

Growth is their nature and decay:
They are produced, they are dissolved again:
And then is best, — when they have sunk to rest!⁷⁷

And they are explained by an orthodox commentator as follows:

“In these verses the words, ‘How transient are all component things!’ mean, Dear lady Subhaddā, wheresoever and by whatsoever causes made or come together, compounds,⁷⁸ — that is, all those things which possess the essential constituents (whether material or mental) of existing things,⁷⁹ — all these compounds are impermanence itself. For of these, form⁸⁰ is impermanent, reason⁸¹ is impermanent, [213] the (mental) eye⁸² is impermanent, and qualities⁸³ are impermanent. And whatever treasure there be, whether conscious or unconscious, that is transitory. Understand, therefore, ‘How transient are all component things!’

And why? ‘Growth is their nature and decay.’ These, all, have the inherent quality of coming into (individual) existence, and have also the inherent quality of growing old; or (in other words) their very nature is to come into existence and to be broken up. Therefore should it be understood that they are impermanent.

And since they are impermanent, when ‘they are produced, they are dissolved again.’ Having come into existence, having reached a state,⁸⁴ they are surely dissolved. For all these things come into existence, taking an individual form, and are dissolved, being broken up. To them, as soon as there is birth, there is what is called a state; as soon as there is a state, there is what is called disintegration.⁸⁵ For to the unborn there is no such thing as a state, and there is no such thing as a state which is without disintegration. Thus are all compounds, having attained to the three characteristic marks (of impermanency, pain, and want of any [214] abiding principle),⁸⁶ subject, in this way and in that way, to dissolution. All these component things, therefore, without exception, are impermanent, momentary,⁸⁷ despicable, unstable, disintegrating, trembling, quaking, unlasting, sure to depart,⁸⁸ only for a time,⁸⁹ and without substance; — as temporary as a phantom, as the mirage, or as foam!

Buddhism sees no distinction of any fundamental character, no difference, except an accidental or phenomenal difference, between gods, men, plants, animals and things. All are the product of causes that have been acting during the immeasurable ages of the past; and all will be dissolved. Of sentient beings, as we have seen in the third Lecture, nothing will survive save the result of their actions; and he who believes, who hopes, in anything else, will be blinded, hindered, hampered in his religious growth by the most fatal of delusions.

Is it not interesting, is it not strange, that this should be the teaching of the religion which numbers [215] more adherents than any other religion which has appeared upon the earth? To us it seems devoid of hope. Is it really so? Must we have a belief in some personal happiness that we ourselves are to enjoy here after? Is it not enough to hope that our self-denials and our struggles will add to the happiness of others? Surely we have even so a gain far beyond our deserts; for we receive more, infinitely more, than we can ever give. We inherit the result of the Karma of the countless multitudes who have lived and died, who have struggled and suffered, in the long ages of the past. And if we can sometimes catch a glimpse of the glories that certainly lie hid behind the veil of the infinite future, is not that enough, and more than enough, to fill our hearts with an abiding faith and hope

⁷⁷ The last clause is literally, Blessed is their cessation, where the word for cessation, upasamo, is derived from the word sam, “to be calm, to be quiet, and means cessation by sinking into rest.”

⁷⁸ Saṅkhārā.

⁷⁹ Khandāyatanādayo.

⁸⁰ Rupaṃ.

⁸¹ Viññānaṃ.

⁸² Kakkhuṃ.

⁸³ Dhammā.

⁸⁴ Thiti.

⁸⁵ Bhaṅgo.

⁸⁶ Aniccaṃ, dukkhaṃ, anattaṃ. See Jātaka, i. 275; and, on the last, Mahāparinibbāna Sutta, i. 10, and Maha Vagga, i. vi. 38–47.

⁸⁷ Khaṇikā. See Oldenberg’s note on Dīpavamsa, i. 53.

