bhikkhū etaḍ avocaṇ . . .' Besides this, he has inverted the order of Subhadda's and M. Kassapa's speeches. Fourthly, his insertion, as often as possible, of the vocative āvuso is one of the many peculiar characteristics of C.V. xi., xii., which will be further dealt with in my second section.

I now give the whole of the borrowed passage as it stands, to aid our criticism.

Dīgha xvi. 6, 19: Tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo Pāvāya Kusināraṇ add-

* See Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, S.B.E. xx., p. 370, n. 1.

hāna-magga-paṭipanno hoti mahatā bhikkhu-sanghena saddhiṃ pañcamatthehi bhikkhusatehi. Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo maggā okkamma aññatarasmiṃ rukkhamūle nisīdi.

Tena kho pana samayena aññataro ājivako Kusinārāya mandārava-pupphaṃ gahetvā Pāvaya addhāna-magga-paṭipanno hoti.

Addasā kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo ājivakaṃ dūrato 'va āgacchantaṃ. Disvā tam ājivakaṃ etad avoca: 'Ap' āvuso amhākaṃ Satthāraṃ jānāsīti.'

'Āma āvuso jānāmi. Ajja sattāha-parinibbuto samaṇo Gotamo. Tato me idaṃ mandārava-pupphaṃ gahitaṃ' ti.

Tattha ye te bhikkhū avīta-rāgā appekacce bāhā paggayha kandanti, chinna-papātaṃ papaṭanti avaṭṭanti vivaṭṭanti: 'Atikhippaṃ Bhagavā parinibbuto, atikhippaṃ Sugato parinibbuto, atikhippaṃ cakkhuṃ loke antarahitaṃ' ti.

Ye pana te bhikkhū vītarāgā, te satā sampajānā adhvāsenti: 'Aniccā saṅkhārā, taṃ kut' ettha labbhā?' ti.

20. Tena kho pana samayena Subhaddo nāma buddhapabbajito tassaṃ parisāyaṃ nisinno hoti. Atha kho Subhaddo buddha-pabbajito te bhikkhū etad avoca:

'Alaṃ āvuso mā socittha mā paridevittha. Sumuttā mayaṃ tena mahā-samaṇena. Upaddutā ca homa "Idaṃ vo kappati, idaṃ vo na kappatīti," idāni pana mayaṃ yaṃ icchissāma taṃ karissāma, yaṃ na icchissāma taṃ na karissāmāti.'

Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo bhikkhū āmantesi:

'Alaṃ āvuso mā socittha mā paridevittha. Nanu etaṃ āvuso Bhagavatā paṭigacc' eva akkhantaṃ: "Sabbe" eva piyehi manāpehi nānābhāvo vinā-bhāvo aññathābhāvo, taṃ kut' ettha āvuso labbhā? Yan taṃ jātaṃ bhūtaṃ saṅkhatāṃ

paloka-dhammaṃ taṃ vata mā palujjiti n'etaṃ
tānaṃ vijjatiti.”’

Now at that time the venerable Mahā Kassapa was journeying along the high road from Pāvā to Kusinārā with a great company of the brethren, with about 500 of the brethren. And the ven. M. Kassapa left the high road, and sat himself down at the foot of a certain tree. Just at that time a certain naked ascetic, who had picked up a Mandārava flower* in Kusinārā, was coming along the high road to Pāvā. And the ven. M. Kassapa saw the naked ascetic coming in the distance, and asked him: ‘O friend! surely thou knowest our Master?’ ‘Yea, friend! I know him. This day a week ago the Samaṇa Gotama attained Parinirvana. That is how I obtained this Mandārava flower.’

And forthwith of those of the brethren who were not yet free from the passions, some stretched out their arms and wept, and some fell headlong on the ground, and some reeled to and fro [in anguish at the thought]: ‘Too soon has the Exalted One died! Too soon has the Blessed One attained Parinirvāna! Too soon has the Eye of the world vanished!’

But those of the brethren who were free from the passions, acquiesced, mindful and self-possessed, saying: ‘Impermanent are all component things; What else were here possible?’

Now at that time a brother named Subhadda, who had been received into the order in his old age, was seated in that company. And Subhadda, the aged recluse, spoke to the brethren, saying: ‘Enough, friends, weep not, lament not! We are well rid of the great Samaṇa. It was harassing to us to be told: “This beseems you, this beseems you not.” But now we shall be able to do whatever we like; and what we do not like, that we shall not have to do!’

But the ven. M. Kassapa addressed the brethren and said: ‘Enough, friends, weep not, lament not! Has not the Exalted One, friends, declared to us from the first: “From all things near and dear to us we must sever, . . . we must change. How can it be possible that, whereas anything whatever born, brought into being, compounded, perishable, should not perish! It cannot be.”’

Culla-vagga xi. 1: Atha kho āyasmā Mahā-Kassapo bhikkhū āmantesi: ‘Ekaṃ idāhaṃ āvuso samayaṃ Pāvāya Kusināraṃ addhānamaggapaṭi-panno mahatā. . . . Atha khv āhaṃ āvuso maggā okkamma aññatarasmiṃ rukkhamūle nisīdiy.

* The Buddha’s funeral couch and all Kusinārā was covered with the blossoms (D. xvi. 5, 2; 6, 16).

Tena kho . . . Addasaṇ khv ahaṇ āvuso taṇ ājivakaṇ . . . disvāna taṇ ājivakaṇ etad avocaṇ . . . Tatrāvuso ye te bhikkhū avītarāgā . . . taṇ kut' ettha labbhā 'ti. Atha khv āhaṇ āvuso te bhikkhū etad avocaṇ: Alaṇ āvuso mā socittha . . . n'etaṇ ṭhānaṇ vijjatitī. Tena kho pana samayena āvuso Subhaddo nāma vuḍḍhapabbajito . . . Atha kho āvuso Subhaddo . . . upadutā ca mayaṇ homa . . . na taṇ karissāmā 'ti.

There then follows immediately M. Kassapa's proposal to hold a Council.*

Here I will only draw such conclusions as are suggested by the text of these two passages and by the variations in C.V.

In the *Dīgha* everything narrated here is happening between Pāvā and Kusinārā, and is timed eight days after the Parinirvāna. (In the next section but one (22) we first hear of M. Kassapa's arrival at the funeral pyre at Kusinārā.)† The characters mentioned are M. Kassapa, a passing Ājivaka, Kassapa's bhikkhus, and, among these, Subhadda. In *Culla-vagga* M. Kassapa reports this occurrence as a past event, rendered less recent by the phrase 'ekaṇ idāhaṇ āvuso samayaṇ . . .'.‡ We cannot tell in the least, from the text, where and when the compiler of C.V. xi. intended this account to have been spoken. We have no ground for assuming that it was at Kusinārā, for even in the original account, in the *Dīgha*, it was not at Kusinārā that the conversation took place.§ Just as little may we infer, from C.V., that his telling took place

* By an error Minayeff ('Recherches,' p. 25) makes this proposal form part of the narrative of what happened between Pāvā and Kusinārā.

† Atha kho āy. M. K. yena Kusinārā-Makuṭa-bandhanaṇ Mallānaṇ cetiyaṇ yena Bhagavato citako ten' upasankami.

‡ Rightly pointed out by Oldenberg against Minayeff.

§ Here I differ from Oldenberg's view (*loc. cit.* 615; cf. *Vin.* I. xxvi.), and share that of De la V. Poussin (*Muséon*, 1905, p. 3). The accounts, given in derived compilations—as, e.g., the *Dīpavaṇsa* (see Oldenberg, *loc. cit.*)—are of no importance.

shortly after the Buddha's death. The only inference that can be drawn from the two texts is that the account in C.V. xi. has a literary connexion with the account of the Parinibbāna and the circumstances connected with it, and that the former has made use of the latter, though not in a skilful manner. But because the C.V. xi. derives from a historical (or quasi-historical) account, we are not, therefore, to conclude that the C.V. itself is history, or that there is any connexion between the events chronicled in both. The apparent reason for deriving C.V. xi. from the Dīgha account was the anarchical sentiment expressed by Subhadda. It was to contravene such rebellious tendencies against both Dhamma and Vinaya that, according to C.V. xi., the work of the Council, described in that chapter, was undertaken. Herein lies the explanation of the changed order in the speeches of Subhadda and M. Kassapa made between Pāvā and Kusinārā.* Subhadda's speech had, in C.V., to come last, since it was to form the bridge to what followed. This consideration is sufficient to lay any doubt whether it were not D. xvi. that had been affected by C.V. xi.

C.V. xi. 9: Atha kho āyasmā Ānando there bhikkhū etad avoca: Bhagavā maṃ bhante parinibbānakāle evam āha: Ākankhamāno Ānanda sangho mam' accayena khuddānukhuddakāni sikkhāpadāni samūhaneyya. 'Then said the venerable Ānanda to the thera-bhikkhus: Sirs, the Exalted One told me at the time of his Parinibbāna: "Ānanda, after I have passed away the Order may, if it will, suspend the rules relating to minor and supplementary matters."' This refers to Dīgha xvi. 6, 3: 'Ākankhamāno Ānanda sangho mam' . . . samūhantu.'†

In the C.V. the brethren reproach Ānanda for not having

* So, too, Oldenberg, Vin. I. xxviii, n. 1. Cf. also Oldenberg, Z.D.M.G., 52, 628.

† This has been already pointed out by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (S.B.E. xx. 377). Minayeff's historical conclusions (*op. cit.* 32) completely misunderstand the situation.

asked the Buddha which rules he had in mind. Now, in D. xvi. 6 there is no statement of Ānanda's asking the Buddha. But there is something in which the reproof may have taken root, and that is (D. xvi. 6, 5): Atha Bhagavā bhikkhū āmantesi: 'Siyā kho pana bhikkhave ekabhikkhussa pi kankhā vā vimati vā Buddhe vā Dhamme vā Sanghe vā Magge vā Paṭipadāya vā: pucchatha, bhikkhave! Mā pacchā vippaṭṭi-sārino ahuvattha: 'Sammukhībhūto no Satthā ahosi, na mayaṃ sakkhimha Bhagavantaṃ sammukhā paṭipucchitun ti.' Evaṃ vutte te bhikkhū tuṃhī ahesuṃ.

Then spake the Exalted One to the brethren:* 'It may be, brethren, that there is doubt or misgiving in the mind of some brother as to the Buddha, or the Truth, or the Order, or the Path, or the Way: ask ye, brethren! Do not have to reproach yourselves afterwards with the thought: "Our Teacher was face to face with us, and we could not bring ourselves to inquire of the Exalted One when we were face to face with him." And when he had thus spoken the brethren were silent.

Note this, too, in C.V. xi. 10: Idam pi te āvuso Ānanda dukkaṭaṃ yaṃ tvaṃ mātugāmehi Bhagavato sarīraṃ paṭhamaṃ vandāpesi, tāsāṃ rodantīnaṃ Bhagavato sarīraṃ assukena makkhitaṃ. Desehi taṃ dukkaṭaṃ ti. Ahaṃ kho bhante mā yimā vikāle ahesun ti mātugāmehi Bhagavato sarīraṃ paṭhamaṃ vandāpesiṃ. . . .

'This also, friend Ānanda, was ill done by thee, in that thou causedst the body of the Blessed One to be saluted by women first, so that by their weeping the body of the Blessed One was defiled by tears. Confess that fault.' 'I did so, Sirs, with the intention that they should not be kept beyond due time. I see no fault therein. Nevertheless, out of my faith in you, I confess that as a fault.' †

* Ānanda being one of them.

† I think that 'first' must mean 'too soon'—*i.e.*, before he was dead, or perhaps 'in the first watch of the night.' But it is not easy to see this meaning in 'paṭhamaṃ,' and it is, perhaps, better to impute a lack of 'correctitude' to the compiler.

This paragraph clearly refers to D. xvi. 5, 20 ff:* ‘And the ven. Ānanda went to the . . . Mallas of Kusinārā . . . saying: This day, O Vāsetṭhas, in the last watch of the night, the Parinibbāna of the Tathāgata will take place. Be favourable herein, O Vāsetṭhas, be favourable. Give no occasion to reproach yourselves hereafter, saying: “In our own village did the Parinibbāna of the Tathāgata take place, and we took not the opportunity of visiting the Tathāgata (once more) in his last hours.”’

‘And when they had heard this saying of the venerable Ānanda, the Mallas, their sons, their daughters-in-law and wives, were grieved and sad, and afflicted at heart. And some of them wept, dishevelled their hair, and stretched forth their arms and wept. . . . Then the Mallas, with their sons, daughters-in-law, and wives, being grieved . . . at heart, went to the Sāla Grove . . . to Ānanda.’

‘Then the ven. Ā. thought: If I allow the Mallas of Kusinārā, one by one, to pay their respects to the Exalted One, the whole of the Mallas of Kusinārā will not have been presented to the Exalted One until this night brightens up into the dawn. Let me now cause the Mallas of Kusinārā to stand in groups, each family in a group, and so present them to the Exalted One, saying: “Lord, a Malla of such-and-such a name, with his children, his wife (or wives), his retinue, and his friends, humbly bows down at the feet of the Exalted One.”’

‘And . . . after this manner the ven. Ānanda presented all the Mallas of Kusinārā to the Exalted One in the first watch of the night.’†

* I cannot understand why Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (S. B. E., xx. 379, n. 2; and, again, Oldenberg, Z.D.M.G., 52, p. 618, n. 3) doubt this.

† Cf. with this the Buddha’s words (D. xvi. 5, 5 [vol. ii. 144]): Paṇḍito kho bhikkhave Ānando; jānāti: ‘Ayaṃ kālo Tathāgataṃ dassanāya upasankamituṃ bhikkhūnaṃ, ayaṃ kālo bhikkhunīnaṃ, ayaṃ kālo upāsakānaṃ, ayaṃ kālo upāsikānaṃ . . .’ (‘He is a wise man, is Ānanda. He knows when it is the right time for . . . the brethren . . . and the laity to come and visit the Tathāgata.’)

The fact that, in the more original document, those who came are not exclusively 'women' will hardly be considered an objection against the connexion between the two narratives. But in view of the admonitions concerning the female sex, which tradition has ascribed to the Buddha (see D. xvi. 5, 9 [ii. 141]; C.V. x. 1; A. iv. 80 (ii. 82 *f.*), it is only natural that the inclusion of women in the reception of laymen by the Buddha during his last hours must have been very annoying to the brethren.

C.V. xi. 10 continues: *Idam pi te āvuso Ānanda dukkaṭaṇ yaṇ tvaṇ bhagavatā oḷārike nimitte kayiramāne oḷārike obhāse kayiramāne na bhagavantaṇ yāci: tiṭṭhatu bhagavā kappañ tiṭṭhatu sugato kappañ bahujaṇahitāya bahujaṇasukhāya lokānukampāya atthāya hitāya sukhāya devamanussānaṇ ti. Desehi taṇ dukkaṭaṇ ti. Ahaṇ kho bhante Mārena pariyuṭṭhitacitto na bhagavantaṇ yāciṇ: tiṭṭhatu bhagavā. . . .*

'This, too, friend Ānanda, was ill done by thee, in that even when a suggestion so evident and a hint so broad were given thee by the Exalted One, thou didst not beseech him, saying, "Let the Exalted One remain on for a kalpa! Let the Blessed One remain on for a kalpa, for the good and happiness of great multitudes, out of pity for the world, for the good and the gain and the weal of gods and men!" Confess that fault.'

'I was possessed by Māra, friends, when I refrained from so beseeching him. . . .'

This passage is based upon D. xvi. 3, 3, 7, 40 (ii. 103 *f.*, 115):* 3. . . So ākaṅkhamāno Ānanda Tathāgato kappañ vā tiṭṭheyya kappāvasesaṇ vā ti. 4. Evam pi kho āyasmā Ānando Bhagavatā oḷārike nimitte kayiramāne oḷārike obhāse kayiramāne nāsakkhi paṭivijjhituṇ, na Bhagavantaṇ yāci: Tiṭṭhatu bhante Bhagavā kappañ, tiṭṭhatu Sugato kappañ bahujaṇahitāya bahujaṇasukhāya lokānukampāya atthāya hitāya

* Pointed out by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (S.B.E., xx. 380, n. 1).

sukhāya devamanussānan ti, yathātaṃ Mārena
pariyuṭṭhitacitto.

‘The Tathāgata could therefore, Ānanda, should he desire it, live on yet for a kalpa, or for that portion of the kalpa which has yet to run. But even though a suggestion so evident and a hint so broad were thus given by the Exalted One, the ven. Ānanda was incapable of comprehending them ; and he besought not the Exalted One, saying, Vouchsafe, Lord, to remain during the kalpa! Live on through the kalpa, O Blessed One, for the good . . . so far was his heart possessed by the Evil One.’

The Māra theme is taken up again in § 7 : Atha kho Māro pāpimā acira-pakkante āyasmante Ānande yena Bhagavā ten’ upasankami . . . Hence in the Dīgha, the narrative occurs in a broader connexion. Moreover, we must also, as I have said, read, with the foregoing, D. xvi. 3, 40 (ii. 115), wherein the Buddha himself reproves Ānanda: Tasmāt ih’ Ānanda tuyh’ ev’ etaṃ dukkaṭaṃ, tuyh’ ev’ etaṃ aparaddhaṃ, yaṃ tvaṃ Tathāgatena evaṃ oḷārike nimitte kayiramāne . . . na Tathāgataṃ yāci . . . Here, then, we find this text ascribing to the Buddha himself those words of upbraiding which find an echo in C.V. xi., and a yet stronger echo in the North-Buddhist report of the Council, which is derived from the C.V. In no case has the compiler of C.V. xi. recorded anything at first hand.*

C.V. xi. 12: Atha kho āyasmā Ānando there bhikkhū etaṃ avoca: bhagavā maṃ bhante parinibbānakāle evam āha: tena h’ Ānanda saṅgho mam’ accayena Channassa bhikkhuno brahmadandaṃ aṇāpetū ’ti. Pucchi pana tvaṃ āvuso Ānanda bhagavantaṃ: katamo pana bhante brahmadandaṃ ’ti. Pucchiṃ kho ’haṃ

* Had Minayeff and Oldenberg adopted a literary, instead of a historical, method, of explanation (*vide* Z.D.M.G., 52, pp. 620 ff.), they would have spared themselves all trouble and difficulty. Oldenberg’s accurate apprehension on p. 621, therefore, does not, unfortunately, fit the case.

bhante bhagavantāṃ: katamo pana bhante brahmadāṇḍo 'ti... Channo Ānanda bhikkhū yaṃ iccheyya taṃ vadeyya, bhikkhūhi Channo bhikkhu n'eva vattabbo na ovaditabbo nānūsāsītabbo 'ti.*

Now the ven. Ānanda said to the Thera Bhikkhus: 'The Blessed One, Sirs, said to me at the time of his Parinirvana: "Let then the Order, Ānanda, when I am passed away, impose the higher penalty on Channa Bhikkhu." 'Didst thou then, friend Ānanda, ask the Blessed One what was that higher penalty?' 'I did, Sirs: "Ānanda, let Channa Bhikkhu say whatever he may wish, but the Bhikkhus shall neither answer him, nor counsel him, nor exhort him." '†

This section and the following account of the Buddha's command being carried out is based on *Dīgha* xvi. 6, 4 (ii. 154)‡: Channassa Ānanda bhikkhuno mam' accayena brahma-daṇḍo kātabbo 'ti.