⁸⁸ Pāyātā, literally “departed”. The forms payāti and payāto, given by Childers, should be corrected into pāyāti and pāyāto. See Jātaka, i. 146.

⁸⁹ Tāvakālikā. See Jātaka, i. 121, where the word is used of a cart let out on hire for a time only.

stronger, deeper, truer, than any selfishness can give?

I do not know. But there is at least a poetry and a beauty in these things that may open our eyes a little to things we know not of, that may invite us to look into these matters a little further. We can at least rejoice that the cultivated world is beginning to enter upon the fruits of Oriental research in Indian matters, and that the habit of Western historians of considering all things at any distance from the basin of the Mediterranean as beneath notice, and of thus practically ignoring the existence of about two thirds of the human race, is beginning to be broken through. It would be useless to attempt to predict the measure of the [216] influence which this change of standpoint will eventually have upon our ideas of history: but it may be compared to the results which followed inevitably on the discovery that this earth was not the centre of the universe. And when we call to mind how closely intertwined are religious with historical beliefs and arguments, we may realize in some degree what effect may follow upon the unveiling of a long history of civilization, independent of Egyptian, Jewish or Greek thought; upon the curtain being drawn back from a new drama of struggling races and rival religions, filled with ideas strangely familiar and as curiously strange. It is not too much to say that a New World has been once more discovered by adventurers as persevering as Columbus, and perhaps at present earning as little gratitude as he did from his contemporaries; and that the inhabitants of the Old World cannot, if they would, go back again to the quiet times when the New World was not, because it was unknown. Every one to whom the entrancing story of man's gradual rise and progress has charms peculiarly its own, will welcome the new light; others will have to face the new facts, and find room for them in their conceptions of the world's history — that history which is the Epic of Humanity. Happy are we if the strains of that epic are ever ringing in our ears, if the spirit of that epic is ever ruling in our hearts! An abiding sense of the long past whose beginnings are beyond imagination, and of [217] the long future whose end we cannot realize, may fill us indeed with a knowledge of our own insignificance — the bubbles on the stream which flash into light for a moment and are seen no more. But it will perhaps bring us nearer to a sense of the Infinite than man in his clearest moments, in his deepest moods, can ever otherwise hope to reach. It will enable us to appreciate what is meant by the Solidarity of Man, and will fill us with an overpowering awe and wonder at the immensity of that series of which we are but a few of the tiny links. And the knowledge of what man has been in distant times, in far-off lands, under the influence of ideas which at first sight seem to us so strange, will strengthen within us that reverence, sympathy, and love, which must follow on a realization of the mysterious complexity of being, past, present and to come, that is wrapt up in every human life.

[218, 219]

APPENDIX.

[220, 221]

APPENDIX I.

Speech in Parliament in 1530 on comparing Religions in order to discover Truth. referred to above, pp. 4 – 6.

The speech referred to in the first Lecture was first pointed out to me in Cobbett's Parliamentary History, Vol. i p. 503, by my friend Mr. Allanson Picton It is there taken word for word from an older and anonymous work, now rare, entitled, "The Parliamentary or Constitutional History of England by several Hands", of which the second edition appeared in 1762. The speech is so interesting that I need make no apology for quoting it in full, with the context. The passage occurs in Vol. iii. of the earlier work, pp. 57 and foll.

"Many Abuses which the Laity received daily from the Clergy were loudly complained of; and the King, being now willing that they should be strictly inquired into, referred the Redress thereof to the Commons in the Parliament. Complaints also being made in that House⁹⁰ against exactions for Probates of Testimonies and Mortuaries; for Pluralities, Non-residence, and against Priests that were Farmers of Lands, Tanners, Woolbuyers, &c., the Spirituality were much offended at these Proceedings; and when the Bills for regulating these Exorbitances were brought before the House of Lords, John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, made a remarkable Speech against them. As the Design of these Inquiries is to preserve an exact Impartiality, we shall give this Speech verbatim; as it is printed in a small Treatise on the Life and Death of that Prelate.⁹¹