Katamo pana bhante brahma-daṇḍo 'ti?

Channo Ānanda bhikkhu yaṃ iccheyya taṃ vadeyya, so bhikkhūhi n'eva vattabbo na ovaditabbo na anusāsītabbo 'ti.§

The story of Channa is in a way connected with *Majjhima* xv. (i. 95): Āyasmā Mahāmoggallāno etad avoca: Pavāreti ce pi āvuso bhikkhu: Vadantu maṃ āyasmanto, vacanīyo 'mhi āyasmantehīti, so ca hoti dubbaco dovacassakaraṇehi dhammehi samannāgato akkhamo appadakkhiṇag-gāhī anusāsaniṃ, atha kho naṃ sabrahmacārī na c'eva vattabbaṃ maññanti na ca anusāsītabbaṃ maññanti na ca tasmiṃ puggale vissāsaṃ āpajjitabbaṃ maññanti.

* See also C.V. xi. 15.

† This Channa was a mutinous fellow, very difficult to manage. Cf. C.V. i. 25; iv. 14, 1. *Pācittiya* xii. 1; liv. 1; lxxi. 1. *Saṅghādisesa* xii. 1.

‡ Already pointed out by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (*S.B.E.* xx., p. 381, n. 2).

§ Certain details in the carrying out may be related to previous passages in the *Cullavagga*. More on this later.

The foregoing are the passages in C.V. xi. more obviously inspired by the Mahā-Parinibbāna-suttanta, and which, in consequence, have long ago been indicated (as stated in my footnotes). Now in my judgment there are certain others to be pointed out, which are of at least no smaller significance.

II.-III. PASSAGES NOT YET COMPARED IN DĪGHA-NIKĀYA XVI.
AND CULLAVAGGA XI., XII.

II. THE APPELLATIONS ĀVUSO AND BHANTE.

The first passage which I shall produce, and which, so far as I can see, has hitherto passed unnoticed in this connexion, does not properly belong to this chapter, but to the next. I bring it forward here, however, because it is useful to the present argument.

In C.V. xi. 2, the bhikkhus, in deciding who is to be chosen as the last of the 500 representatives to hold the Council, say to Mahā Kassapa: 'Ayaṇ bhante āyasmā Ānando kiñcāpi sekho, abhabbo,' etc. 'Lord, this ven. Ānanda, although he have not yet attained [to Arahatsip], yet is he incapable of falling into error. . . .' In § 6 Ānanda himself says: 'Sve sannipāto, na kho me taṇ paṭirūpaṇ yo' haṇ sekho samāno sannipātaṇ gaccheyyan 'ti.

'To-morrow is the assembly. Now it beseems me not to go into the assembly while I am still only on the way (towards Arahatsip).'

In the night he is set free from earthly weaknesses: Etasmiṇ antare anupādāya āsavehi cittaṇ vimucci. The original passage which reverberates here is Dīgha xvi. 5, 13, and 14 (ii. 143, 144). Ānanda is here lamenting over the Buddha's announcement of his impending death: 'Ahaṇ ca vat' amhi sekho sakaraṇiyo, Satthu ca me parinibbānaṇ bhavissati. . . .' 'Alas! I remain still but a learner; one who has yet to work out his own perfection. And the Master is about to pass away from me. . . .' The Buddha then speaks

words of consolation to him, ending with: *khippaṃ hohisi anāsavo*—‘quickly shalt thou be free from earthly weaknesses.’

Ānanda’s immaturity in sainthood is shown, in C.V. xi., xii., to have induced another very interesting result, which, among others, we will now consider.

In *Dīgha* xvi. 6, 2 (ii. 154), the Buddha decides as follows: *Yathā kho paṇ’ Ānanda etarahi bhikkhū aññamaññaṃ āvuso-vādena samudācaranti, na vo mam’ accayena evaṃ samudācaritabbaṃ. Theratarena Ānanda bhikkhunā navakataro bhikkhu nāmena vā gottena vā āvuso-vādena vā samudācaritabbo, navakatarena bhikkhunā therataro bhikkhu bhante ti vā āyasmā ti vā samudācaritabbo.*

Ānanda! when I am gone address not one another in the way in which the brethren have heretofore addressed each other—with the epithet, that is, of (*āvuso*) ‘friend.’ A younger brother may be addressed by a senior superior brother by his name, or by his family name, or by the title ‘friend.’* But an elder brother should be addressed by a younger brother as ‘lord’ or as ‘venerable sir.’

With this somewhat surprising injunction from the lips of the dying Buddha compare the preceding section (xvi. 6, 1): ‘It may be, Ānanda, that in some of you the thought may arise, “The word (*pāvacaṇaṃ*) has lost its Teacher; we have no more a Teacher!” But it is not thus, Ānanda, that you should regard it. The truths and the rules of the Order which I have set forth and laid down for you all, let them, after I am gone, be the Teacher to you.’ The connecting-link between this and the passage previously quoted is the idea of authority,

* That by the title ‘Thera’ (elder) more was conveyed than mere seniority in years, see A. ii. 22, iii. 195, according to which one of the characters of a Thera is that he *āsavānaṃ khayā anāsavaṃ cetovimuttiṃ . . . upasampajja viharati*. In C.V. ix. 3, 1, the Theras are called *paracittaviduno*—‘knowers of the thoughts of others.’ This may not mean for us what it did then, but it shows sufficiently that Thera was not simply ‘elder.’

and this gives consecutiveness to the two paragraphs. A certain guarantee for the genuineness of the former (not, of course, as a logion of the Buddha, but as an integral part of the Suttanta) is conferred by the inner agreement in this pronouncement (D. xvi. 1, 6): Yāvākīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū ye te bhikkhū therā rattaññū cirapabbajitā saṅgha-pitaro saṅgha-parināyakā te sakkarissanti garukarissanti mānessanti pūjessanti tesañ ca sotabbaya maññissanti, vuddhi yeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnaṃ pāṭikaṅkhā no parihāni.

‘So long, O bhikkhus, as the brethren honour and esteem and revere and support the elders of experience and long standing, the fathers and leaders of the Order, and hold it a point of duty to hearken to their words, so long may the brethren be expected, not to decline, but to prosper.’

What is to be said as to the justification and the consequences of that utterance ascribed to the dying Buddha regarding forms of mutual address? Did the usage indeed prevail for the brethren to address each other indiscriminately as āvuso? Do we find in C.V. xi., xii., where we naturally look first to watch the effect of the Buddha’s depositions, that that usage was replaced by a more conventional observance?

We can reply ‘Yes’ to both questions.

As to the former question, the inquiry most obviously suggesting itself on reading the injunction only is: Was there any such indiscriminate use of āvuso as a vocative during the Buddha’s lifetime? But this cannot well be put. Our knowledge of the age and the genuineness of the different Buddhist documents is only at its rudimentary stage. It is given as yet to no mortal man to demonstrate that any one Buddhist sentence was spoken during the lifetime of the Founder. All that we can, therefore, decide on is the reply to a question framed thus: ‘Does the Canon supply instances where on any one occasion the bhikkhus addressed each other, irrespective of age or dignity, as āvuso?’ And we shall naturally consult for instances

those prose books, which in all probability are the oldest. But one thing must be noted. The more formal, hierarchical term, *bhante*, was not initiated in connexion with the Buddha's decree. It was already current, side by side with *āvuso*, when the oldest Pali literature was compiled, and was the mode in which highly respected men, both religious and sometimes lay, were addressed. The Buddha is always addressed by disciples and by the believing laity as *bhante*.* Sakka, even, and Māra, as well as a Yakkha and a Gandhabba, follow their example on certain occasions. Any Buddhist bhikkhu is also so addressed by the believing laity, and even by a god (D. xxiii. 33 [ii. 356]). Even were we able to distinguish, with apodeictic certainty, between the oldest and the youngest texts, we should feel no surprise at finding one bhikkhu addressing a superior bhikkhu as '*bhante*,' from the very natural desire of airing his sincerely deep respect; how much less should it surprise us in any text which we have good ground for believing to be younger than the Mahā Parinibbāna-suttanta, as, *e.g.*, the Saṅyutta-Nikāya.

Notwithstanding such possible cases, the results of trying to establish anything respecting the use of *āvuso* are satisfactory and positive. In the Dīgha, no doubt, the speaker is nearly always the Buddha, and such instances as we seek are hence not numerous. (I speak only of the first two volumes, which I have searched carefully.) Where bhikkhus of equal standing converse together—to mention briefly at the outset this somewhat self-evident fact—the invariable mode of address in the Dīgha and other ancient works is *āvuso*.† Those bhikkhus are always treated as equals who are referred to, without naming or other charac-

* The adherents of other religious orders—*e.g.*, the Paribbājikas—permit themselves now and again to address the Buddha and his bhikkhus as *āvuso*. The Brahmins are still less ceremonious.

† Cases where a bhikkhu of higher standing addresses one of lower degree as *āvuso*, as in D. xvi. 5, 13 (vol. ii. 143), when Ānanda addresses an ordinary brother, need not be exemplified, since in such relations the Buddha introduced no innovation.

terization, as 'bhikkhus' (mendicants). The few instances of this otherwise abundant use of āvuso occurring in the two first volumes of the Dīgha are as follows (i. 1, 3 [i. 2]): Atha kho sambahulānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ . . . ayaṃ sankhiyā-dhammo udapādi: Acchariyaṃ āvuso abbhutaṃ āvuso. . . . xiv. 1, 13 (ii. 8): Atha kho tesāṃ bhikkhūnaṃ acirapakkantassa Bhagavato ayaṃ antarākathā udapādi: Acchariyaṃ āvuso abbhutaṃ āvuso. . . .^{*} With these we may compare, e.g., Anguttara x. 115, 2 (v. 225): Atha kho tesāṃ bhikkhūnaṃ acirapakkantassa Bhagavato etad ahoṣi: Idaṃ kho no āvuso Bhagavā . . . vihāraṃ pavitṭho. . . . Further citations are superfluous.

The Vinaya Piṭaka also affords innumerable instances—e.g., M.V. ii. 12, 3: . . . bhikkhū duccolā honti lūkhacivarā. Bhikkhū evaṃ āhaṃsu: kissa tumhe āvuso duccolā lūkhacivarā ti? etc. And among the many examples in the C.V. take i. 6, 1: Atha kho sangho Paṇḍukalohitakānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ tajjaniyakammaṃ akāsi. te . . . bhikkhū upasaṃkamitvā evaṃ vadenti: mayaṃ āvuso sanghena tajjaniyakammakatā sammāvattāma . . . iv. 14, 18: tehi . . . bhikkhūhi taṃ āvasaṃ gantvā āvāsikā bhikkhū evam assu vacanīyā: idaṃ kho āvuso adhikaraṇaṃ evaṃ jātaṃ. . . . v. 2, 4: tena kho pana samayena aññatarassa bhikkhuno mukhe vaṇo hoti. so bhikkhū pucchi: kīdiso me āvuso vaṇo 'ti. bhikkhū evam āhaṃsu: idiso te āvuso vaṇo 'ti. vi. 3, 4: bhikkhū upadhāvitvā taṃ bhikkhuṃ etad avocuṃ: kissa tvaṃ āvuso vissaram akāsīti.

But a quite peculiar interest attaches to those properly evidential passages, in which a bhikkhu of lower standing addresses a brother possessing notoriously greater prestige than himself (theratara), and they must, therefore, be

* In xv. 28, 30, and 31 (vol. ii. 66, 67) the phraseology is too general to determine whether a bhikkhu only or a layman also may be included under āvuso.

treated of more in detail. The texts allow us in many ways to infer whenever they deem any bhikkhu especially worthy. They give, for instance, repeatedly a list of notable 'thera's.' In C.V. i. 18, 1: Tena kho pana samayena sambahulā therā bhikkhū āyasmā ca Sāriputto āyasmā ca Mahāmoggallāno āyasmā ca Mahākaccāno āyasmā ca Mahākoṭṭhito āyasmā ca Mahākappino āyasmā ca Mahācundo āyasmā ca Anuruddho āyasmā ca Revato āyasmā ca Upāli āyasmā ca Ānando āyasmā ca Rāhulo. . . .

Again, in M. 92 (i. 212): Ekaṃ samayaṃ Bhagavā Gosīṅgasālavanadāye viharati sambahulehi abhiññātehi abhiññātehi therehi sāvakehi saddhiṃ, āyasmatā ca Sāriputtena āyasmatā ca Mahāmoggallānena āyasmatā ca Mahākassapena āyasmatā ca Anuruddhena āyasmatā ca Revatena āyasmatā ca Ānandena. . . .

M. 118 (iii. 78) gives the same list, but inserts between Mahākassapa and Anuruddha āyasmatā ca Mahākaccāyanena āyasmatā ca Mahākoṭṭhitena āyasmatā ca Mahākappinena āyasmatā ca Mahācundena.

A. ii. 17, 2 (iii. 299), has: Kahan nu kho bhikkhave Sāriputto, kahaṃ Mahāmoggallāno, kahaṃ Mahākassapo, kahaṃ Mahākaccāno, kahaṃ Mahākoṭṭhito, kahaṃ Mahācundo, kahaṃ Mahākappino, kahaṃ Anuruddho, kahaṃ Revato, kahaṃ Ānando, kahan nu kho te bhikkhave therā sāvakā gatā ti? Compare also with these Udāna i. 5.

The last place I give to M.V. x. 5, 3, and 6, because the appellation of thera is omitted: 3. Assosi kho āyasmā Sāriputto. . . . 6. Assosi kho āyasmā Mahāmoggallāno . . . Mahākassapo . . . Mahākaccāno . . . Mahākoṭṭhito . . . Mahākappino . . . Mahācundo . . . Anuruddho . . . Revato . . . Upāli . . . Ānando . . . Rāhulo. . . . Ānanda is ranked in the

list of Sākya nobles who had renounced the world, C.V. vii. 1, 4, after Anuruddha, and is also so placed in the scale of religious graduates, inasmuch as Anuruddha, immediately after entering the Order, won the 'heavenly eye,' while Ānanda won only the 'fruit of conversion.'

This list of Theras has a significance also for the modes of address in C.V. xi. xii. Just here I will only bring forward this much: Ānanda, although he plays a great part in the life-history of the Buddha, and in the canonical literature, remains at the bottom of the list, Mahā-Kassapa among the first. And we learn, from detached passages, that this estimate of, and by, himself found general acceptance. Take, *e.g.*, S. xvi. 11, 7, and 8 (ii. 218). In § 7 Mahā-Kassapa rebukes Ānanda for consorting so much with novices (*navehi bhikkhūhi*),* and concludes his admonition with the words: 'This youth does not know his place'—*navāyaṇ kumāro mattam aññāsi*. In § 8 Ānanda replies: 'There are grey hairs on my head, and still I am exposed to being called "youth" by the venerable Mahā-Kassapa!†

Again, in M.V. i. 74, 1: *Tena kho pana samayena āyasmato Mahākassapassa upasampadāpekkho hoti. Atha kho āyasmā Mahākassapo āyasmato Ānandassa santike dūtaṇ pāhesi: āgacchatu Ānando imaṇ anussāvessatīti. Āyasmā Ānando evaṇ āha: nāhaṇ ussahāmi therassa nāmaṇ gaheṭuṇ garu me thero ti.*

At that time some one requested to be ordained at the hand of Mahākassapa. Then the ven. M. Kassapa sent a messenger to the ven. Ānanda, saying: 'Ānanda is to come and declare this (person to be a bhikkhu).' The ven. Ānanda replied: 'I should not dare to make

* *Cf.* S. xvi. 11, 3 (vol. ii. 217): *Tena kho pana samayena āyasmato Ānandassa tiṇsamattā saddhivihārino . . . yebhuyyena kumārabhūtā.*

† In S. xxii. 83, 3 (vol. iii. 105), however, Ānanda counts himself among the novices: *Āyasmā Ānando etad avoca: Puṇṇo nāma āvuso āyasmā Mantāniputto amhākaṇ navakānaṇ sataṇ bahūpakāro hoti.*

use of the Thera's name.* I have too high a respect for the Thera.' (This, be it said in passing, comes very nearly into our forthcoming discussion, in chap. v., on C.V. xi. and xii., but this, in the M.V., need not seem strange.)

To the best of my belief, therefore, the two extremes of the quoted list of Theras, naming Mahā-Kassapa and Ānanda respectively, represent the greatest difference in importance and estimation of the Theras in that list. Imagine a Thera at the head of the list,† perhaps the admired Great Kassapa himself, conversing with another figuring at the bottom of it, perhaps with the modest Ānanda, or even with a bhikkhu who was not a Thera. Now, if any such latter interlocutor could call any of the former interlocutors āvuso (friend), then we have the best proof which the literary documents available can afford, that, during a certain period, and previous to an impending change, the usage indicated by the Buddha in D. xvi. 6, 2, was actually current. That change we shall presently discuss.

In D. xvi. 5, 13 (ii. 143), an anonymous bhikkhu dispatched to Ānanda, addresses that Thera as āvuso: Atha kho Bhagavā aññatarañ bhikkhuñ āmantesi: 'Ehi tvañ bhikkhu, mama vacanena Ānandam āmantehi: "Satthā tañ āvuso Ānanda āmantetīti." 'Evañ bhante' ti kho so bhikkhu Bhagavato paṭissutvā yen' āyasmā Ānando ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā āyasmantañ Ānandañ etad avoca: 'Satthā tañ āvuso Ānanda āmantetīti.'

From D. xvi. 5, 23 ff (ii. 148 ff), we learn that, shortly before the Buddha's death, a wandering recluse named Subhadda‡ was by the Master admitted into the Order. In xvi. 5, 29 (ii. 152), the Exalted One commissions Ānanda

* For the procedure held requisite at such a declaration, cf. M.V. i. 76, 8, and 11.

† To realize the pre-eminence of such a Thera—*e.g.*, of Sāriputta—cf. M. (xxiv.) i. 150.