[222] 'My Lords,

Here are certain Bills exhibited against the Clergy, wherein there are Complaints made against the Viciousness, Idleness, Rapacity, and Cruelty of Bishops, Abbots, Priests, and their Officials. But, my Lords, are all vicious, all idle, all ravenous and cruel Priests, or Bishops? And, for such as are such, are there not Laws provided already against such? Is there any Abuse that we do not seek to rectify? Or, can there be such a Rectification as that there shall be no Abuses? Or, are not Clergymen to rectify the Abuses of the Clergy? Or, shall men find Fault with other Mens Manners, while they forget their own; and punish where they have no Authority to correct? If we be not executive in our Laws, let each Man suffer Delinquency; or, if we have not Power, aid us with your Assistance, and we shall give you Thanks. But, my Lords, I hear there is a Motion made, that the small Monasteries should be given up into the King's Hands, which makes me fear that it is not so much the Good as the Goods of the Church that is looked after. Truly, my Lords, how this may sound in your Ears I cannot tell, but to me it appears no otherwise, than as if our Holy Mother the Church were to become a Bondmaid, and now brought into Servility and Thralldom; and, by little and little, to be quite banished out of those Dwelling Places, which the Piety and Liberality of our Forefathers, as most bountiful Benefactors, have conferred upon her. Otherwise, to what tendeth these portentous and curious Petitions from the Commons? To no other Intent or Purpose, but to bring the Clergy in Contempt with the Laity, that they may seize their Patrimony. But, my Lords, beware of yourselves and your Country; beware of your Holy Mother the Catholic Church; the People are subject to Novelty, and Lutheranism [223] spreads itself amongst us. Remember Germany and Bohemia, what Miseries are befallen them already, and let our Neighbours Houses that are now on Fire teach us to beware of our own Disasters. Wherefore, my Lords, I will tell you plainly what I think; that, except ye resist manfully, by your Authorities, this violent Heap of Mischiefs offered by the Commons, you shall see all Obedience first drawn from the Clergy, and secondly from yourselves; and if you search, into the true Causes of all these

⁹⁰ These Complaints were drawn up into six Articles, and are in Fox's Acts and Monuments, Vol. ii. p. 907 (edit. 1595).

⁹¹ The Life and Death of John Fisher, Bishop of Rochester, &c., by Dr. Thos. Bailey (12mo, London, 1655; reprinted, 1739).

Mischiefs which reign amongst them, you shall find that they all arise through Want of Faith.’

The same Authority⁹² tells us, that this Speech pleased or displeased several of the House of Lords, as they were diversly inclined to forward or flatter the King’s Designs. But, amongst them all, none made a Reply to it but only the Duke of Norfolk, who said to the Bishop,

‘My Lord of Rochester, Many of these Words might have been well spared; but I wist it is often seen that the greatest Clerks are not always the wisest men.’

To which the Bishop replied:

‘My Lord, I do not remember any Fools in my Time that ever proved great Clerks.’

When the Lower House heard of this Speech, they conceived so great Indignation against the Bishop that they immediately sent their Speaker, Audley, attended with a Number of the Members, to complain of it to the King; and to let his Majesty know ‘how grievously they thought themselves injured thereby, for charging them with Lack of Faith, as if they had been Infidels or Heretics, &c.’

To satisfy the Commons, the King sent for the Bishop of Rochester to come before him; when, being present, the King demanded of him, why he spoke in such a Manner? The Prelate answered, ‘That, being in Parliament, he spake his Mind freely in Defence of the Church, which he saw daily injured and oppressed [224] by the common People, whose Office it was not to Judge of her Manners, much less to reform them; and therefore, he said, he thought himself in Conscience bound to defend her in all that lay within his Power.’ However, the King advised him ‘to use his Words more temperately another Time,’ which was all he then said to him.