‡ Not to be confounded with the Subhadda whom we have to discuss later, and who, as we have seen, was travelling with M. Kassapa (D. xvi. 6, 20).

as follows: 'Tena h'Ānanda Subhaddaṃ pabbā-jethāti.' 'Evaṃ bhante' ti kho āyasmā Ānando Bhagavato paccassosi.

30. Atha kho Subhaddo paribbājako āyasmantaṃ Ānandaṃ etaḍ avoca: 'Lābhā vo āvuso Ananda, suladdhaṃ vo āvuso Ānanda. . . .' There can be no question as to the difference in position between these two at the time, and yet Subhadda addresses Ānanda confidentially as āvuso. However, it is possible that Subhadda was on that occasion, prior to his ordination, merely using the familiar address in vogue among the Paribbājaka's.

In D. xvi. 6, 20 (ii. 162) we hear the other Subhadda speaking to the brethren attending the great Kassapa, and to the latter. This Subhadda was also a new recruit, since he is described as having left the world in his old age (buddhapabbajito).'* Even if his speech was not intended to include the apostle, there must have been among the 500 several of senior standing to himself. And yet he calls them all simply āvuso: 'Araṇ āvuso mā socittha. . . .'

It is in this very Suttanta itself that the important change in address takes place just after the Buddha's decease. Of this later. I will first give other examples of āvuso from other older Nikāya texts.

In M. xv. (i. 95) the bhikkhus call Mahā-Moggallāna āvuso, even though he was one of the first of the Buddha's disciples: 'Āvuso ti kho te bhikkhū āyasmato Mahāmoggallānassa paccassosun.' So in M. xviii. (i. 110), the bhikkhus address Mahākaccāna: 'Ekamantaṃ nisinnā kho te bhikkhū āyasmantaṃ Mahākaccānaṃ etaḍ avocun: 'Idaṃ kho no āvuso Kaccāna Bhagavā sankhittena uddesaṃ uddisitvā . . . vihāraṃ pavitṭho, etc. In M. xxviii. (i. p. 184)

* It is conceivable that, in some more original form of traditional narrative, the two Subhaddas were one and the same. That two of the same name should have entered the Order so nearly at the same time is a little curious; but the matter is not worth discussing.

the bhikkhus address Sāriputta: *Āvuso ti kho te bhikkhū āyasmato Sāriputtassa paccassosun.*

In M. xxxii. (i. 212) the two senior Theras, M. Moggallāna and M. Kassapa, address each other as *āvuso*: ‘*Āyām’ āvuso Kassapa . . . Evaṃ āvuso ti . . .*’ So also, in the same words, do Revata and Ānanda. Again, on p. 213, Ānanda, whose rank we have seen, addresses in the same way the leading Thera Sāriputta: ‘*Evarūpena kho āvuso Sāriputta bhikkhunā Gosingasālavanaṃ sobheyya.*’

In Ang. iv. 174, 4 (ii. 161), Ānanda to Mahakoṭṭhito: ‘*Channaṃ āvuso phassāyatanānaṃ asesavirāganirodhā atth’ aññaṃ kiñcīti.*’

In Ang. iv. 179 (ii. 167), Ānanda to Sāriputta: ‘*Ko nu kho āvuso Sāriputta hetu . . .*’ and v. 169, 2 (iii. 201): ‘*Kittāvatā nu kho āvuso Sāriputta bhikkhu . . .*’ and also vi. 51 (iii. 361). In Ang. ix. 11, 2 (iv. 374), an anonymous bhikkhu to Sāriputta: ‘*Satthā taṃ āvuso Sāriputta āmanteti.*’ In A. x. 86, 1 (v. 162), the bhikkhus to M. Kassapa: ‘*Āvuso ti kho te bhikkhū āyasmato M. Kassapassa paccassosun.*’ So in A. iv. 170 (ii. 156) the bhikkhus to Ānanda; also in S. xxi. 2 (ii. 274) the bhikkhus to Sāriputta, and (§ 4 *ibid.*) Ānanda to Sāriputta: ‘*Satthu pi te āvuso Sāriputta . . .*’ So again in xxviii. 1, 6 (iii. 235), Ānanda to Sāriputta: ‘*Vipprasannāni kho te āvuso Sāriputta indriyāni . . .*’ and again in lv. 4 and 13 (v. 346, 362).

Again in Udāna iii. 3, a company of bhikkhus address Yasoja their leader as *āvuso*: ‘*Evaṃ āvuso ti kho bhikkhū āyasmato paccassosun*’ (p. 25).

I will pass over the many other instances that might be quoted, and bring forward only one more. A fortunate accident has reserved it for us, as if to make the antithesis in C.V. xi. all the more tangible. In S. xxii. 90, 8, and 18 (iii. 133, 135), Channa, too, addresses Ānanda with the familiar *āvuso*: 8. *Ekam antaṃ nisinno kho āyasmā Channo āyasmantam Ānandam etad*

avoca: Ekam idāhaṇ āvuso Ānanda samayaṇ Bārāṇasiyaṇ viharāmi. 18. Evam etaṇ āvuso Ānanda hoti. And in M. iii. 264=S. xxxv. 87 (iv. 56), Channa addresses the greater apostle, Sāriputta himself, in the same way: 'Na me āvuso Sāriputta khamaṇiyaṇ. . . .'

The Vinaya-Piṭaka offers also equivalent examples;* and this, as we should expect, since the greater part of it deals with the lifetime of the Buddha. In M.V. ii. 12, 1: Bhikkhū āyasmantaṇ Mahākassapaṇ etad avocaṇ: kissa te āvuso cīvarāni allānīti. In C.V. iv. 4, 5: Te (*i.e.*, Mettiyabhummajakā bhikkhū) pacchābhattaṇ piṇḍapātapaṭikkantā there bhikkhū pucchanti: tumhākaṇ āvuso bhattagge kiṇ ahoṣi. . . . In C.V. v. 8, 1: Atha kho āyasmā Piṇḍolabhāradvājo āyasmantaṇ Mahāmoggallaṇaṇ etad avoca: . . . gacchāvuso Moggallāna. . . . In C.V. vii. 3, 10: Evaṇ āvuso 'ti kho te bhikkhū āyasmato Ānandassa paṭissutvā. . . . In C.V. vii. 4, 2, Devadatta addresses Sāriputta as āvuso, but this instance cannot be relied on, as Devadatta had left the Order, and would consequently be at no pains to follow its usages.

The point, then, is well established, and in the older Nikāyas I have found no contradictory instance. Superficially considered, D. vi. 4 (i. 151) might seem to form one: Atha kho Sīho samaṇuddeso yen' āyasmā Nāgito ten' upasankami, upasankamitvā āyasmantaṇ Nāgitaṇ abhivādetvā ekamantaṇ aṭṭhāsi. Ekamantaṇ ṭhito kho Sīho samaṇuddeso āyasmantaṇ Nāgitaṇ etad avoca: 'Ete bhante Kassapa sambahulā . . . brāhmaṇa-dūtā . . . idh' upasankantā. . . . A samaṇuddesa is not yet a bhikkhū, but is a candidate for the position (see Childers's Dicty., *s. v.* uddeso; S.B.E. xiii. 48, *n.* 4; S.B.B. ii. 198). Hence he ranks very near to the pious laity. The

* Together with discrepant instances, which will be explained later.

respectful term *bhante*, used invariably by the latter, is, therefore, quite fitting on his tongue. In the next section *Siha* conveys the same announcement to the Buddha, and in that case, of course, cannot but use the same appellative *bhante*. It may be that the message as delivered to *Nāgita-Kassapa* is a mere duplication of the announcement to the Buddha, or has been assimilated to it in the course of handing down the narrative.

There is a quite analogous case of a *samaṇuddesa* using *bhante* in addressing a Thera in S. xlvii. 13 (v. 161):
2. Tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Sāriputto Magadhesu viharati Nālagāmake ābādhi-ko dukkhito bāḥagilāno, Cundo ca samaṇuddeso āyasmato Sāriputtassa upaṭṭhāko hoti.
3. Atha āyasmā Sāriputto tena ābādheṇa parinibbāyi.
4. Atha kho Cundo samaṇuddeso . . . yenāyasmā Ānando tenupasankami, upasankamitvā . . . āyasmantaṃ Ānandaṃ etad avoca: Āyasmā bhante Sāriputto parinibbuto. . . .

Worthy of special notice, on the other hand, is S. xvi. 10, 2 *f.*, and 11, 4 *ff.* (ii. 214 *ff.*, 217 *ff.*). In both passages *Ānanda* addresses *Mahā-Kassapa* as *bhante*, which is in harmony with the Buddha's injunction: Atha kho āyasmā Ānando . . . yenāyasmā Mahākassapo tenupasankami. 3. Upasankamitvā āyasmantaṃ Mahākassapaṃ etad avoca: Āyāma bhante Kassapa . . . xvi. 11, 6: Tayo kho bhante Kassapa atthavase paṭicca Bhagavatā kulesu tikabhōjanam paññattaṃ. As, however, the *Saṃyutta-nikāya* unquestionably uses portions of the *Dīgha-nikāya*, and in particular the *M. Parinibbāna-Suttanta*, it is really a much more impressive fact that it should not more thoroughly adapt itself to the arrangements made by the Buddha, but should contain so much important evidence for the previously current usage of *āvuso*.

The case of the *Vinaya-piṭaka* is quite similar. As it is a later compilation than the *M. Parinibbāna-Suttanta* (v. below, ch. v.), but at the same time purports to be a

testimony of the Buddha's lifetime, we find, as we should expect, instances both of the older form of address and also of the newer. And to the thoroughgoing adoption of the latter, it devotes two entire chapters. I have given instances of the older form. Among those of the newer, take the following:

Both forms of address occur in accordance with the prescribed usage in M.V. ii. 17, 3: *Tena kho pana samayena aññatarasmiṃ āvāse . . . sambahulā bhikkhū viharanti bālā avyattā. . . . Te therayaṃ ajjhesiṃsu: 'Uddisatu bhante thero pātimokkhan ti.'* So evayaṃ āha: *'Na me āvuso vattatīti.'* But the change of situation brings about, naturally enough, a change of social tone. These same bhikkhus no longer call any of their number down to the youngest novice as *bhante*, *āyasmā*, or indeed by any title at all. The novice, on the other hand, uses the term *bhante* to those held more worthy than he: *Eten' eva upāyena yāva Saṅghana vakaṃ ajjhesanti: 'Uddisatu āyasmā* Pātimokkhan ti.'* So pi evayaṃ vadeti: *'Na me bhante vattatīti.'*

In the concluding paragraphs of this section of the M.V. *āvuso* appears again, this time correctly applied, either to bhikkhus 'of equal or junior rank,' or, since this instance is of the Buddha's own words, as the general usage permitted during his lifetime: *'Tehi bhikkhave bhikkhūhi eko bhikkhu sāmantā āvāsā sajjukaṃ pāhetabbo "Gacchāvuso. . . ."'*†

Equally instructive, and precisely in accordance with the injunction, is the etiquette of address in M.V. ii. 26, 6: *Evañ ca pana bhikkhave kātabbo: therena bhikkhunā ekaṃsaṃ uttarāsaṅgaṃ karitvā ukkuṭikaṃ nisīditvā añjaliṃ paggahevā navo bhik-*

* This is not the 'Venerable Sir' prescribed by the Buddha along with 'bhante' as a title (D. xvi. 6, 2), but is the bhikkhu's usual prefix used in the third person. More hereon at the end of this chapter.

† In view of the passage (M.V. ii. 26, 6), this second eventuality is improbable.

khu evam assa vacanīyo: parisuddho ahaṇ āvuso . . . Z. Navakena bhikkhunā ekaṇsaṇ uttarāsaṅgaṇ karitvā . . . thero bhikkhu evam assa vacanīyo: parisuddho ahaṇ bhante.

In M.V. iv. 1, 14, an ordinary bhikkhu, though he is learned and competent (*vyatto paṭibalo*), uses in addressing the brethren, among whom, as it appears, is a Thera, the word *bhante*. The Thera follows, using in his speech to the brethren the word *āvuso*. Lastly, a novice under the same conditions uses *bhante*. The same etiquette is observed in iv. 5, 3-6; viii. 24, 5 and 6. Again, in M.V. viii. 31, 1, the Theras Sāriputta and Revata (who ranks under the former in the list given above, p. 23) and an ordinary bhikkhu conform throughout to the prescribed forms. Revata calls Sāriputta *bhante*; the bhikkhu, *āvuso*. Sāriputta calls Revata *āvuso*. The bhikkhu calls Revata *bhante*.

Let us turn to C.V. iv. 14, 25: *Atha kho te bhikkhū taṇ āvāsaṇ gantvā te there etad avocaṇ: idaṇ bhante adhikaraṇaṇ evaṇ jātaṇ*. In vi. 14, 31, *sambahulā bhikkhū* are addressed as *bhante*, because there are *vuddhā bhikkhū* among them: *No ce labhetha tena bhikkhave bhikkhunā sambahule bhikkhū upasankamitvā ekaṇsaṇ uttarāsaṅgaṇ karitvā vuddhānaṇ bhikkhūnaṇ pāde vanditvā ukkuṭikaṇ nisīditvā añjaliṇ paggahetvā evam assu vacanīyā: ahaṇ bhante itthannāmaṇ āpattiṇ āpanno taṇ paṭidesemīti*.

An instance of the newer use of *bhante* in bhikkhus addressing a Thera occurs in *Pārājika i. 7* (*Vin. iii. 23*): *Tena kho pana samayena sambahulā Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū yāvadatthaṇ bhuñjiṇsu yāvadatthaṇ supiṇsu. . . Te aparena samayena . . . āyasmantaṇ Ānandaṇ upasaṅkamitvā evaṇ vadenti: na mayaṇ bhante Ānanda buddhagarahino. . .* Other internal evidence leads us to suspect that this passage is derived from the *M. Parinibbāna-S.*, to which we shall return (ch. v.). Compare

also in Nissaggiya xxii. 1 (Vin. iii. 247): *Thero vat-tabbo: 'Gaṇhātu bhante thero pattan ti.'*

With regard to the presumptive presence, in any conference, of elder, eminent bhikkhus, we find the Order, on the occasion of any motion, being addressed as *bhante*. It is only addressed as *āvuso* when the mover is himself the one held most worthy, or a bhikkhu of equal standing to any present. This is exemplified in the instance just given from M.V. iv. 1, 14.

Let us now, before going further, resume our results. In the older canonical texts there appears a certain customary mode of address, different from that prescribed for the future by the Buddha. Exceptions occur, referring distinctly to a later period, and sufficiently intelligible as due to the influence of the new tendency. Whether, however, this be so or not, in no matter how many exceptions, the fact remains that, in the literature referred to, there is an overwhelming number of instances which do not harmonize with the Buddha's injunction, but follow that older mode of address which he suspended, showing that it was still in vogue. Now, suppose that we suddenly meet, in the Canon, with instances where the new mode is both used, and used not casually, but with conscientious persistence (such treatment being alone sound evidence), we may here conclude with certainty that the compiler chose his words with conscious intention, and in conscious dependence upon that injunction of the Buddha—that is to say, in dependence not on the spoken injunction itself, but upon the literary record of it. For if the guiding influence had been the expression of the Buddha's will, and not the literary vehicle of it in the M. Parinibbāna-S., it would be quite inexplicable why that influence should show itself so unequally, in such passages on the one hand, and in the passages quoted from the Sutta-piṭaka on the other—passages which unquestionably originated after the M.P.S. The only possible conclusion is, first, that the compiler of the passages consistent with the injunction must have been influenced by the record of the same; secondly, that the

Sutta-Piṭaka compilers either deliberately ignored that record,* or overlooked it, or were ignorant of it, the newer custom resulting from it occasionally influencing them against their will.

The opposite result—consistent obedience to the new rule—may be traced with absolute precision from its inception. We can lay our finger on the very passage. (I do not yet refer to the C.V. passages showing it, with which we shall be chiefly concerned.) And that it occurs just where, in the available documents, it could only occur, points to the accuracy of my observation. We shall naturally look for the passage in the M. Parinibbāna-S. itself immediately after the account of the death of the Master. And there we find it, in D. xvi. 6, 8 (ii. 156): Atha kho Bhagavā . . . nevasaññā - nāsaññāyatana - samāpattiyā vuṭṭhahitvā saññāvedayitanirodhaṃ samāpajji. Atha kho āyasmā Ānando āyasmantaṃ Anuruddhaṃ etad avoca: 'Parinibbuto bhante Anuruddha Bhagavā' ti. 'Na āvuso Ānanda Bhagavā parinibbuto, saññāvedayitanirodhaṃ samāpanno' ti. The Buddha is not yet actually dead, but Ānanda believes he is, and forthwith carries his will into execution by calling Anuruddha, the 'Theratarā,' bhante. If the list of Theras given above, giving the relative position of these two, be consulted, it will be seen that Ānanda was bound to use the form he did use. And Anuruddha's āvuso is equally correct.

In xvi. 6, 9, the moment of death actually supervenes: Catutthajjhānā vuṭṭhahitvā samanantarā Bhagavā parinibbāyi. Thereupon (6, 11) Anuruddha begins: Atha kho āyasmā Anuruddho bhikkhū āmantesi: 'Alaṃ āvuso mā socittha. . . .' And the bhikkhus reply: 'Kathaṃ bhūtā pana bhante āyasmā Anuruddho devatā manasikarotīti? Anuruddha in replying addresses himself to Ānanda, saying: 'Sant' āvuso Ānanda devatā. . . .' In § 12

* Because they narrate chiefly events as happening in the Buddha's lifetime.

Anuruddha calls on Ānanda: 'Gacch' āvuso Ānanda . . .' Ānanda replies: 'Evaṃ bhante.'

In 6, 20, as has been noticed, the old, but junior bhikkhu Subhadda addresses M. Kassapa's disciples, the leader being with them, as āvuso. But then they were on tour, and had not heard of the Buddha's death.

We see that all is in perfect order—that the change in the use of āvuso, with bhante, was precisely in accordance with the Buddha's injunction.

There is in C.V. xi. and xii. an account of certain events after the Buddha's death. We shall see whether this, too, harmonizes with the Master's injunction or not. I will sketch the contents of both chapters, pointing out as we go any changes in the use of the two forms of address.

C.V. xi. 1: The first two sections, as I have said, are on the whole derived from D. xvi. 6, 19, and 20 (ii. 162), and are to that extent irrelevant. Both use āvuso in the older way. But the compiler has, after his own fashion, put a few āvuso, not in the original, into the mouth of M. Kassapa, who is addressing the bhikkhus as their head, so as to adapt the passage more plausibly.

In the third section M. Kassapa continues in an un-derived passage: 'Handa mayaṃ āvuso dhammañ ca vinayañ ca sangāyāma.'* After Śāriputta and Moggallāna were dead (cf. S. xlvii. 13, 14 [v. 161, 163])—*N.B.*, when they really were dead (cf. in Introduction, p. 3)—M. Kassapa, by our list of Theras, became the highest Thera, which explains his taking the lead after the Buddha's death, and perhaps the respectful attitude of Ānanda in S. xvi. 10, 3. He was 'Therātara,' senior to all other bhikkhus, and hence it was in accordance with the injunction of D. xvi. 6, 2, that he addressed the general assembly of bhikkhus, and later even the Council of Theras (C.V. xi. 3), as āvuso, and so in all subsequent sections.

* To recite together, to test by reciting. Passages like M.V. v. 13, 9 (=Ud. v. 6) and C.V. v. 3 show that the texts were occasionally recited in chanting.

Even if Sāriputta and Moggallāna were not dead, it is certain they were not present.*

In xi. 2, the assembly reply by calling on him to select those who are to take part in the proposed 'Council,' and repeatedly and correctly address him as bhante: 'Tena hi bhante thero bhikkhū uccinatū ti.' On their motion Ānanda is elected as the 500th (and last) member, although he is yet but a sekho (*v.* above, p. 18). This relative ecclesiastical inferiority of Ānanda, to which the *Dīgha* already alludes, is quite consistently maintained in the passages already cited, where Ānanda occupies a low degree in the hierarchy of the Order. In C.V. xi. this feature is distinctly and deliberately mentioned, as is also the fact that thenceforth the elected 500 are called exclusively 'Theras' (xi. 3, etc.). It follows that Ānanda has to address both M. Kassapa and the rest of the 500 as bhante, which he accordingly does (xi. 8, 9).

In xi. 3 the Conference of Theras proposes to hold the Council at Rājagaha. In 4 M. Kassapa moves this before the Order, and it is passed. He addresses the Order correctly with: 'Suṇātu me āvuso Sangho!'

In xi. 5 the 500 Theras propose among themselves to spend the first month of the rainy season in repair of dilapidations (*khaṇḍaphullaṇ paṭisankharoma*).†

* They would else have certainly been named. M. Kassapa's primacy is undisputed.

† So S.B.E. xx. 373. The *Samantapāsādikā* interprets the phrase as 'repair of monasteries,' and the *Dharmagupta* version speaks of putting in order dwellings and sleeping accommodation. *Cf.* C.V. vi. 5, 2: *navakammiko bhikkhave bhikkhu ussukkaṇ āpajjissati kinti nu kho vihāro khippaṇ pariyosānaṇ gaccheyyā ti, khaṇḍaphullaṇ paṭisankharissati.* 'Bhikkhus, the bhikkhu who is overseer shall zealously exert himself, to the end that the work on the Vihāra may be quickly concluded, and he shall repair dilapidations.' Building operations are again clearly referred to in C. V. vi. 17, 1, where *khaṇḍaphullapaṭisankharaṇa* occurs, and are hinted at in vi. 11, 1: *tena kho pana samayena sattarasavaggiyā bhikkhū aññatarāṇ paccantimaṇ mahāvihāraṇ paṭisankharonti idha mayaṇ vassaṇ vasissāmā 'ti.* '... a company of seventeen bhikkhus made ready a large Vihāra ... with the intention of dwelling in it. ...'

As equals, where no distinction by way of name or otherwise is made, they call each other naturally *āvuso*.

6. Ānanda at length attains to spiritual maturity, and becomes an Arahāt: *anupādāya āsavehi cittaṃ vimucci*.

7. M. Kassapa moves that a certain distribution arrangement be made in the revision of the Vinaya. Should he go through the registered contents of the Vinaya with Upāli by way of catechizing him? Upāli also moves that he be allowed to be questioned. The forms of address are again in order; M. Kassapa says, 'Suṇātu me āvuso Sangho!' Upāli, 'Suṇātu me bhante Sangho!' In the Therapist Upāli ranks among the lowest. Either, then, he has many superiors among the 500, or in any case there is the primate M. Kassapa. The revision then proceeds as proposed and sanctioned, Kassapa saying *āvuso* and Upāli replying *bhante*.

8. Revision of the Dhamma, with Ānanda in place of Upāli, and with the difference in the form of address.

9. Ānanda brings forward the dying Buddha's permission to the Sangha to revoke at will all the lesser and least precepts (*v. above*, p. 12). In correct fashion he calls the Theras *bhante*; they call him *āvuso*. Differences of opinion, as to which precepts are meant, are ended by Kassapa's motion that all precepts should be maintained. To this we shall return in chap. iii. He addresses the Council as before.

10. The Council rebuke Ānanda for various shortcomings, addressing him as *āvuso*, he replying correctly with *bhante*.

11. The ven. Purāṇa, with a following of 500 bhikkhus, returns from a tour in the Southern Hills to Rājagaha, and is invited by the Council to accept the results of their discussions. He approves, nevertheless declares that he will continue to retain in his memory his own recollection of the Buddha's preaching of both Dhamma and Vinaya. Addressed as *āvuso*, and himself so addressing the Council, he is treated as an equal.

12. Ānanda brings forward a dying injunction of the Buddha to impose the ban (*brahmadandaṅ*) on the bhikkhu Channa. The Council commission him to carry out the imposition, and to be accompanied by 500 bhikkhus.* Once more the correct appellations *bhante* and *āvuso*. Ānanda with his following proceeds by water to Kosambī, landing in King Udena's park. Here the ladies of the harem shower gifts of robes upon him, and he pacifies the grudging king by explaining the communistic and economic use to which they are to be put.

15. Channa is put under the ban. Here, then, arises an interesting problem in etiquette for the compiler. Ānanda, the lowest among the Theras, becomes for Channa an important personage! Consequently, the form of address is altered. He calls Channa *āvuso*; the latter calls him *bhante* Ānanda. In S. xxii. 90, 8 (iii. 133), Channa calls him *āvuso*. Eventually Ānanda removes the ban.

C.V. xii. But the problems of etiquette in titles of C.V. xi. are child's play compared with those in xii. It would almost seem as if, in composing chap. xi., the compiler had caught the infection for such puzzles. In xii. he seems to revel in complicated rencontres between persons of different rank. If one only reads the text unsuspectingly, one might break one's head over the bringing hither and thither of so many different bhikkhus. It is only when the reason for it becomes clear that one can afford to enjoy the ingenuity of the construction. The enjoyment is caused, be it said, more by the humour of the procedure than by historical or æsthetic reasons. The contents of C.V. xii. are as follows:

1. 1. One hundred years after the Parinibbāna of the Buddha, the Vajjian Bhikkhus of Vesālī set up a claim for ten indulgences: Salt may be stored in a horn vessel, etc., gold and silver may be received. They forthwith instituted the raising of a fund. The ven. Yasa, then residing at Vesālī, was unable to check them. The bhikkhus offered him a share of the Sabbath collection, with

* With this *cf.* chap. iv.

the words: 'Eso te āvuso Yasa hiraññassa paṭiviso'—'This, friend Yasa, is your share of the money.' He declines, saying: 'N'atthi me āvuso hiraññassa paṭiviso.' This mode of address is correct, Yasa being, as compared with the Vajjians, neither theratara nor navakatara. (So, again, in § 2.)

2. The Vajjiputtakas, addressing each other correctly as āvuso, now bind over Yasa to reconcile himself with the Vesālī laity, to whom, according to them, he has given offence by his opinions.* Yasa claims a companion, according to an enactment of the Buddha.† Āvuso is again used on both sides.

3. Yasa reports the accusation against him to the Vesālīans, and refers to a sermon of the Buddha's forbidding the use of gold and silver to the Order, recorded in A. iv. 50 (ii. 53 ff.). It should be noted that the compiler of C.V. xii., in introducing this quoted sermon, makes Yasa address the laity twice as āvuso: Ekam idaṃ āvuso samayaṃ Bhagavā Sāvatthiyaṃ viharati Jetavane Anāthapiṇḍikassa ārāme. Tatra kho āvuso Bhagavā bhikkhū āmantesi. This had previously been the usual mode of addressing laymen, and in itself, therefore, is not strange. But its adoption in this borrowed text shows what weight the compiler laid upon these matters.

4. Contains another quotation from a sermon = S. xlii. 10 (iv. 325).‡ Here āvuso is continued even in the quoted words: Ekam idaṃ āvuso samayaṃ Bhagavā Rājagahe viharati Veḷuvane Kalandakanivāpe. Tena kho panāvuso samayena. . . .

5. Reference to the Buddha's prohibition of the acceptance of gold and silver (Nissaggiya xviii.; Vin. iii. 236 f.)§

* Cf. C.V. i. 20.

† Cf. C.V. i. 22.

‡ The Mañicūlaka mentioned in it is consequently not a fictitious character, 'un doublet' of Yasa, as de la V. Poussin (*Muséon*, 1905, p. 296) believes.

§ Pointed out by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (S.B.E. xx. 392, n. 2).

6, 7. The friendly reception by the Vesālians is reported by the escort to the Vajji Bhikkhus, who address him as āvuso: 'Khamāpitā āvuso Yasena Kākaṇḍaka-puttena Vesālikā upāsakā ti?' 'Have they forgiven Yasa?' He replies with āvuso: 'Pāpikaṇ no āvuso kataṇ. . . .' 'Evil, friends, hath been wrought against us.' They thereupon resolve to suspend Yasa temporarily (*ukkhepaniyakamma*). Yasa travels through the air to Kosambī, and sends messengers to the bhikkhus of Pāṭheyya, Avanti, and the Southern country to aid him in defending the Dhamma and Vinaya.*

8. He himself visits the ven. Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī on the Ahoganga Hill. It should be remembered that, in M.V. viii. 24, 6, one Sāṇavāsī occurs in a list of Theras. There are other such coincidences in names between C.V. xii. and parts of the Canon purporting to be narratives of the Buddha's own lifetime (*e.g.*, Revata, Sālha). There is, therefore, no doubt that the compiler of C.V. xi., xii., in his choice of names, was at least influenced by canonical names, unless he expressly claims to be treating of some one who was alive in the Buddha's time or in that of his immediate disciples. Such, *e.g.*, is the case with Sabbakāmī (*v. below*).† Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī will certainly have been not only a Thera, since the plural therā bhikkhū, C.V. xii. 1, 9, includes him, but also one having great reputation and authority, else Yasa would have no motive for invoking his aid. We are, therefore, quite prepared to find Yasa calling him bhante: 'Ime bhante Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā. . . .' and 'Handa mayaṇ bhante imaṇ adhikaraṇaṇ ādiyissāma.' 'Come now, lord, let us take in charge

* Cf. S.B.E. xvii. 146 ff. ; also below, § 8.

† According to the Dipavaṅsa version of the second Council (Dīp. iv. 50 f., V. 24), these, as well as the delegates summoned (in C.V. xii. 2, 7), had all personally seen the Buddha. According to the Dulva (Rockhill, 'Life of the Buddha,' p. 176), Sālha was a contemporary of Ānanda. Moreover, according to Dharmagupta, not only Sabbakāmī, but 'Sambuno' (Sambuto?) and Revata had been pupils of Ānanda (Beal, Trans. Fifth Or. Congress, ii. 2, 44). See also de la V Poussin, *Muséon*, 1905, p. 50.

this controversy.' Sambhūta replies, with due heed to their relations: 'Evaṃ āvuso ti. . . .' (So again in § 10.) The two are joined by 148 bhikkhus from the above-named districts,* all of them Arahats, on the Ahoganga Hill.

In 9 all are called Theras: 'Atha kho therānaṃ bhikkhūnaṃ mantayamānānaṃ etad ahosi. . . .' They, including Sambhūta, determine to win over Revata, since his help would be most effective (balavantatarā). He was wise, sagacious, learned, master of both Dhamma and Vinaya, and endowed with transcendent powers. He ranked high as a Thera, therefore, higher even than Sambhūta. He is called Thera in xii. 2, 3; and in 2, 5 he says of himself: 'Api ca mayā cirapattaṃ arahattaṃ.' However, Revata evades their messengers from place to place, till they catch up with him at Sahajāti. Possibly this causing himself to be much looked for is a mode of emphasizing his great pre-eminence; but an alternate explanation is given in Chap. III.

10. Sambhūta Sānavāsī commissions Yasa, calling him āvuso, to visit Revata, and consult him about the indulgences. Yasa addresses Sambhūta, and then Revata correctly as bhante: 'Kappati bhante singiloṇakappo?' (*cf.* xii. 2, 3). Revata knows nothing about the ten, nor even what is meant by the name given in each case: 'Ko so āvuso singiloṇakappo ti?' etc. The two forms of address are maintained.

2. 1. The Vajji bhikkhus also make overtures to Revata, further showing how highly the compiler thought of him. They set out with offerings.

2. One of them (*cf.* xii. 2, 7), the ven. Sālha, deliberating which side is right, the Eastern (Pācīnakā bhikkhū) —*i.e.*, the Vajjians—or the Pāṭheyyakas, decides for the latter, and is strengthened therein by a god in a vision. This vision is described very much in the same words as that of Brahmā to the Buddha (M.V. i. 5, 4-6). It may well have been inserted with the object of proving the

* On Pāṭheyya, *cf.* below, chap. iv.

importance of Sālha as a Thera, and his right to rank among the other Theras (2, 7) and be addressed by Revata as 'bhante.' It is just possible that the title of bhante, used in M.V. i. 5, 6, by Brahmā to the Buddha (and accordingly by the anonymous god to Sālha: 'Tena hi bhante Sālha yathādhammo tathā tiṭṭhāhi'), may have suggested reproducing M.V. i. 5, 4-6, here.

3. The Vajji bhikkhus present their offerings to 'bhante' Revata—'Paṭigaṇhātu bhante thero . . . '—which are declined: 'Alaṇ āvuso . . . ti na icchi paṭiggahetuṇ . . . ' They turn to Uttara, Revata's famulus, a bhikkhu of twenty years' standing (*vīsativasso*)—*i.e.*, of about forty years of age or more (*c.f.* Pāc. 65, 1, Vin. iv., p. 130; and M.V. i. 49). It is a striking feature that the compiler should have alluded to this date in the case of Uttara. The more numerous the *dramatis personæ*, the more complicated becomes their mutual precedence. To give bases for the terms he uses, the compiler now begins stating their age. Uttara is of an age to treat the Vajji delegates as equals, and accordingly he calls them āvuso: 'Alaṇ āvuso . . . ti na icchi paṭiggahetuṇ.' They also, in persuading him, by analogy with the Buddha and Ānanda's procedure, call him āvuso: 'Manussā kho, āvuso Uttara, Bhagavato sāmaṇakaṇ pari-kkhāraṇ upanāmenti . . . ' Uttara, in taking one robe, engages himself to present their case to Revata, whom, of course, he calls bhante: 'Ettakaṇ bhante thero sanghamajjhe vadetu.'

4. Now comes the first sitting, Revata, preceding Sambhūta, is President, and of course addresses the Thera Council as āvuso: 'Suṇātu me āvuso Sangho!' all being of inferior standing to himself. On his motion, the company of Theras go to decide the matter where the dispute arose—to Vesālī—so that their decision shall be acknowledged by the instigators. There was then dwelling at Vesālī the oldest Buddhist Thera on earth (*pathavyā sanghathero*), by name Sabbakāmī. He had been ordained 120 years previously (*vīsatiṇvassasatiko*

upasampadāya), and had been a pupil (saddhivihāriko) of Ānanda. To consult an ancient of at least 140 years old was, no doubt, a very curious device, but it is not surprising to anyone who can see through this whole chapter. It has to be shown how Revata, theratara than all those previously named, and therefore called bhante by every one else, has himself to stoop before one yet higher. The progression leads quite naturally to one of so extreme a seniority as Sabbakāmī. (As residing at Vesālī he belongs—in xii. 2, 7—to the Western bhikkhus.) Revata agrees with Sambhūta Sāṇavāsī, who is somewhat his inferior, that they shall both call on Sabbakāmī, to consult him privately. Revata calls Sambhūta āvuso: ‘Ahaṇ āvuso yasmiṇ vihāre Sabbakāmī therō viharati taṇ vihāraṇ upaga-cchāmi. . .’ Sambhūta replies correctly with ‘bhante’: ‘Evaṇ bhante ti kho āyasmā Sambhūto S. āyasmato R. paccassosi.’ Without discerning the underlying object of the chronicle, it would not be very clear why these two go, and go at different hours, to Sabbakāmī. The object is this—that the compiler would not lose the opportunity of bringing either separately into conversation with Sabbakāmī, so that each might show his acquaintance with ‘good form.’

5. The very aged gentleman makes use of an unusual mode of address to Revata—‘bhummi’: ‘Katamena tvaṇ, bhummi, vihārena etarahi bahulaṇ viharasi. . .’ I cannot explain it. If it is connected with bhūmi (ground), it may possibly mean what creeps on the ground, and so ‘my child.’ Buddhaghosa explains it by piyavacanaṇ etaṇ, and thus Rhys Davids and Oldenberg render it ‘beloved one.’ If the translation is correct, and thus the word be a sort of synonym of āvuso, it fits in with the compiler’s scheme of etiquette. In any case, this variety of address strengthens the probability that questions of form in intercourse were the author’s main concern. Revata replies, ‘by the book,’ with bhante: ‘Mettāvihārena kho ahaṇ bhante etarahi

bahulaṃ viharāmi. . . .’ The subject of their talk is not relevant to our argument.

6. Meanwhile enter Sambhūta, who addresses Sabbakāmi correctly with bhante, and consults him on the controversy. The latter takes the side of the Pāṭheyyakas.

7. The Council now takes place. Revata again presides, but this time, now that a theratara, Sabbakāmi, is present, he addresses the assembly, no longer as āvuso, but as bhante: ‘Suṇātu me bhante Sangho!’ He moves that a committee be appointed. This consists of four Pācīnakas, including Sabbakāmi and Saḷha, and four Pāṭheyyakas, including Revata and Sambhūta Sānavāsī.

8. Revata, using the correct bhante, asks permission of the committee* to question Sabbakāmi on the Vinaya; the latter, in his turn and using āvuso—‘Suṇātu me āvuso Sangho!’—asks permission of the committee to be questioned. Revata then questions him concerning the ten indulgences, whether they are feasible. Sabbakāmi asks, as Revata had done, what each of the ten, as labelled, signifies, deciding in each case in the negative. Both decide, by citing the Vinaya, that every one of the ten indulgences is illegal, the latter questioning with bhante, Sabbakāmi replying with āvuso. In declaring before the committee each question in succession as closed, the latter addresses all as āvuso: ‘nihaṭaṃ etaṃ āvuso adhikaraṇaṃ. . . .’ But he bids Revata question him again before the Sangha: ‘Api ca maṃ tvaṃ āvuso Sanghamajjhe pi imāni dasa vatthūni puccheyyāsi.’