But the Injury the Commons thought they had received, by this reflection, was not so easily digested; for one of the Members, making Use of the Gospel Doctrine so far, says the Noble Historian,⁹³ as to take a reasonable Liberty to Judge of Things, and, being piqued at the Bishop for laying it all on Want of Faith, stood up in that House, and spoke to this effect:

‘Mr. Speaker,

If none else but the Bishop of Rochester, or his Adherents, did hold this Language, it would less trouble me; but since so many religious and different Sects, now conspicuous in the whole World, do not only vindicate unto themselves the Name of the true Church, but labour betwixt Invitations and Threats, for nothing more than to make us resign our Faith to a simple Obedience, I shall crave Leave to propose what I think fit in this Case for us Laiques and Secular Persons to do; not that I will make my Opinion any Rule to others, when any better Expedient shall be offered, but that I would be glad we considered hereof, as the greatest Affair that doth or may concern us.

For if, in all human Actions, it be hard to find that Medium, or even Temper, which may keep us from declining into Extremes, it will be much more difficult in religious Worship; both as the Path is supposed narrower, and the Precipices more dangerous on every side. And because each Man is created by God a free Citizen of the World, and obliged to nothing so much as the Inquiry of those Means by which he may attain his everlasting Happiness, it will be fit to examine to whose Tuition and Conduct he commits himself. For as several Teachers not only differing [225] in Language, Habit, and Ceremony, or at least in some of these, but peremptory and opposite in their Doctrines, present themselves, much Circumspection must be used: Here then, taking his Prospect, he shall find these Guides directing him to several Ways, whereof the first extends no further than to the Laws and Religions of each Man’s native Soil or Diocese, without passing those Bounds. The second, reaching much further, branches itself into that Diversity of Religions and Philosophies, that not only are, but have been extant in former Times, until he be able to determine which is best. But, in either of these, no little Difficulties will occur: For, if each Man ought to be secure of all that is taught at home, without inquiring further, how can he answer his Conscience? When looking abroad, the Terrors of everlasting Damnation shall be denounced on him, by the several Hierarches and visible Churches of the World, if he believes any Doctrine but theirs. And that, amongst these again, such able and understanding Persons may be found, as in all other Affairs will equal his Teachers. Will it be fit that he believe God hath inspired his own Church and Religion only, and deserted the rest, when yet Mankind is so much of one Offspring, that it hath not only the same *Pater Communis* in God, but is come all from the same carnal Ancestors? Shall each Man, without more Examination, believe his Priests in what Religion soever; and, when he hath done, call their Doctrine his Faith? On the other Side, if he must argue Controversies before he can be satisfied, how much Leisure must he obtain? How much Wealth and Substance must he consume? How many Languages must he learn? And how many Authors must he read? How many Ages must he look into? How many Faiths must he examine? How many Expositions must he confer, and how many Countries must he wander into, and how many Dangers must he run? Briefly, would not our Life, on these Terms, be a perpetual Peregrination, while each Man posted into the other’s Country to learn the Way to Heaven, without yet that he could say at last he had known or tried all? What remains then to be done? Must he take all [226] that

⁹² The abovementioned Life of Fisher.

⁹³ Lord Herbert’s Life of Henry VIII, p. 295.