Thus in the matter of āvuso and bhante, the text punctiliously carries out the Buddha’s injunction in D. xvi. 6, 2. In view of the freer and more frequent use of āvuso in the Sutta texts, which agrees with what the Buddha, on his death-bed, had described as the custom till then, this shows that the compiler of C.V. xi., xii., in his selection of forms of address, conformed to those prescribed by the Buddha. Now, the subject-matter is mainly unimportant,

* Also called Sangho, though, ‘of course, consisting of the eight referees’ only (Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, S.B.E. xx. 408, n. 2).

and only gains some significance as a vehicle for this conformity. And in C.V. xii. the confused and artificial construction only gains coherence when interpreted as compiled for that purpose. In other words, the two *Khandakas* which, from the age of the *Dīpavaṅsa* till to-day, have ranked as chronicles of the Councils, are in reality more or less readings in 'good form' for bhikkhus in all events and circumstances.*

Hence the influence of D. xvi. is felt, not only in the separate points adduced at first, but also throughout the scope of the narrative; not only in C.V. xi., but also in xii. The recognition of this gives us the right and the stimulus to determine other more or less radical influences.

III.—FURTHER UNNOTICED PARALLELS BETWEEN *DĪGHA-NIKĀYA XVI.* AND *CULLAVAGGA XI., XII.*

In *Dīgha* xvi. 6, 1 (ii. 154), the Buddha says to his disciples: 'Yo vo Ānanda mayā Dhammo ca Vinayo

* It may be asked how far the other modes of address prescribed by the Buddha prevailed? With regard to *āyasmā*, this is found in all cases, and it may be used as a vocative in direct speech to a second person, or, analogous to *bhavaṇ*, as nominative, used with the verb in the third person (and in all cases without the verb) to denote a second person. It is not clear which use Buddha had in mind in prescribing it; hence I could not bring *āyasmā* into my demonstration. Besides, the application of the term is far too comprehensive to make it possible to determine clearly what use the Buddha desired should be made of it. In the third person it can be applied to any and every kind of bhikkhu, and even to persons outside the Order, by way of epithet. Hence even the author of the 'M. Parinibbāna-S.' made no attempt to use it in any definite manner as prescribed. And the compiler of C.V. xi., and xii. seems to have followed him, since the one instance to which the rule seems to apply is too isolated, viz.: (xi. 10), where Ānanda says to the Theras: 'Api cāyasmantānaṃ saddhāya desemi taṃ dukkaṭaṇ.' 'Nevertheless, out of my faith in the Venerable (Gentlemen) I confess that as a fault.'

The addressing mostly of inferiors by name only was already in the Buddha's time, or at least at the time of the genesis of the oldest texts, so constantly in use, that the compiler of C.V. xi., xii. probably held no special illustration of the usage not worth while.

ca desito paññatto so vo mam' accayena Satthā.'
'The truths and the rules which I have declared to you,
Ānanda, let them, after I am gone, be the Teacher to you.'

In xvi. 4, 8 (ii. 124) his admonition is, in its idea, the same, but set forth in greater detail: 'Idha bhikkhave bhikkhu evaṃ vaḍeyya: "Sammukhā me taṃ āvuso Bhagavato sutāṃ sammukhā paṭiggahītaṃ, ayaṃ Dhammo ayaṃ Vinayo idaṃ Satthu sāsanaṃ 'ti, tassa bhikkhave bhikkhuno bhāsitaṃ n'eva abhinanditabbāṃ na paṭikkositabbāṃ. Anabhinanditvā appaṭikkositvā tāni padavyañjanāni sādhukaṃ uggahetvā Sutte otāretabbāni Vinaye sandassetabbāni. Tāni ce Sutte otāriyamānāni Vinaye sandassiyamānāni na c'eva Sutte otaranti na Vinaye sandissanti niṭṭham ettha gantabbāṃ: 'Addhā idaṃ na c'eva tassa Bhagavato vacanaṃ, imassa ca bhikkhuno dugghāṭan' ti, iti h' etaṃ bhikkhave chaḍḍeyyātha. Tāni ce Sutte otariyamānāni Vinaye sandassiyamānāni Sutte c'eva otaranti Vinaye ca sandissanti, niṭṭham ettha gantabbāṃ: 'Addhā idaṃ tassa Bhagavato vacanaṃ imassa ca bhikkhuno suggahītan' ti.

'If, brethren, a brother should say thus: "From the mouth of the Exalted One himself have I heard, from his own mouth have I received it; this is the truth, this is the law, this is the teaching of the Master," ye shall receive his word without praise, nor treat it with scorn. Without praise and without scorn every word and syllable should be carefully understood, and then put beside the Sutta, and compared with the rules of the Order. If, when so compared, they do not harmonize with the Sutta, and do not fit in with the rules of the Order, then you may come to the conclusion, "Verily, this is not the word of the Exalted One, and has been wrongly grasped by that brother." Therefore, brethren, you should reject it. But if they harmonize with the Sutta, and fit in with the rules of the Order, then you may conclude: "Verily, this is the word of the Exalted One, and has been well grasped by that brother."'

^ Now, the scanty kernel of C.V. xii. is a report of precisely such a testing of assertions by the Vinaya (rules of the

Order) as the Buddha here prescribes.* When the committee, sitting in the Sand Park at Vesālī, is making its final pronouncements, Revata asks Sabbakāmi (C.V. xii. 2, 8), in connexion with the ten indulgences demanded by the Vajji Bhikkhus, 'Kappati bhante singiloṇakappo?' and then, in other words, 'Kappati bhante singinā loṇaṇ parihaṛituṇ yattha aloṇakaṇ bhavissati tattha paribhuñjissāmi?' 'Is it allowable, lord, to carry about salt in a horn with the intention of enjoying it when there is no salt?' This being negatived, he asks, 'Kattha patikkhittan ti?' 'Where has it been forbidden?' Sabbakāmi answers, 'In Sāvattī, in the Sutta-Vibhanga.' And there certainly is, in the Sutta-Vibhanga, Pācittiya 38 (Vin. iv. 87), the prohibition of storing foods and condiments.† Similarly, against each one of the ten theses a passage from the Vinaya is brought forward, constituting, for the most part, fair refutations. It does not matter whether they fit exactly, without exception; it is only required that the compiler thought them suitable for comparison and refutation.

Is it possible to doubt, in view of the many coincidences pointed out above between Dīgha xvi. and C.V. xi., xii., that this is not the result of accident, but that C.V. xii. depends, as literature, on Dīgha xvi.? What is right in C.V. xii. will be approved by xi., which in so many points companions it. Even if, in this case, the matter is not so clear in xi. as in xii.,‡ the degree of certainty of connexion is levelled up by the greater number of parallels to D. xvi. in C.V. xi., as compared with xii.

* Purāṇa's affirmation (C.V. xi. 11) may, perhaps, be considered as an attempt to substantiate this passage from the D.: 'Api ca yath'eva mayā Bhagavato sammukhā sutāṇ . . . tath' evāhaṇ dhāressāmi.' But he gives no instance of testing.

† Pointed out by Oldenberg (Vin. ii. 306).

‡ Because here we do not get assertions which are tested by the texts, but simply the agreement concerning the latter; but the case is different. It would have been supererogatory, first to assert that a given text belonged to the Canon, then to confirm it as such forthwith.

Hence it is my belief that C.V. xi. is also an attempt to carry out the admonition given in D. xvi. 4, 8; xi. is an attempt from the positive; xii. an attempt from the negative side; xii. is devoted to the refutation of what was wrong; xi. to the acknowledgment of what was right. The sound doctrine is also elicited by question and answer, and established by bringing forward, as from a register, the external circumstances at the time the rule was made. These statements fit exactly what we find in our versions of the Sutta and Vinaya Pitakas.

In C.V. xi. 7: Atha kho āyasmā Mahākassapo āyasmantaṃ Upāliṃ etad avoca: paṭhamaṃ āvuso Upāli pārājikaṃ kattha paññattan ti. Vesāliyaṃ bhante ti. Kaṃ ārabbhā ti. Sudinnaṃ Kalandaputtaṃ ārabbhā ti. Kismiṃ vatthusmin ti. Methunadhamme ti, etc.

‘Then the ven. M. Kassapa said to the ven. Upāli: “Ven. Upāli, where was the first Pārājika promulgated?” “In Vesālī, sir.” “Concerning whom was it spoken?” “Concerning Sudinna, the son of Kalanda.” “In regard to what matter?” “Sexual intercourse.”’

Cf. Vinaya iii. 15-21.

Next, C.V. xi. 8 with respect to the Dhamma: ‘Atha kho āyasmā Mahākassapo āyasmantaṃ Ānandaṃ etad avoca: Brahmajālaṃ āvuso Ānanda kattha bhāsitan ti. Antarā ca bhante Rājagahaṃ antarā ca Nālandaṃ rājagārake Ambalaṭṭhikāyan ti. Kaṃ ārabbhā ti. Suppiyaṃ ca paribbājakaṃ Brahmadataṃ ca māṇavan ti,’ etc.

‘And the ven. M. Kassapa said to the ven. Ānanda: “Where, friend Ānanda, was the Brahmajāla (suttanta) spoken?” “On the way, sir between Rājagaha and Nālandā, at the royal resthouse at Ambalaṭṭhikā,” “Concerning whom was it spoken?” “Concerning Suppiya, the Wanderer, and the young brahmin, Brahmadata.”’

See *Dīgha* i.

Both chapters are applications of the Buddha’s admonition, stated above: ‘The truths and the rules . . . let them, when I am gone, be a Teacher to you.’

There is one more circumstance that I should like to point out. In itself it may be reckoned as unobtrusive and unimportant—likely, indeed, to escape notice altogether. But from the standpoint of the mutual coherency of C.V. xi. and xii. as the positive and negative sides of one and the same subject, it gains a deep significance. This is the parallel between the two verbal forms *dippati* (xi. 1) and *dīpenti* (xii. 1, 1).*

In xi. 1, Mahā Kassapa proposes the first Council in the words: ‘Handa mayaṅ āvuso dhammañ ca vinayañ ca saṅgāyāma, pure adhammo dippati dhammo paṭibāhīyati, avinayo dippati vinayo paṭibāhīyati. . . .’ ‘Well, then, friends, let us establish a concensus in the Dhamma and the Vinaya, before what is not Dhamma is proclaimed, and what is Dhamma is put aside; before what is not Vinaya is proclaimed, and what is Vinaya is put aside.’ Now, when the account of the second Council (in xii. 1, 1) is introduced with the words: ‘Tena kho pana samāyena vassasatapariniḥḥute bhagavati Vesālīkā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū Vesālīyaṅ dasa vatthūni dīpenti,’—‘Now at that time, a century after the Parinibbāna of the Exalted One, the Bhikkhus of Vesālī, Vajjians, promulgated at Vesālī ten theses’—it seems to me clear and evident that this latter sentence is spoken with reference to the former sentence, and that the contingency which M. Kassapa tried to exclude is come about. For compare, again, xii. 1, 7: Yasa opposes the Vajjians’ innovations with the precise words used by M. Kassapa: Imaṅ adhikaraṇaṅ ādiyissāma, pure adhammo dippati dhammo paṭibāhīyati, avinayo dippati vinayo paṭibāhīyati. . . .†

The account of the establishment of Dhamma and Vinaya

* These both depend, of course, ultimately on C.V. vii. 5, 2 (*cf.* A. i. 11 [vol. i. 19]): . . . adhammaṅ dhammo ti dīpenti . . . avinayaṅ vinayo ti dīpenti. . . .

† This coincidence of phrases has already been pointed out by de la V. Poussin (*Muséon*, 1905, p. 49).

might have finished with C.V. xi. 8, had not two mutually contradictory injunctions of the Buddha respecting rules for the brethren, according to D. xvi., lain before them. That C.V. xi. is occupied with the reconciliation of this discrepancy is a new proof of its dependence on D. xvi.

Mention has been made above of the permission given by the Buddha shortly before his death (in D. xvi. 6, 3) to suspend unimportant precepts. But in D. xvi. 1, 6 (ii. 77) we find another injunction: *Yāvakiṃvaṇ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū appaññattaṃ na paññāpessanti, paññattaṃ na samucchindissanti, yathāpaññattesu sikkhāpadesu samādāya vattissanti, vuddhiyeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnaṃ pāṭikankhā no parihāni.*

‘So long, brethren, as the brethren shall ordain nothing that has not been already ordained, and abrogate nothing that has been already ordained, and act in accordance with the precepts according as they have been laid down, so long, brethren, may the brethren be expected, not to decline, but to prosper.’

I believe I shall not be wrong in assuming that the discussions on the slackening in the minor precepts were determined by that twofold injunction of the Buddha. Ānanda, as we saw, knew of the permission given by the Master in this connexion (D. xvi. 6, 3). But Mahā Kassapa finally brings forward the motion in which we distinctly hear the words of D. xvi. 1, 6 reverberating: *Yadi saṅghassa pattakallaṃ, saṅgho appaññattaṃ na paññāpeyya paññattaṃ na samucchindeyya yathāpaññattesu sikkhāpadesu samādāya vatteyya.*

‘If the time seems meet to the Saṅgha, not ordaining what has not been ordained, and not abrogating what has been ordained, let it take upon itself and act in accordance with the precepts according as they have been laid down.’*

Another probable influence exerted by Dīgha xvi. on the conception and construction of C.V. xi., xii., is this: in

* This would render Minayeff's and de la V. Poussin's conclusions unnecessary.

D. xvi. 1, 6, the sentence quoted above is preceded by this sentence: *Yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū samaggā sannipatissanti samaggā vuṭṭhahissanti samaggā sanghakarāṇiyāni karissanti, vuddhiyeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnaṃ pāṭikañkhā no parihāni.*

‘So long, brethren, as the brethren meet together in full and frequent assemblies, so long as they meet together in concord, and rise in concord, and carry out in concord the duties of the Order, so long may the brethren be expected not to decline, but to prosper.’

It seems to me, again, to be not accidental that C.V. xi. and xii. are instances of both possibilities. The assembly in C.V. xi. discharges its duties in concord. The resolutions carried by the assembly in C.V. xii., on the other hand, are directed against a want of unanimity in the assembly, against the divergent theses of an heretical minority, the Vajjian Bhikkhus.

In this connexion we cannot refrain from glancing at another point. Can it, after all that has been said, be still regarded as accidental that, in C.V. xi., xii., the two opposed tendencies in the Order are described, and the Vajjian Bhikkhus made responsible for the tendency that is condemned? And is it accidental if, on the other hand, we find, in *Dīgha* xvi. 1, 4 *ff.*, and 1, 6 *ff.*, two parallel groups of conditions for success laid down, the first of which are the special conditions for the welfare of the Vajjians? *Yāvakīvañ ca Ānanda Vajjī samaggā sannipatissanti. . . . Yāvakīvañ ca Ananda Vajjī appaṇṇattaṃ na paṇṇāpessanti, paṇṇattaṃ na samucchindissanti, yathāpaṇṇatte porāṇe Vajjīdhamme samādāya vattissanti. . . .*

With so much incontestable evidence of the relations between *Dīgha* xvi. and C.V. xi., xii., it is quite obvious that the compiler of the latter was only following the inspiration of D. xvi. when he made the Vajjians the scapegoats for disregard of the conditions necessary to the welfare of the Order. And he had no need to tax his brain unduly as to

the particular way in which they were disregarded. He simply varied what he had said in C.V. vii. 4, 1, that the Vajjians, namely, had taken up theses divergent in principle, and held them to be correct Dhamma and Vinaya. This was, it is true, a century earlier, and Devadatta was the seducer; but that is a detail. Only those can boggle at this who are determined from the first to consider these statements as genuine history.

I shall proceed to prove that there is no reason to doubt the identity of the compiler of C.V. xi., xii., and of the rest of the C.V. The natural process of evolution will have been that the compiler, already in vii. 4, 1, supplemented *Dīgha* xvi. by planning the misdeed of the Vajjians, and in C.V. xii. repeated it. The reason why the innovation of the Vajjians in C.V. xii. is timed at 100 years after the Buddha's death is, even without the assumption of a historical basis, not difficult to understand. The Buddha's prediction concerning the Vajjians lays down that the revolt would not come immediately. But this prediction constitutes a reply to the inquiry made by King Ajātasattu, through his minister Vassakāra, of the Buddha concerning the eventual success of a plot against the Vajjians. The meaning, then, of the reply is, that the plot would at the present not succeed, because the Vajjians were fulfilling the conditions requisite for their welfare (the fact that they were so doing is explicitly established). In other words, the Vajjians were as yet prospering. In *D.* xvi. 1, 27 (ii. 87) they are still prospering, for they are to be checked by the building, under the superintendence of the Magadhese ministers, Sunidha and Vassakāra, of a fortified town in place of the village at Pāṭali (*Vajjīnaṇ paṭibāhāya*). Hence if the compiler of the C.V. wanted to speak of the Vajjians not fulfilling certain conditions, in other words, of their innovations and altered precepts, he had to place all this in an age after the Buddha's day. 'A hundred years' is a date that for such purposes most readily suggests itself, and it seems pretty clear that it was 'good enough' for him.

But we have to adduce yet another probable influence of

Dīgha xvi. D. xvi. 1, 4—the last above-given quotation—ends thus: ‘Yāvakīvañ ca Ānanda Vajjinaṃ arahantesu dhammikāraḅbhāvaraṇagutti susaṇvhitā bhavissati, kin ti anāgatā ca arahanto vijitaṃ āgaccheyyuaṃ āgatā ca arahanto vijite phāsuṃ vihareyyun ti vuddhi yeva. . . .’

‘So, long, Ānanda, as, among the Vajjians, the rightful protection, defence, and support shall be fully provided for the Arahats, so that Arahats from a distance may enter the realm, and the Arahats therein may live at ease, so long. . . .’

Any susceptible author could easily, from this passage, derive the idea that, in depicting the signs of a revolt, it would be fitting to say something about intrigues against an Arahata, such as would drive him eventually out of the country. It is from this point of view, I think, that we should understand the arbitrary procedure taken in Yasa’s case (C.V. xii. 1, 1 *f.*), which has been sketched above, and which he finally evaded by his flight through the air.

As to the influence possibly exerted by two or three other passages in the M. Pari. S., I speak with less certainty. D. xvi. 1, 7 (ii. 78) contains the following pronouncements: ‘Yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū na bhassārāmā bhavissanti. . . . Yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū na niddārāmā bhavissanti. . . . Yāvakīvañ ca bhikkhave bhikkhū na saṅgaṇikārāmā bhavissanti. . . . vuddhi yeva bhikkhave bhikkhūnaṃ paṭikankhā no parihāni.’

‘So long, brethren, as the brethren shall not be in the habit of, or be fond of, idle talk; so long as they shall not be addicted to sloth . . . shall not frequent, or be fond of, or indulge in society . . . so long may the brethren be expected, not to decline, but to prosper.’

In C.V. xii. Revata and Sabbakāmi are shown as belonging to the saintlier side of the Order, whom one may be sure to find striving to realize these conditions of salvation. Is it, then, perhaps with an eye to this passage* that the

* In C.V. itself the flight of Revata is explained in another manner.

compiler (C.V. xii. 2, 7) represents Revata moving that, in order to avoid much 'pointless speaking' (bhassāni), the investigation of the controversy be devolved upon a committee,* makes him, as guest of Sabbakāmi, forego his night's rest (xii. 2, 4), and withdraw himself repeatedly when sought (xii. 1, 9) ?

IV. PARALLELS BETWEEN CULLA-VAGGA XI. AND XII. AND OTHER CANONICAL WORKS, ESPECIALLY THE VINAYA.

If we now glance over the essentials of the two accounts, which cannot be explained by the influence of Dīgha xvi., we have in the first place to point out once more that C.V. xii. 1, 3, is identical with A. iv. 50 (ii. 53 f.), and C.V. xii. 1, 4, with Saṅg. xlii. 10 (iv. 325 f.). We may, then, eliminate those passages which quite obviously owe their existence to the influence, either of earlier passages in the C.V., or of the Vinaya in general. That, for instance, which we may call the protocol to the motions and resolutions, corresponds word for word to the formula so constantly occurring in the Vinaya, and hence needs no further explanation. Again, the rebuke administered to Ananda, that he had supported the efforts of the Gotamī to be admitted into the Order, refers to matters which are narrated in the C.V. itself (x.), and is hereby sufficiently explained.

On the relation between the phrases *dippati* and *dīpenti* contained in C.V. xi. 1; xii. 1, 1, on C.V. vii. 5, 2 (*cf.* A. i. 11), the reader should consult above, p. 48. Again, on *khaṇḍaphullaṅga paṭisankharoma* in C.V. xi. 5, as connected with C.V. vi. 5, 2; vi. 17, 1, consult above, p. 35, *n.*

Chapters xi. and xii., with their contrasted base-ideas, were obviously elaborated under the influence of C.V. vii. 5, 2-3 (= A. x. 35 ff. [v. 73, 74], and *cf.* Itv. 18, 19) on *sanghabheda* and *sanghasāmaggī*—vii. 5, 2: Saṅ-

* In this case we should have to declare C.V. iv. 14, 19 derived from D. xvi. But that, as will appear presently, we should be able to piece into the general situation.

ghabhedo saṅghabhedo 'ti bhante vuccati. Kittāvātā nu kho bhante sangho bhinno hotīti. Idh' Ūpāli bhikkhū adhammaṃ dhammo 'ti dīpenti, dhammaṃ adhammo 'ti dīpenti, avinayaṃ vinayo 'ti d., vinayam avinayo 'ti d., abhāsitaṃ alapitaṃ tathāgatena bhāsitaṃ lapitaṃ tathāgatena 'ti d., bhāsitaṃ lapitaṃ t. abhāsitaṃ alapitaṃ t. 'ti d., anāciṇṇaṃ t. āciṇṇaṃ t. 'ti d., . . . apaññattaṃ t. paññattaṃ t. 'ti d., paññattaṃ t. apaññattaṃ t. 'ti d., anāpattiṃ āpattīti d., āpattiṃ anāpattīti dīpenti. . . .

3. Sanghasāmaggī sanghasāmaggīti bhante vuccati. Kittāvātā nu kho bhante sangho samaggo hotīti. Idh' Ūpāli bhikkhū adhammaṃ adhammo 'ti dīpenti dhammaṃ dhammo ti dīpenti, etc., as in § 2.

In C.V. xi. and in C.V. xii., what we note in the positive party is all borne along by the current of C.V. vii. 5, 3; and everything schismatic in C.V. xii. by the current of vii. 5, 2. This is proved, not only by the identity of the base-ideas, but also by manifold coincidences of phraseology. The C.V. relates not only the settlement as a whole of Dhamma as Dhamma and of Vinaya as Vinaya, but also the instructions (paññattaṃ) of the Buddha in this or that place, what is āpatti and anāpatti (xi. 7), as well as what the Buddha preached (bhāsitaṃ, xi. 8).

In xii. Yasa takes his stand, with fastidious correctness, on the Vinaya, when he, *e.g.*, asks for an escort on his expedition to apologize to the Vajjians (see above, p. 38, and below, p. 55), expressly referring to the Buddha: Bhagavatā āvuso paññattaṃ. Again, before the laity, he emphasizes his adherence to Dhamma and Vinaya with the words (vii. 5, 3): 'Yo 'haṃ adhammaṃ adhammo 'ti vadāmi, dhammaṃ dhammo ti vadāmi, avinayaṃ avinayo 'ti vadāmi, vinayaṃ vinayo 'ti vadāmi' (xii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5). In xii. 1, 5, he refers the bhikkhus to Buddha's instructions respecting gold and silver observed by himself: 'Bhagavā . . .

jātarūparajataṃ paṭikkhipi sikkhāpadañ ca paññāpesi.'

On the other hand, the theses put forward by the Vajjiputtakas are adhamma, avinaya, apaññatta, called in xii. 2, 8, by the synonymous terms uddhamma ubbinaya, apagatasatthusāsana. When the Vajjiputtakas act in accordance with their theses, this is anāciṇṇaṃ Tathāgatenā; the āciṇṇakappa is, moreover, one of the liberties they take, and they punish Yasa, who opposes them in the name of Dhamma and Vinaya, as if his conduct, which is anāpatti, were āpatti (xii. 1, 2, 7).

Their finding of a sentence (paṭisāraṇiyakamma) against Yasa (xii. 1, 2) is distinctly based on i. 20. As if to leave no doubt about it, Yasa is accused, in the words taken from i. 20, akkosati paribhāsati, of an offence which, in his case, is quite out of the question. Yasa thereupon, as has been related, demands the escort of a colleague, which the Buddha had prescribed in the case of one charged with paṭisāraṇiyakamma. This injunction is in C.V. i. 22.

C.V. xii. 1, 8: Atha kho saṭṭhimattā Pāṭheyyakā bhikkhū sabbe āraññakā sabbe piṇḍapātikā sabbe paṇsukūlikā sabbe tecīvarikā, belongs partly to M.V. vii. 1, 1, : Tena kho pana samayena tiṇṣamattā Pāṭheyyakā bhikkhū sabbe āraññakā sabbe piṇḍapātikā sabbe paṇsukūlikā sabbe tecīvarikā, partly to Saṃy. xv. 13, 2: Atha kho tiṇṣamattā Paveyyakā (S. 1-3 Pāṭheyyakā) bhikkhū sabbe āraññakā sabbe p° s° pa° s° t°.

C.V. xii. 2, 2: A god inspiring Sālha to persevere may derive from the Buddha's being incited by Brahmā, M.V. i. 5, 4-6.

The connexion between C.V. xii. 2, 4: Sace mayaṃ imaṃ adhikaraṇaṃ idha vūpasameyyāma siyāpi mūlādāyikā bhikkhū punakammāya ukkoṭeyyaṃ, and Pācittiya 63 has already been pointed out by de la V. Poussin, *Muséon*, 1905, p. 266, n. 1.

On the parallel between the end of xii. 2, 4, and C.V. vi. 13, 1, see note on p. 80.

The story of the appointment of a committee in C.V. xii. 2, 7, rests on C.V. iv. 14, 19, which is reproduced verbatim.* The sentences are given side by side.

C.V. xii.

Tasmiṃ kho pana ad-
hikaraṇe vinicchiya-
māne anaggāni c'eva
bhassāni jāyanti na
c'ekassa bhāsitassa
attho viññāyati.

Atha kho āyasmā Re-
vato sanghaṃ ṇāpesi:
suṇātu me bhante
sangho, amhākaṃ ima-
smiṃ adhikaraṇe vini-
cchiamāne anaggāni
c'eva bhassāni jāyanti
na c'ekassa bhāsitassa
attho viññāyati, yadi
sanghassa pattakallaṃ,
sangho cattāro Pācī-
nake bhikkhū cattāro
Pāṭheyyake bhikkhū
sammanneyya ubbāhi-
kāya imaṃ adhikara-
ṇaṃ vūpasametvaṃ.

C.V. iv.

Tehi ce bhikkhave
bhikkhūhi tasmiṃ ad-
hikaraṇe vinicchiya-
māne anaggāni c'eva
bhassāni jāyanti na
c'ekassa bhāsitassa
attho viññāyati.

Yācivā vyattena
bhikkhunā paṭibaleṇa
sangho ṇāpetabbo:
suṇātu me bhante
sangho, amhākaṃ ima-
smiṃ adhikaraṇe vini-
cchiamāne anaggāni
c'eva bhassāni jāyanti
na c'ekassa bhāsitassa
attho viññāyati, yadi
sanghassa pattakallaṃ
sangho itthannāmaṃ ca
itthannāmaṃ, ca bhi-
kkhuṃ sammanneyya
ubbāhikāya imaṃ ad-
hikaraṇaṃ vūpasa-
metvaṃ.

The following similarities are less clearly made out.

The second rebuke levelled against Ānanda in C.V. xi. 10 is: Idam pi te āvuso Ānanda dukkaṭaṃ yaṃ tvaṃ bhagavato vassikasāṭikaṃ akkamitvā sibe-
besi. 'This also, friend Ānanda, was ill done by thee, in that thou trodest upon the Exalted One's rainy-season

* Already pointed out by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg (S.B.E. xx. 407, n. 1).

garment to sew it' (or, 'that thou trodest upon . . . garment and then sewedst it—*i.e.*, because it had thereby become torn?'). There is in the Canon no mention of any episode with which this rebuke can be referred without objection. But it is conceivable that the compiler's imagination may have been guided by dim memories of phrases in earlier passages of the Vinaya.* Now, in C.V. v. 11 the subject turns on the sewing of bhikkhus' robes (cīvaraṃ sibbenti); then on a frame in which the garment is stretched while it is sewn (kaṭhina; v. 11, 3: *anujānāmi bhikkhave kaṭhinaṃ kaṭhinarajjuṃ tattha tattha obandhitvā cīvaraṃ sibbetuṃ*); then on the treading upon this frame (with the garment stretched in it?). C.V. v. 11, 4: *Tena kho pana samayena bhikkhū adhotēhi pādehi kaṭhinaṃ akkamanti*; and the Buddha declares this to be an offence: *Yo akkameyya āpatti dukkaṭassa*. I believe that this dukkaṭa was the bridge by which the Council chronicler, in counting up Ānanda's dukkaṭas, got into this chapter of the C.V. And the reason why, among all the many dukkaṭas treated of in the Vinaya, he should light on this one, may well have been the fact that Ānanda is repeatedly involved in affairs concerning garments. More of this presently. Perhaps, too, a dim memory of C.V. v. 21 unconsciously played its part. Ānanda is there mentioned in connexion with a proceeding which results in eliciting this injunction from the Buddha: *Na bhikkhave celapattikā akkamitabbā. Yo akkameyya āpatti dukkaṭassa*.

C.V. xi. 11 and 13 *f.* still remain to be connected with other passages. Purāna comes with 500 bhikkhus from the southern hills to Rājagaha, and expresses his esteem for the work achieved by the Council. Ānanda, commissioned to impose the penalty on Channa, at Kosambī (*cf.* above, p. 37), receives an offering of 500 robes† in the park of

* I have pointed out analogous occurrences in other Pali books (W.Z.K.M. xx., xxi.), and could produce other instances

† Called both *uttarāsanga* and *cīvara*.

King Udena from the Court ladies, and explains to the indignant monarch* that he will divide them among the bhikkhus escorting him; that out of the robes when worn out bed-spreads will be made, then cushion covers, then carpets, then towels for feet-ablution, then dusters; that finally, torn into shreds and stiffened with mud, they will be made into flooring.

Now it will be admitted that in all this, beyond Purāṇa's opinion, there is no connexion with the Council, and that, therefore, a discussion on the originals of these passages has little bearing upon its probability. Notwithstanding this, I will try to explain their literary *raison d'être*. Should the attempt not be reckoned conclusive in every detail, this will not cut us off from the aim of our inquiry. It will, anyway, not be an utter failure.

The Theras had decided that Ānanda should carry out the brahmadāṇḍa, or higher penalty, imposed by the Buddha himself upon Channa (C.V. xi. 12). Two motives seem to have determined their choice, both of a literary character. Ananda had already been represented, in the C.V., as carrying out a penalty. This was against the Licchavi Vaddha; and I take that episode (v. 20) to be the prototype of xi. 16. The verbal agreement in particular phrases removes all doubt:

V. 20, 5.

... etad avoca: Sanghena te āvuso Vaddha patto nikkujjito ... atha kho Vaddho Licchavi ... 'ti tatth'eva mucchito papato. Atha kho. . . .

XI. 15.

... etad avoca: Sanghena te āvuso Channa brahmadāṇḍo āṇāpito 'ti . . . 'ti tatth'eva mucchito papati. Atha kho. . . .

The second motive was, I believe, the following: The compiler of C.V. xi. designed it as a crowning witticism that Ānanda, who had hitherto, by the way in which he

* The King asked Ānanda humorously whether he intended to open a shop.

was addressed, been distinguished as the lowest among the Theras, should finally appear before the overthrown Channa as a gentleman of eminence, to be respectfully addressed as bhante. For this purpose Ānanda had to come on as leader of the deputation. But he would not take his escort from the Theras at Rājagaha, in whose presence he would have been dwarfed. He needed a troop of ordinary bhikkhus, in no way distinguished. Only the 500 Theras were in Rājagaha at the time (*cf.* xi. 4). The escort Ānanda was bound to have, by the statue of brahmadāṇḍa, as defined by the Buddha. As defined in C.V. xi., Ānanda needed one to defend him against the violence of Channa. Where should the escort be found? From somewhere in the neighbourhood, of course. Now, the Southern Mountain (Dakkhiṇāgiri) was known as a centre for bhikkhus, not very far from Rājagaha (*cf.* Mahāvagga i. 53): 1. Tena kho pana samayena bhagavā tatth'eva Rājagahahe vassaṇ vasi. . . . 2. Atha kho bhagavā āyasmantaṇ Ānandaṇ āmantesi: . . . icchat'āvuso bhagavā Dakkhiṇāgiriṇ cārikaṇ pak-kamituṇ; viii. 12, 1: Atha kho bhagavā Rājagahahe yathābhirantaṇ viharitvā yena Dakkhiṇāgiri tena cārikaṇ pakkāmi; Saṅy. xvi. 11, 4: Atha kho āyasmā Ānando Dakkhiṇāgirismiṇ yathābhirantaṇ cārikaṇ caritvā yena Rājagahaṇ Veluvanaṇ . . . tenupasaṅkami (see also S.B.E. xvii., p. 207, n. 2). Hence the compiler makes the troop appear from thence.

Now, in one of the passages where the Dakkhiṇāgiri occurs, M.V. viii. 12, 1, the subject turns on bhikkhus' garments, which Ānanda is to provide, as we find him doing: Atha kho bhagavā Dakkhiṇāgirismiṇ yathābhirantaṇ viharitvā punad eva Rājagahaṇ paccāgacchi. Atha kho āyasmā Ānando sambahulānaṇ bhikkhūnaṇ cīvarāni saṇvidahitvā yena bhagavā ten' upasaṅkami. . . .

Does not the thought obtrude itself that the compiler of the episode in C.V. xi. 13, 14, had it suggested to him by

M.V. viii. 12, especially if, as I believe, he simply copied what he had himself written? To complete the details of the same he would have to draw suggestions from the following chapters in the M.V., where there is a series of particulars concerning bhikkhus' clothing: In M.V. viii. 13, 6, the Buddha proscribes: 'na bhikkhave atirekacīvaraṃ dhāretabbāṃ.' 'Ye shall not, brethren, wear an extra suit of robes.' And in viii. 24, 3: Tena kho pana samayena aññataro bhikkhu utukālaṃ eko vasi. Tattha manussā sanghassa demā ti cīvarāni adaṃsu. Atha kho tassa bhikkhuno etad ahosi: bhagavatā paññattaṃ catu-vaggo pacchimo sangho ti, ahaṃ c'amhi ekako, ime ca manussā sanghassa demā ti cīvarāni adaṃsu . . . bhikkhū bhagavato etam atthaṃ ārocesuṃ. Anujānāmi bhikkhave sammukhībhūtena sanghena bhājetuṃ.

'Now at that time a certain bhikkhu spent the rest of the year (besides the rainy season) alone.* The people then gave him robes, saying: "We give them to the Sangha." Then that bhikkhu thought: "It has been laid down by the Blessed One that the lowest number which can constitute a Sangha is four. Now, I am by myself, and these people have given the robes, saying: . . ." The bhikkhus told the matter to the Exalted One. "I prescribe, O bhikkhus, that you are to divide such robes with the Sangha (whether large or small in number) that may be present there."'

Not all the details fit in with my hypothesis, but that the two cases are related is inexpugnable; and that suffices to make the possibility of the one suggesting the other plausible. It may be said that C.V. xi. should not merely repeat and apply, but should form a complement on several points.

But that a literary reminiscence of this sort has really been efficient is rendered probable by another aperçu. In C.V. xii. 2, 3, the compiler stumbles once more against Ananda's rôle of clothes-receiver, and, in contrast to xi. 13*f.*, places this episode in the Buddha's lifetime. I refer to the

* Cf. Buddhaghosa, *apud* S.B.E. xvii. 236, n. 1.

attempt made by the Vajjian bhikkhus to bribe Revata and his attendant Uttara by presents of robes, etc. When both have declined to receive any with the words, 'I possess the triple garment,' they persuade Uttara: 'Manussā kho āvuso Uttara Bhagavato sāmaṇakaṃ parikkhāraṃ upanāmenti . . . no ce Bhagavā paṭigaṇhāti āyasmato Ānandassa upanāmenti paṭigaṇhātu bhante thero. . . .

'People used to offer such requisites to the Exalted One. . . . If he did not receive them, they used to offer them to the ven. Ānanda, saying, "Let the Pater Ānanda receive these requisites."'