each Priest, upon Pretence of Inspiration, would teach him, because it might be so; or may he leave all, because it might be otherwise? Certainly, to embrace all Religions, according to their various and repugnant Rites, Tenets, Traditions, and Faiths, is impossible, when yet in one Age it were not possible, after incredible Pains and Expences, to learn out and number them. On the other Side, to reject all Religions indifferently is as impious, there being no Nation that in some Kind or other doth not worship God, so that there will be a Necessity to distinguish. Not yet that any Man will be able, upon Comparison, to discern which is the perfectest among the many professed in the whole World, each of them being of that large Extent, that no Man's Understanding will serve to comprehend it in its uttermost Latitude and Signification: But, at least, that every Man might vindicate and sever, in his particular Religion, the more essential and demonstrative Parts from the rest, without being moved so much at the Threats and Promises of any other Religion that would make him obnoxious, as to depart from this Way, there being no ordinary Method so intelligible, ready, and compendious, for conducting each Man to his desired End. Having thus therefore recollected himself, and together implored the Assistance of that Supreme God whom all Nations acknowledge, he must labour, in the next place, to find out what inward Means his Providence hath delivered to discern the true not only from the false, but even from the likely and possible, each of them requiring a peculiar Scrutiny and Consideration: Neither shall he fly thus to particular Reason, which may soon lead him to Heresy; but, after a due Separation of the more doubtful and controverted Parts, shall hold himself to common, authentic, and universal Truths, and consequently inform himself, what in the several Articles proposed to him is so taught, as it is first written in the Heart, and together delivered in all the Laws and Religions he can hear of in the whole World: This certainly can never deceive him, since therein he shall find out how far the Impressions of God's Wisdom and Goodness are extant in all Mankind, [227] and to what Degrees his universal Providence hath dilated itself while thus ascending to God by the same Steps he descends to us, he cannot fail to encounter the Divine Majesty.

Neither ought it to trouble him if he finds these Truths variously complicated with Difficulties or Errors; since, without insisting on more Points than what are clearly agreed on every Side, it will be his Part to reduce them into Method and Order; which also is not hard, they being but few, and apt to Connection: So that it will concern our several Teachers to initiate⁹⁴ us in this Doctrine, before they come to any particular Direction⁹⁵ lest otherwise they do like those who would persuade us to renounce Daylight to study only by their Candle. It will be worth the Labour, assuredly, to inquire how far these universal Notions will guide us, before we commit ourselves to any of their abstruse and scholastic Mysteries, or supernatural and private Revelations; not yet but that they also may challenge a just Place in our Belief, when they are delivered upon warrantable Testimony; but that they cannot be understood as so indifferent and infallible Principles for the Instruction of all Mankind.

Thus, among many supposed inferior and questionable Deities worshipped in the four Quarters of the World, we shall find one Chief so taught us, as above others to be highly revered.

Among many Rites, Ceremonies, Volumes, &c., delivered us as Instruments or Parts of his Worship, he shall find Virtue so eminent, as it alone concludes and sums up the rest. Insomuch as there is no Sacrament which is not finally resolved into it; good Life, Charity, Faith in, and Love of, God, being such necessary and essential Parts of Religion, that all the rest are finally closed and determined in them.

Among the many Expirations, Lustrations, and Propitiations for our Sins, taught in the several Quarters of the World in sundry Times, we shall find that none doth avail without hearty Sorrow for our Sins, and a true Repentance towards God, whom we have offended.

And, lastly, amidst the divers Places and Manners of Reward [228] and Punishment, which former Ages hath delivered, we shall find God's Justice and Mercy not so limited, but that he can extend either of them even beyond Death, and consequently recompense or chastise eternally.

These, therefore, as universal and undoubted Truths, should, in my Opinion, be first received; they will at least keep us from Impiety and Atheism, and together lay a Foundation for God's Service and the Hope of a better Life: Besides, it will reduce Men's Minds from uncertain and controverted Points, to a solid Practice of Virtue; or, when we fall from it, to an unfeigned Repentance and Purpose, thro' God's Grace, to amend our sinful Life, without making Pardon so easy, cheap, or mercenary as some of them do. Lastly, it will dispose us to a General Concord and Peace; for, when we are agreed concerning the eternal Causes and Means of our Salvation, why should we so much differ for the rest? Since as these Principles exclude nothing of Faith or Tradition, in what Age or Manner soever it intervened, each Nation may be permitted the Belief of any pious Miracle that conduceth to God's Glory; without that, on this Occasion, we need to scandalize or offend each other. The Common Truths in Religion, formerly mentioned, being firmer Bonds of Unity, than that any Thing emergent out of Traditions, whether written or unwritten, should dissolve them; let us therefore establish and fix these Catholic or universal Notions; they will not hinder us to believe whatsoever else is faithfully taught upon the Authority of the Church. So that whether the Eastern, Western, Northern, or Southern Teachers, &c., and particularly whether my Lord of

⁹⁴ Sic lege for imitate.

⁹⁵ Query, lege doctrine.

Rochester, Luther, Eccius, Zuinglius, Erasmus, Melancthon, &c., be in the Right, we Laiques may so build upon these Catholic and infallible Grounds of Religion, as whatsoever Superstructures of Faith be raised, these Foundations yet may support them.’

This Speech was differently taken also by those who were still Friends or Enemies to the Church of Rome. However, the Majority being of the latter Opinion, a Reformation in Religion was resolved upon, as far as was consistent with the established Laws of the Kingdom.’

APPENDIX II.

Religious Liberty and Toleration as held by the early Buddhists.

In support of the allegation in the note to p. 4, I annex here some passages which illustrate the views on respect for the opinions of others held generally by Buddhists about two thousand years before religious liberty was advocated by isolated thinkers in Europe.

1. Brahma-jāla Sutta.

The following words are placed, at the commencement of the Sutta, in the mouth of Gotama. The Sutta is the first in the Dīgha Nikāya, and is probably one of the very oldest statements of the Buddhist Dhamma, or Doctrine, now extant. It is still much read, and very popular among the orthodox Buddhists.

“Should those who are not with us, Bliikkhus, speak in dispraise of me, or of the Dhamma, or of the Saṅgha, you are not on that account to give way to anger, heartburning or discontent. Should those who are not with us, Bhikkhus, speak in dispraise of me, or of the Dhamma, or of the Saṅgha, if you were on that account to be either enraged or displeased, it is you (not they) upon whom the danger would fall; for would you then be able to discriminate whether what they had spoken was right or wrong?

“Not so, Lord!” was the reply.

“Should people so speak, Bhikkhus, you should explain anything incorrect in what is said as being incorrect, and should say, ‘This is not correct; this is not so; this exists not among us, is not found in us!’”

2. Asoka’s Seventh Edict.

On Asoka’s inscriptions it is sufficient to refer the reader to M. Senart’s important work, entitled, *Les Inscriptions de Piyadasi*, where all the former authorities are quoted. The seventh Edict runs as follows:

“King Piyadasi, beloved of the gods, desires that all the sects should dwell (at liberty) in all places. They all indeed seek (equally) after the subjugation (of one’s self) and purity of heart: though the people are fickle in their aims and fickle in their attachments. They may pursue, either in part or in whole, the aim they set before them. And let everyone, whether he receive abundant alms or not, have self-control, purity of heart, thankfulness, and firmness of love. That is always excellent.

3. Asoka’s Twelfth Edict.

“King Piyadasi, beloved of the gods, honours all sects, both recluses and laymen: he honours them with gifts and with every kind of honour. But the beloved of the gods attaches not so much weight to alms and honours as to (the desire) that the good name and (the moral virtues which are) the essential part of the teaching of all sects may increase. Now the prosperity of this essential part of the teaching of all the sects (involves), it is true, great diversity. But this is the one foundation of all, (that is to say) moderation in speech; that there should be no praising of one’s own sect and decrying of other sects; that there should be no depreciation (of others) without cause, but, on the contrary, a rendering of honour to other sects for whatever cause honour is due. By so doing, both one’s own sect will be helped forward, and other sects will be benefited; by acting otherwise, one’s own sect will be destroyed in injuring others. Whosoever exalts his own sect by decrying others, does so doubtless out of love for his own sect, thinking to spread abroad the fame thereof. But, on the contrary, he inflicts the more an injury upon his own sect. Therefore is concord the best, in that all should hear, and love to hear, the doctrines [231] (Dhamma) of each other. Thus is it the desire of the beloved of the gods that every sect should be well instructed, and should (profess) a religion that is lovely. So that all, whatever their belief, should be persuaded that the beloved of the gods attaches less weight to alms and to honours than to the desire that the good name, and the moral virtues which are the essential part of the teaching of all sects, may increase. To this end do the ministers of religion everywhere strive, and the officers placed over women, and the inspectors, and the other officials. And this is the fruit thereof; namely, the prosperity of his own sect and the exaltation of religion generally.”