If in chronicles of events purporting to be 100 years apart one and the same theme appears, it is not too bold an assumption that this arose, not from the event repeating itself, but either in the mind of the compiler, or on literary grounds. And besides the passages in M.V., it is possible that the memory of some organization for the reception of robes (cīvarapaṭiggāhaka), as in C.V. vi. 21, 2, may have been a factor. We cannot overlook the remark by King Udena: 'Kathaṃ hi nāma samaṇo Ānando tāva bahuṃ cīvaraṃ paṭiggahessati?'

Some details of this episode may well have been due to the influence of other passages in the Vinaya, such as the mention of uttarattharaṇas, bhummattharaṇas, and pādapuñchanīs, to that of Pāc. xiv. 2 (Vin. iv. 40); or that of uttarattharaṇa's, bhummattharaṇa's, and bhisicchavi's to that of Niss. vi. 2 (Vin. iii. 212); and tā . . . bhummattharaṇaṃ karissāma and tāni . . . pādapuñchaniyo karissāma *cf.* C.V. vi. 14: . . . 'tūlikaṃ vijatetvā bimbohanaṃ kātuṃ, avasesaṃ bhummattharaṇaṃ kātuṃ.' 'I allow you, O bhikkhus, to comb out the cotton of the mattresses, and make pillows of it, and to use all the rest as floor-covering.' Again, vi. 19: colakaṃ uppannaṃ hoti. 'Anujānāmi bhikkhave pādapuñchaniṃ kātuṃ.' Now at that time the Sangha had received . . . a colaka cloth . . . 'I allow you, O bhikkhus, to make foot-towels of them.'

Or, again, with *cikkhallena madditvā* cf. *cikkhallāṇ madditvā*, C.V. vi. 5, 1, and *Pārājika* ii. 1, 1 (Vin. iii. 41).*

It is, perhaps, no accident that, in C.V. vi. 5, 1, a tailor busies himself over this clay-preparation, since we know, from xi. 14, that, when mixed with shreds of stuff, the mortar gained in stiffness. Thus one passage dovetails with another, and the literary connexion becomes ever more probable through such details.

This clothes story is placed at Kosambī because the Ghositārāma, in which Channa dwelt, was near Kosambī. And Channa dwells there, because he does so in C.V. i. 25, 1: 'Tena samayena Buddho Bhagavā Kosambiyaṇ viharati Ghositārāme. Tena kho pana samayena āyasmā Channo āpattiṇ āpajjitvā . . .' Whoever is disposed to regard the Culla-vagga as history has some reason to wonder at the persistence with which Channa resides so long in that same park. Once these matters and personal touches are looked upon as constant literary types and artifices, there remains no room for wonder. Again, the appearance of the 500 Court ladies of King Udena of Kosambī is nothing surprising. Udāna vii. 10 shows that the Ghositārāma, King Udena, and his 500 wives are linked by a strong association of ideas: *Ekaṇ samayaṇ bhagavā Kosambiyaṇ viharati Ghositārāme. Tena kho pana samayena rañño Udenassa uyyānagatassa antepuraṇ daddhaṇ hoti, paṇca itthisatāni kālaṅkatāni honti.*

It remains only to consider the two central elements of either chapter in respect of their descent—the account of what was transacted at the two Councils. Do they, too, betray literary motives? The reply must be, Yes.

The following is a translation of the passage describing the first Council:

* Cf. also C.V. viii. 8, 2: 'Yo pacchā jantāgharā nikkhamati, sace jantāgharaṇ cikkhallāṇ hoti, dhovitaḅbaṇ': —'Whoso comes last out of the bathroom is to wash it out, if it be dirty (with lime).'

xi. 7: . . . The ven. Mahā Kassapa then said to the ven. Upāli: 'Friend Upāli, where was the first Pārājika promulgated?' 'In Vesālī, sir.' 'Concerning whom?' 'Concerning Sudinna, the son of Kalanda.' 'In regard to what matter?' 'In regard to sexual intercourse.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Upāli as to the matter, as to the occasion, as to the individual concerned, as to the rule, as to its supplement, as to who would be guilty, and as to who would be innocent of the first Pārājika. 'Again, Friend Upāli, where was the second Pārājika promulgated?' 'At Rājagaha, sir.' 'Concerning whom was it spoken?' 'Concerning Dhaniya, the potter's son.' 'In regard to what matter?' 'The taking of what had not been given.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Upāli as to the matter . . . of the second Pārājika. 'Again, friend Upāli, where was the third Pārājika promulgated?' 'At Vesālī, sir.' 'Concerning whom was it spoken?' 'Concerning different bhikkhus.' 'In regard to what matter?' 'In regard to (the murder of) human beings.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Upāli as to [all the particulars, as before], of the third Pārājika. 'Again, friend, where was the fourth Pārājika promulgated?' 'At Vesālī, sir.' 'Concerning whom was it spoken?' 'Concerning the bhikkhus dwelling on the banks of the Vaggumudā River.' 'In regard to what matter?' 'In regard to superhuman conditions.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Upāli as to [all the particulars, as before] of the fourth Pārājika. And in like manner did he question him through both the Vinayas, and as he was successively asked, so did Upāli make reply.

8 . . . And the ven. M. Kassapa said to the ven. Ānanda: 'Where, friend Ānanda, was the Brahmajāla spoken?' 'Between Rājagaha, sir, and Nālandā, at the royal resthouse at Ambalaṭṭhikā.' 'Concerning whom was it spoken?' 'Suppiya, the wandering recluse, and the young Brahmin, Brahmadaṭṭa.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Ānanda as to the occasion of the Brahmajāla, and as to the individuals concerning whom it was spoken. 'And, again, friend Ānanda, where was the Sāmaññaphala spoken?' 'At Rājagaha, sir, in Jīvaka's mango-grove.' 'In whose presence?' 'In the presence of Ajātasattu, the son of the Vedehī.' Thus did the ven. M. Kassapa question the ven. Ānanda as to the occasion of the Sāmaññaphala, and as to the individuals concerned. In like manner did he question him concerning the five Nikāyas, and as he was asked, did Ānanda make reply.

All the questions and answers referring explicitly to specific Pārājika statutes agree exactly with those which we find in the Pārājika Book, Vinaya, vol. iii. This gives us, strictly reckoned, a guarantee for the existence, at the time of the compilation of C.V. xi., of only the four first

Pārājikas out of the whole Vinaya. And even then it is only a guarantee that their skeletons existed. Nevertheless, it may be ungrudgingly admitted that if the questions and answers in C.V. xi. had all been given *in extenso* they would probably have revealed the contents of both Vinayas—that for bhikkhus, and that for bhikkhunīs.* But however much we may concede after this sort, there is nothing to be got out of C.V. xi. as a chronicle beyond what is always given in the fact of its existence; nothing that tells us anything positive over and above its relations with other documents. The very existence of C.V. xi., as a chapter at the end of the Culla-Vagga, Book IV. of the Vinaya,† establishes the fact that, when this chapter was compiled, the contents of the rest of the Vinaya books had already been compiled, no matter whether by the same, or by a different author. All that we need for the alleged revision of the Vinaya in C.V. xi. 7 is simply to assume a literary basis. And this suffices equally for the allusion to ‘Four Pārājikas,’ to ‘Thirteen Sanghādisesas,’ etc., in xi. 9. Here, too, we get along quite well without requiring to assume a historical fact—the fact, namely, of any Council to establish the text really having taken place. We may, indeed, go so far as to say that to come to a conclusion concerning form and diction of the texts, and to gain any feeling of certainty respecting the age and the genuineness of the texts as handed down to us, the assumption of any historical fact—the assumption that a revision of a register of contents actually took place—is of no importance whatever.

The assertions in xi. 8 as to the maintenance of the Dhamma are in precisely the same position. Taken strictly, only the first two Suttantas of the Digha Nikāya are catechetically determined, and these only as in a

* See, *e.g.*, Oldenberg, Z.D.M.G., 52, p. 618.

† The text is not preserved in the order indicated by its subject-matter, for it does not put, as it ought, the two volumes of the Sutta Vibhanga before the Mahā-Vagga and Culla-Vagga. Cf. also Oldenberg, Z.D.M.G., 52, p. 629.

register, with the Nikāya as we have it. But it does not follow that the whole of the Nikāya was present to the mind of the compiler. Nevertheless, from his ample exploitation of the Mahā Parinibbāna-Suttanta, a text taken from the middle of the Nikāya, we may credit his affirmation of the existence of 'the Dhamma' so far at least as the Dīgha-Nikāya is concerned. Further than this, as we shall presently see, blind confidence cannot take us. We must, it is true, go so far as to believe that in his time—and when that was we do not know*—there was known to be a division of the Dhamma into Five Nikāyas, and that there were other texts besides the Dīgha. He mentions Five Nikāyas, and we can believe him the more readily, in that relatively early epigraphical evidence testifies to their existence.† But just what is of most importance we do not learn, and that is, which texts, and of what form, were those called the Five Nikāyas? Of how little use such a mere framework title as this really is, we may see, for example, in the allusions to 'Vinaya,' 'Dhamma,' 'Sutta,' occurring in the very earliest texts of the Canon, and certainly not implicating all the contents as known to us. Cf., e.g., the above-given quotation from Dīgha xvi. 4, 8 (ii. 124). And how could the author of C.V., as not identified with the author of the last two chapters, have known a five-fold Nikāya which includes the Jātaka Book, when the Jātaka Book itself refers to the Culla-Vagga? In any case, however, the chronicler of C.V. xi. could perfectly well allude to the Dhamma and Five Nikāyas in virtue of his literary knowledge of them, whatever the contents as known to him may have been. But to make this possible, it is not necessary to assume that a revision and settlement of these texts did actually take place.

To come to the innovations, for the sake of which the second Council takes place, these are subsumed by the compiler of C.V. xii. (2, 8) himself, with explicit reference,

* Also, e.g., according to Kern's 'Manual of Ind. Buddhism,' p. 102, this was relatively late.

† Cf. also Oldenberg, Z.D.M.G., 52, p. 676.

under the rules of the 'Sutta-vibhanga,' and without naming the book, but with distinct particularization, under cases occurring in the Mahā-Vagga.* Here, then, again the possibility of a literary basis is beyond all doubt.

V. ON THE LITERARY DEPENDENCE OF
CULLA-VAGGA XI. AND XII.

The question of literary borrowing being admitted, it may be possibly asked whether the indebtedness is not on the other side? Does Dīgha xvi. refer to C.V. xi., xii.? So very little is known of the chronology of the Pali Canon that, considered by itself, the question is not less reasonable than the assumption of the inverse case. There is this, moreover, to support it, that the M. Parinibbāna-Suttanta does not impress one as an original work. The abrupt changes of subject, the numerical schemata,† recalling strongly the Anguttara-Nikāya and other features, are by no means a guarantee for the absolute authority of the work.‡ The Dīgha-Nikāya, nevertheless, is, if not the oldest, at least one of the oldest parts of the Canon. And of it the M. Parinibbāna-Suttanta is older than C.V. xi. xii. and has been the basis of both chapters. This is demonstrable by a comparison of the coinciding passages.

On the assumption that the Dīgha is the relatively original work, we easily understand why, in C.V. xi. 1, Subhadda's words, mentioned by Mahā-Kassapa, are transposed from their order in the Dīgha, by the reverse assumption it is less intelligible.

If the mutually conflicting injunctions of the Buddha concerning the treatment of precepts after his death (D. xvi. 1, 6, and 6, 3) had been originally related in C.V. xi. 9, they would not, in the Dīgha, have been stated in two separate passages, or rather, they would not have been stated without being mutually adjusted. The story, told

* Verified by Oldenberg himself in C.V. *loc. cit.*, which see.

† 1, 5 ff.; 1, 23 f.; 2, 2; 3, 13 ff.; 3, 21 ff.; 3, 24 ff.; 3, 33 ff.; 4, 2; 4, 7; 5, 8; 5, 12; 5, 16; 5, 18.

‡ Cf. also Introductory above, p. 3, 4.

in very general terms (D. xvi. 5, 20 ff.), of the visiting the dying Buddha by both sexes could not well have been elaborated out of the rebuke levelled at Ānanda (C.V. xi. 10) for his admission of women to the death-bed. On the other hand, a jealous monkish disposition might very well have found ground for a rebuff in the pre-existing story.

Again, had the string of rebukes uttered against Ānanda been the earlier compilation, the occasions for which he was rebuked would scarcely have been scattered about the borrowing compilation.

The application, in C.V. xi., xii., of the rule of etiquette respecting 'friend' and 'sir,' promulgated in D. xvi. 6, 2, is intelligible. But it is very questionable whether the compiler of *Dīgha* xvi., viewed as a later work, would, with all the complicated machinery of intitulation in C.V. xii., have stated the original injunction of the dying Buddha in terms so simple.

And so on. It is scarcely necessary to go over all such points to establish my case. Nor has it, indeed, ever been asserted or surmised that the author of D. xvi. made use of C.V. xi. Even if some of the congruent passages leave us vacillating, there are sufficient to establish the fact of literary dependence. A literary dependence! If the parallels hitherto published between the *M. Parinibbāna-S.* and C.V. xi. (none had been pointed out in xii.) have suffered the hypothesis that they rested on a basis of historical fact to stand,* the quantity of connected passages now brought forward should show that to be an impossibility. How is it intelligible that, out of the multitude of events in real history, by pure accident in two different compilations, each having an entirely different object, one and the same matter should come up so amazingly often, and in exactly similar words?

We saw in our introduction † that even the same work (*Dīgha*) treats of the same matter in two different places (xvi., xvii.) in a different style. Are we to suppose that two

* For me those few would have upset it.

† Above, p. 3, 4, n. 2.

different works may quite accidentally relate the same things in the same words? This is so incredible that Oldenberg himself, who at bottom upholds the historical theory, has established the derivation of the congruent passages in C.V. xi. from those in the M.P.S. But the settlement of this matter brings us to further important conclusions.

In the first place, to inquire into date, object, and procedure of the first two Councils as something historical is a question quite falsely put.

Our one original source of knowledge respecting them is C.V. xi., xii.* But these chronicles are elaborated out of *Dīgha* xvi. and other canonical passages. Hence the two Councils have for us only a literary existence, and only that, paradoxical as it sounds, because *Dīgha* xvi. exists. To seek a historical background is to make something merely literary into something actually real, and indicates a logical fallacy. To inquire into the date of the first Council is to inquire into a point of time later than the compilation of *D.* xvi. This *Suttanta* is a text of about 100 printed pages in length. And this text, quite apart from the probability of its being a secondary conglomerate, cannot have been compiled in less than one or two weeks after the Buddha's death, even if the inconceivable be held possible—namely, that the compiler set to work immediately. Hence to ask about the date of this Council is impossible, or at least irrational.

It is no less a catching at soap-bubbles to make out that a Council took place a few weeks after the Buddha's death, than it is to believe that the assumption of such an event is to be refuted on historical grounds. Had there been no pros and cons, both in tradition and in criticism, the matter need not have been held to be sufficiently real to be argued about at all. There is no need to accuse the compiler of C.V. xi. of having led us astray in regard to the date of a first Council. He neither says that what he describes happened in connexion with what happened at or soon

* On the northern Buddhist Councils, see Conclusion.

after the Master's death, nor brings about this misunderstanding by any ambiguities of phraseology. There is no point of time given in C.V. xi. when that may have taken place which we call the First Council. From the outset of the chronicle we are *in mediis rebus* in an assembly of bhikkhus, to whom Mahā-Kassapa is speaking. He tells—using, for the most part, words taken from Dīgha xvi.—of a conversation which he once had (*ekaṇ samayaṇ*), on a journey from Pāvā to Kusinārā, with an Ājīvaka and Subhadda. How long ago this was we do not learn. To assume that it was but weeks ago is unjustifiably arbitrary, and the 'once upon a time' betrays at least so much, that the compiler did not know precisely himself. But if it is contended that this '*ekaṇ samayaṇ*' was the stereotyped way of beginning a Sutta, and adopted from that customary style, then this only amounts to what I said before: that it is a literary idiom which excludes any idea of a definite, especially of a recent, point of time.

So much only is clear—that the compiler of the C.V. puts the event in the lifetime of M. Kassapa, Ānanda, and Upāli. In view, however, of the longevity of saintly personages, such as we meet with in C.V. xii. and repeatedly in the Dīpavaṅsa, this does not help us much to a more precise determination of date. And besides, anyone whose imagination is not bound by the historical, is entirely free to choose his own point of time.

But we may put all these possibilities on one side. The only question with which we are really concerned is: Does the Culla-Vagga give a date? Or, at least, does it let us infer a date, or does it not? The reply to this is, No! Herewith we are rid of the whole question as to its credibility. It is to Oldenberg's credit that, many years ago, in spite of other suppositions, he declared the First Council to be fictitious.* If I have here once more pronounced concerning a *res judicata*, I do so because Oldenberg's approximately correct conclusion, being drawn from false premises, needs new data if it is to stand.

* Vinayaṭṭaka, vol. i. xxvii., xxxi.

So far as I can see, it would be, for the canonical literature, but a gift of the Danaæ to have proved that it was settled at that 'First Council.' The remark made in C.V. xi. 11 would suffice, in that case, to wipe out the attribute of authenticity. Purāna, namely, when invited to approve of the revised Canon, answers: 'Friends, the Dhamma and the Vinaya have, by the consensus of the Theras, been well rehearsed (*susangīto*). Nevertheless I, even in such manner as it has been heard by me, and received by me from the very mouth of the Exalted One, will in that manner bear it in memory.'*

We may confront the chronicle of the 'Second Council' with even greater indifference. This is not only a merely literary construction; it does not even possess any relevant subject-matter. Whether such monkish steam as those ten puerilities was ever let off has little or no importance for the history of Buddhist literature. We do not hear whether, on that occasion, anything was done by way of settling the Canon, except from secondary sources.† That the prior existence of the Vinaya is attested is a fact that did not need the help of C.V. xii. The only point of interest about the chapter is the persuasion, both past and present, of the historical value of its contents,‡ and the conclusion that attaches thereto.§ We must go into the latter.

Oldenberg's keen eye detected the sharp line dividing most of the C.V. (i. to x.) from the last two books. C.V. x. gives an account of the founding of the sisterhood and of rules for the sisters. Books i. to ix. contain the rules for the brethren, a cleavage that is unquestionably made deliberately. But we may by no means conclude that the cleavage between x. and xi. is one between an actual work and its appendices.|| To me it seems fairly obvious that the compiler had a very different dividing line in his eye.

* Cf. already de la V. Poussin, *Muséon*, 1905, p. 250.

† Pointed out by Oldenberg (*e.g.*, 'Vinayapīṭaka,' i, p. xxx. ff.), and Kern's 'Manual, p. 106.