There is no record known to me in the whole of the long history of Buddhism, throughout the many countries where its followers have been for such lengthened periods supreme, of any persecution by the Buddhists of the followers of any other faith.

PĀLI TEXT SOCIETY.

COMMITTEE OF MANAGEMENT.

Hon. Treasurer — W. W. Hunter, Esq., C.I.E., LL.D.*Hon. Secretary* — U. B. BRODRIBB, Esq., B.A., 3, Brick Court, Temple, E.C.

Professor FAUSBÖLL.

Dr. MORRIS.

Dr. OLDENBERG.

M. EMILE SENART.

T. W. RHYS DAVIDS, *Chairman*.(*With power to add workers to their number.*)*Bankers* — LONDON JOINT-STOCK BANK, Princes Street, E. C.

A Pāli Text Society has been started on the model of the Early English Text Society, in order to render accessible to students the rich stores of the earliest Buddhist literature now lying unedited and practically unused in the various MSS. scattered throughout the Public and University Libraries of Europe.

The historical importance of these Texts can scarcely be exaggerated, either in respect of their value for the history of folklore, or of religion, or of language. It is already certain that they were all put into their present form within a very limited period, probably extending to less than a century and a half (about B.C. 400 – 250). For that period they have preserved for us a record, quite uncontaminated by any outside influence, of the every-day beliefs and customs of a people nearly related to ourselves, just as they were passing through the first stages of civilization. They are our best authorities for the early history of that interesting system of religion so nearly allied to some of the latest speculations among ourselves, and which [233] has influenced so powerfully, and for so long a time, so great a portion of the human race — the system of religion which we now call Buddhism. And in the history of speech they contain unimpeachable evidence of a stage in language midway between the Vedic Sanskrit and the various modern forms of speech in India. The sacred books of the early Buddhists have preserved to us the sole record of the only religious movement in the world's history which bears any close resemblance to early Christianity; and it is not too much to say that the publication of this unique literature will be no less important for the study of history, and especially of religious history, than the publication of the Vedas has already been.

When we call to mind the passionate patience with which well-worn and less important studies are pursued among us, it is matter for wonder that a nearly unworked mine, where the nuggets of gold can still be gathered on the surface, should thus far have remained neglected. But there is no endowment of research among us. The well-worn studies afford the means of livelihood; and scholars may well be excused for preferring work that brings immediate reward, to embarking in difficult and untried undertakings. There has also been hitherto a want of reliable MSS. in Europe from which to edit Pāli texts. But this difficulty is now very nearly overcome; and during the last few years the number of scholars who have turned their attention to Pāli has considerably increased.

The Society can now therefore look forward to publishing, within a no very distant period, the whole of the texts of the Sutta and Abhidhamma Piṭakas. Professor Fausböll having completed the Dhammapada, is already far advanced with his edition of the Jātaka Book, the longest of the texts of the Sutta Piṭaka; and Dr. Oldenberg has the Vinaya Piṭaka well in hand. The remaining texts of the Piṭakas lend themselves easily to distribution among various editors. The project has been most heartily welcomed by scholars throughout Europe; and Professor Fausböll and Dr. Oldenberg (when their present undertakings are completed), Dr. Morris, Dr. Trenckner, Dr. Thiessen, Dr. Frankfurter, Dr. Hultsch, Professor Ernst Kuhn, Professor Pischel, Dr. Edward Müller, Professor Windisch, [234] Professor H. Jacobi, M. Léon Feer, M. Senart, Professor Kern, Professor Lanman, and Mr. Rhys Davids, have already pledged themselves to take part in the undertaking.