‡ Oldenberg, *ibid.*, p. xxix. § *Ibid.*, p. xxxv. ff.

|| See also Oldenberg, *Z.D.M.G.*, 52, p. 618, n. 1.

Books i. to x. treat of the life of the community during the Buddha's lifetime; xi., xii., of proceedings in the community after his death.* Where else could Book x. have been placed but where it is? And since hereby the only argument against the unity of scheme in the C.V. falls through, and since I can see, in the diction of the two groups of chapters, no support for the theory of a distinct origin, I cannot doubt that i. to x. and xi., xii. are by one and the same author. For it will be admitted by every one that, as a general principle, a work handed down as a unit is to be reckoned as such till its unity is refuted, or till there is good evidence to hold it as suspect.

Oldenberg, it is true, has not contented himself with one reason, but has given two more—reasons which I, too, bring forward separately because they were intended to prove something else.† He is of opinion that C.V. i. to x. must have been in existence some time before xi. was compiled, because the compiler of xi. believes that the whole Vinaya was edited, after the Buddha's death, at the First Council, and also because the first ten books of C.V. do not contain detailed precepts sufficient to quash the ten controversial theses; and yet there would certainly have been no delay in settling such adequate precepts if C.V. i. to x. was compiled at the same time as xii.—that is, after the Council at Vesālī.‡ This explanation suffers through those erroneous premises which I have been attempting in my article to

* Oldenberg, *Z.D.M.G.*, 52, p. 630, 'can scarcely believe' this, because the Suttapitaka follows no chronological order. This is true in more ways than his illustrations show. But if some works are not chronologically arranged, it does not follow that others are not. Anyway, the compiler of C.V. has certainly tried here to write chronologically. Besides, it is one thing to relate disconnected events, mixed with philosophical and dogmatic views, and another to bring together precepts for the life of a community, where the system is made to work in a definite period. In the former case chronological treatment is a detail; in the latter it is very important to know whether the statute was created by the Buddha himself, or by bhikkhus after him.

† *Vinayapitaka* i., p. xxxv.

‡ *Cf.* also *Z.D.M.G.*, 52, p. 630 *ff.*

confute. It is an error to say that C.V. xi. places the First Council immediately after the Buddha's death. And to assert that the historical nature of certain things ought to have led to their being mentioned, when this historical character is that which has to be proved, or rather, is unprovable, is to reason in a circle.* As to that setting back of the date of compilation of the Vinaya and of C.V. i. to x., the author of xi. sets it not only before the First Council, but even in the Buddha's lifetime. Now, if such claims proved anything, they would show that the antiquity of C.V. i. to x. is really much greater still.† As to the form, however, of these books, with which Oldenberg is, of course, mainly concerned, nothing by such a claim is established regarding their existence at the time of the First Council. And for this reason, that the alleged revision only consists in the rehearsal of a scanty register. Even in the earlier portions of the Vinaya, 'Vinaya' is always assumed as already existing. Moreover, to require of the one C.V. compiler that he should, already in the earlier chapters, have given precepts in detail adequate to meet the controverted matters in xii. would be giving an author prescriptions how to make his books. Possibly, it was a great enjoyment for him to be handling, in C.V. xii., particular cases which did not definitely come under any of the statutes of Books i. to x., ascribed to the Buddha himself. After all, we do not expect a dramatic author to spoil his plot for himself, his readers, his audience, by telling in the first act the events of the last.

We may, indeed, possibly find even in the earlier portions of C.V. and of the Vinaya traces of that influence of *Dīgha* xvi., to which I have said that we owe the existence of C.V. xi., xii. If so, we should add positive to the nega-

* Cf. also de la V. Poussin, *Muséon*, 1905, p. 302 f.

† Oldenberg, however, himself excludes such a view with the words (*Vinaya*, i., p. xxxv.): 'No reader of the Vinaya will hesitate to admit that this collection contains not an historical account of what Buddha permitted and forbade, but an account of what was regarded as allowable and forbidden at a certain period long after Buddha's time.'

tive proof of the author of the C.V. being but one person. Now Pārājika i. 7 seems to me to be due to the suggestion in D. xvi. 1, 4 (ii. 73-5). This passage, quoted already on p. 50, holds out to the Vajjians that their welfare depends upon their loyalty to the precepts. Pārājika i. 7 shows how the novices among the Vajjians disregarded the rules of the Order, and how, in consequence, they got into all sorts of trouble: Tena kho pana samayena sambahulā Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū yāvadattahaṃ bhuñjīsu yāvadattahaṃ supīsu yāvadattahaṃ nhāyīsu . . . methunaṃ dhammaṃ paṭisevīsu. Te aparena samayena ñātivyaśanena pi phutṭhā . . . rogavyāśanena pi phutṭhā āyasmantaṃ Ānandaṃ upasankamitvā evaṃ vādenti: na mayaṃ bhante Ānanda buddhagarahino na dhammagarahino, . . . attagarahino mayaṃ bhante Ānanda anaññagarahino. Mayaṃ ev' amhā alakkhikā mayaṃ appapuññā, ye mayaṃ evaṃ svākkhāte dhammavinaye pabbajitvā māsakkhimhā yāvajīvaṃ paripuññaṃ parisuddhaṃ brahmacariyaṃ caritvaṃ.

At that time many of the Vajjian Bhikkhus at Vesālī ate, slept, and bathed as it pleased each one . . . and permitted themselves sexual intercourse. Thereupon sorrows befell them and those related to them . . . and trouble through sickness. They went to the ven. Ānanda and said to him 'Lord* Ānanda, we make no reproaches to the Buddha, nor to the doctrine . . . we reproach only ourselves, none other. We are miserable sinners, in that, having been induced by a so excellently proclaimed Dhamma and Vinaya to renounce the world, we did not go on to perfection, and throughout our whole life lead the perfect, pure course of holiness.

The alleged opposition of the 'Six' to the recitation of the smaller and minor precepts (khuddānukhuddakehi sikkhāpadehi uddiṭṭhehi), in celebrating the Pātimokkha, may also show literary dependence on D. xvi. 6, 3, although there is no substantial warrant for this. But, on the other hand, it fits equally badly with

* The word 'bhante' itself speaks for Dīgha influences. See above, chap. ii.

the dying Buddha's ordinance in D. xvi. 1, 6,* to assume that the Buddha's prohibition of such opposition, at the end of the cited Pācittiya paragraphs, is original and genuine.

C.V. i. 28: Atha kho sangho Channassa bhikkhuno āpattiyā adassane ukkhepaniyakammaṃ akāsi asambhogāṃ sanghena. so . . . tamhā āvāsā aññaṃ āvāsaṃ agamāsi, tattha bhikkhū n'eva abhivādesuṃ na paccuṭṭhesuṃ . . . na mānesuṃ na pūjesuṃ.

So the Sangha carried out against Channa the Bhikkhu the Ukkhepaniya-kamma, for not acknowledging a fault, to the effect that he should not eat or dwell together with the Sangha. And . . . he went from that residence to another residence. And the Bhikkhus there did no reverence to him . . . and refused him . . . honour and esteem.

This passage seems to rest upon Dīgha xvi. 6, 4 (*cf.* above p. 17).

The forms of address in the Vinaya Pit show Dīgha influence, as I have pointed out above, pp. 29-32.

That the M.V. is later than Dīgha xvi., and dependent upon it, may be seen in the coincidence between M.V. vi. 28 *ff.* and D. xvi. 1, 19 *ff.* and 2, 1 *ff.* (ii. 84, 90). In the M.P.S. these two passages occur in their natural connexion, while in M.V., although it is a work that treats of the rules of the Order, their appearance is unexpected. †

CONCLUSION.

The Pali Canon offers thus no support, however modest, to the theory of the Councils. Hereby must we judge that theory. The Northern Buddhist Canon is not original, but is throughout derived from the Pali Canon (or from a sister-recension of it, but anyway, not from any more original, as yet undetermined tradition). If there are discrepancies in details, this is a common feature of any two exemplars of any literary work of ancient India. The handing on of texts was a flowing stream, and accuracy was for the Indian handing them on a thing inconceivable.

* See above, p. 49.

† Already pointed out by Rhys Davids, S.B.E. xi, p. xxxiv.

We are thus in a position to quote here and there from North Buddhist works features that look older than their equivalents in the Pali; but we can do no less from any work of the Pali Canon as compared with its equivalents in other works. Such discrepancies are manuscriptural, or, in the case of older oral tradition, quasi-manuscriptural nuances of deterioration or of more faithful retention, such as may be distributed to the disadvantage of the Pali Canon. The originality of the Pali Canon, as compared with the Northern, has been thoroughly established by Oldenberg.* Much has yet to be said on the more precise definition of the relations between the different recensions. In this connexion any more circumstantial discussion on recensions may be put aside. That which concerns us is whether, in that form of the Canon which the Northern Buddhists either translated or elaborated, the Culla-Vagga contained chaps. xi. and xii., and whether they occupied a corresponding place in that work. In view of Oldenberg's inquiry, there can about this be no room for doubt.†

If we compare the Dharmagupta chronicle of the two First councils, translated from the Chinese by Beal,‡ with C.V. xi. and xii., it is impossible, as I think, to get away from the conviction that we there have two versions of one and the same work, differently written down, and not two independent registrations of one and the same tradition.§ The Chinese version, I grant, contains in some passages more, in some less. But it is evident that the 'more,' for the most part, has been amplified from the M.P.S.,|| the Vinaya-piṭaka,¶ and the rest of the Canon.** The 'less'

* In the Z.D.M.G. 52, pp. 613 ff., and especially p. 652. With the relation between particular books certain other scholars have dealt in a similar way (e.g., Barth, *J. des Sav.*, 1899, p. 628).

† *Cf. loc. cit.*, pp. 648, 651, 653; Vinaya-piṭaka I., xxxiv., xlv., xlvii.

‡ Trans. of the Fifth Internat. Or. Congress, ii. 2.

§ The Chinese version, it should be admitted, is only a derived, and, at best, secondary work. It has certain features in common with the Tibetan version of the *Dulva*, hence we must assume the probable existence of an intermediate version.

|| Viz., in Beal, *op. cit.*, 13 f., 23 (= *Digha* xvi. 4, 22 ff.).

¶ In Beal, *op. cit.*, 25 ff.

** In Beal, *op. cit.*, 28.

consists of omissions. If we take the small residuum wherein the Chinese version has the advantage over C.V. xi, xii, and trace it back to the exploitation of a specific source, thus claiming for the former a higher antiquity, we should, for one thing, affirm that, before C.V. xi, xii. were compiled, the Abhidhamma-piṭaka was already existing and known. Whereas the non-existence of that Piṭaka is perhaps one of the safest historical conclusions to be drawn from C.V. xi. For the Dharmagupta narrative tells that at the First Council the Abhidhamma-piṭaka was also compiled.*

Beal's translation is, unfortunately, not sufficiently literal to enable us to decide whether the forms of address are analogously distributed in the Chinese report with the punctiliousness characterizing C.V. xi, xii. But so much is clear from the translation that the highest Thera at the Second Council, Sabbakāmi, is addressed by a specially reverential title, stated to be equal to mahābhādanta sthāvira.†

A consideration of the Tibetan version of Dulva yields similar results.‡ Here, however, we are much further from any prototype than in the Dharmagupta version. It would be scarcely correct to see, in those features where it differs, the basis for a reconstruction of some older tradition divergent from C.V. xi, xii., since it is easy to recognize its late origin in several peculiarities of the Dulva version. We find here, again, the false assertion that the Abhidhamma-piṭaka was in existence at the time of the First Council.§ It differs from both the Dharmagupta and C.V. in making Mahākāśyapa ask Ānanda concerning the Sūtranta, and then Upāli, concerning the Vinaya.|| This divergence is unquestionably not the older form of the

* Beal, *op. cit.*, 29.

† Beal, *op. cit.*, 38 ff. In Dulva, too, he is always addressed as *Sthāvira*, hence, anyway, not as 'friend.'

‡ See Rockhill, 'The Life of the Buddha,' London, 1884, 148 ff.

§ Rockhill, *op. cit.*, 156.

|| *Op. cit.*, 156, 158; also *Ann. du Musée Guimet*, ii. 196.

account, wherever we may look for the latter, for, since one Northern version (Dharmagupta's) and the Southern (C.V. xi.) agree that the Vinaya was first settled, this alone can be the correct order.

Equally false, and for the same reason, must be many of the questions relating to particular texts put by the Dulva into the mouth of Mahākāśyapa. A striking feature in the Dulva account, shared by neither of those other versions, is the admission of Ānanda to the First Council only in the character of water-server to the Council delegates.* We need not look far for the source of this statement. I know of two cases in the Pali Canon where Ānanda is dispatched by the Buddha to fetch water (D. xvi. 4, 22, *ff.* [ii. 128], and Ud. vii. 9). And in both Dharmagupta and the Dulva the episode in the former of these two passages furnishes yet another occasion for indignation against Ānanda. Hence Ānanda's function as a water-carrier was a familiar association of ideas, and easily hit upon by the compiler of the Dulva in the absence of a better idea.

From my point of view it does not matter at all whether our Pali recension of the Culla-Vagga, or, indeed, any version of the C.V., created and contained the original record of the Councils. But this one thing I should like to say against De la Vallée Poussin's preference for non-Sinhalese schools; and that is, that everything which we learn respecting their origin stands or falls with the trustworthiness of the oldest records of the Councils. And on these I have already expressed my opinion.

I am, of course, not competent to form a correct and adequate judgment as to the relations of the Northern versions to the Southern considered with respect to every detail, and it would not, therefore, beseem me to enlarge on this matter. But on this I may and must lay stress: 1. The Pali accounts of the two Councils are brought up in their place for quite special literary reasons which we now know. 2. The Northern Buddhist accounts of the two alleged First Councils are also contained in the Vinayapi-

* Rockhill, p. 150 *f.*

taka (and apparently for the most part in the corresponding part of it).*

This being so, † it seems to me that first and foremost two points will have to be demonstrated: that, in the first place, we miss, in the Northern records, those characteristic features which led us to conclude, in the case of C.V. xi. and xii., a literary dependence on the Southern Canon; that, in the second place, the Northern records, in spite of the close agreement there certainly is between their contents and those of the C.V. chronicle, have grown, independently of the latter, out of a common base-tradition. If these two points could be proved, then and then only would the Northern records merit consideration as self-dependent sources of history, and as noteworthy evidence for the Council-theory. In my opinion it is not likely that these two proofs will ever be established.

Still less importance, if that be possible, attaches to the alleged testimony of the *Dīpavaṅsa* to the councils. After what I have said in my Introduction, ‡ I need here only point out that the dependence of *Dīp.* ch. iv. on C.V. xii. is put beyond all doubt, when in the midst of the *Dīp.* verses there falls on our heads this prose sentence: 'Tena kho pana samayena vassasatamhi nibbuta bhagavati Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā Vesāliyaṇ dasa vatthūni dīpenti: kappati singiloṇakappo, kappati dvaṅgulakappo, kappati gāmantarakappo, kappati āvāsakappo, kappati anumatikappo, kappati āciṇṇakappo, kappati amathitakappo, kappati jalogiṇ pātuṇ, kappati adasakaṇ nisīdanaṇ, kappati jātarūparajatan ti' which reflects

* De la V. Poussin also testifies: 'La ressemblance ou l'identité des Vinayas Mahīśāsaka (Beal), Mahāsarvāstivādin (sources tibétaines) et pali, la légende des deux premiers conciles conservée dans ces diverses traditions.' (*Études et Matériaux*, 55). But these are the oldest schools.

† Although this is no indispensable condition for the certainty of my argument.

‡ Cf. Kern's critique of the *Dīp.* ('Man. of Ind. Buddhism,' 105, 107 ff.); also Barth (*J. des Sav.*, 1899, 531), who pronounces the *Dīp.* and the Northern records dependent on C.V. xi., xii.

in C.V. xii. 1, 1: 'Tena kho pana samayena vassasataparinibbute bhagavati Vesālikā Vajjiputtakā bhikkhū Vesāliyaṃ dasa vatthūni dīpenti: kappati singilonakappo . . . jātarūparajatan ti.'

The two accounts in C.V. xi., xii. are but air-bubbles. Those of the Dip. could not therefore well be anything else, even had the author not, in divers ways, done everything he well could to force their impossibility as history upon us. That he could so construe the statements in C.V. xi., xii. as he does, especially to make out, like the compiler of the Dharmagupta version,* that the decision to hold the First council at Rājagaha was made at Kusinārā, only shows that those two chapters had at an early date been misunderstood. Anyone who has been compelled to get a clear idea as to sense and coherence in the text of C.V. xi. 1 will know how much thought is required, and will not be surprised that misunderstandings should arise.

Regarding yet later witnesses to the two Councils, based not only on Dīgha xvi. and C.V., but also on the Dip.—Buddhaghosa and Mahāvamsa—comment is superfluous.†

The Third Council, alleged to have been held at Pāṭaliputta, does not come into the scope of scientific discussion, its oldest and best witness being the Dip. Only one point becomes salient in that testimony, and this is, that when the Dip. came into being, the Kathāvatthupparakaraṇa, and, indeed, all the Abhidhamma was in existence (Dip. vii. 41, 43, 56)—a matter that is sufficiently probable otherwise. On the other hand, we are not bound to believe that the Kathāvatthu was composed in the time of Asoka.

Oldenberg himself does not maintain that the allusions to particular texts in Asoka's Bhabra Edict is a proof of the existence of our entire Vinaya and Sutta-Pitaka.‡ As much may be said concerning the Bharhut inscriptions, etc. All that is proved is the existence of just what is named and depicted, nor even then does this involve the

* See in Beal, *op. cit.*, 17. † Cf. W.Z.K.M. xxi. 317 ff.

‡ Cf. Z.D.M.G. 52, p. 676.

text as we know it. But neither do I maintain that everything not so named or depicted is more recent. I only ask unrestricted freedom for the historical and comparative examination of the texts themselves.

This all had to be said sooner or later, so that we should not be eternally wrestling with phantoms. Phantoms may be really but air, and yet they have most effectively barred the way to the fruitful historical consideration of the gradual growth of our Pali Canon.

NOTE.—The quaint narrative, in C.V. xii. 2, 4, in which Revata and Sabbakāmī are made, from mutual politeness, to deprive each the other of his night's rest, is also rendered more intelligible, if C.V. xi. and xii. be regarded as model lessons in refined deportment. Moreover, the compiler had, in this case, too, a pattern in an earlier passage of the work: in C.V. vi. 13, 1, Upāli remains standing while he teaches, out of deference to his audience of theas; and the theas remain standing out of respect for the Dhamma, so that, in the end, both parties are sorely tried.

Translated by MRS. RHYS DAVIDS.