It is proposed to include in the Society's series those of the more important of the earlier Jain and uncanonical Buddhist texts which may be expected to throw light on the religious movement out of which the Piṭakas also arose.

Analyses in English of the published Texts, Introductions to them, Catalogues of MSS., Indices, Glossaries, and Notes and Queries on early Buddhist History, will appear from time to time in the Society's Journal.

Later on, the Society hope also to publish Translations of all the texts not elsewhere translated. But the series of translations from the Sacred Books of the East, now being published at Oxford under the editorship of Professor Max Müller, has already found room for a version of the greater part of the Vinaya Piṭaka, and will find room for others. The Society desires to be strictly subservient to that series, and will only deal, in the way of translation, with those books which do not appear in the Sacred Books of the East.

The twenty-six books of the Sutta and Abhidhamma Piṭakas are written in the Ceylon manuscripts on about 4000 palm-leaves. The Vinaya Piṭaka, as edited by Dr. Oldenberg, will be printed on about 1600 pages 8vo, and it occupies about 900 similar palm-leaves. About 7000 pages 8vo ought therefore to be sufficient for the whole of the work; and the cost of printing this quantity of Pāli text in Roman characters will be about £1750.

It is proposed to raise the sum in two ways. In the first place, the Subscription to the Society will be One Guinea a year, or Five Guineas for six years, due in advance. No charge will be made for postage; and this payment will entitle the subscriber to a copy of all those publications of the Society published during the year for which he subscribes. In the second place, it is hoped that persons who are desirous to aid the objects of the Society and who do not require to receive its publications, will give Donations, to be spread, if necessary, over a term of years. Though the Society [235] has only just been started, a very encouraging number of subscribers have already come forward, including many of the leading Orientalists and University Libraries in Europe; and this number will doubtless increase as the Society becomes better known. But although enough funds are already in hand to enable the Society to go to press with the first volume (which will appear early next year), it cannot hope to be able to depend entirely upon subscriptions. A number of donations, varying in amount from five to a hundred pounds, have already been paid or promised; but about £900 more, reckoning each present subscription at ten years' value, will be required if the undertaking is to be carried out to a successful accomplishment. Seeing that the distinguished scholars whose names appear in the above list are willing to work without pecuniary reward of any kind, it would be nothing less than a disgrace if such an object were allowed to fall through, in so wealthy a country as England, for so small an amount.

As the price to nonsubscribers will be about double the amount of the subscription, all intending subscribers are requested to send their subscription at once to the Honorary Secretary, with whom intending donors are respectfully urged to communicate without delay. *Bis dat qui cito dat.*

The following gentlemen have kindly consented to act as agents for the receipt of subscriptions:

Berlin — Professor OLDENBERG (Genthiner Strasse, No. 38).

Paris — M. ERNEST LEROUX (Rue Bonaparte, No. 28).

Ceylon — E. R. GUNARATNA, Esq. (Attapattu Mudaliyar, Galle).

Burma — J. A. BRYCE, Esq. (or in his absence, Henry Maxwell, Esq.), Rangoon.

Siam — HENRY ALABASTER, Esq., Bangkok.

America — Professor Lanman, Harvard University.

The principal contents of the first volume will be selected from the Thera- and Their-gāthā by Prof. Oldenberg, the Ācāranga Sutta by Prof Jacobi, the Mūla and Khudda-sikkhā by Dr. Edward Müller, the Dīgha Nikāya by Dr. Morris and Mr. Rhys Davids, and the Aṅguttara Nikāya by Dr. Morris. Prof Windisch has undertaken the Itivuttakam, Prof. Kern the Jātaka mālā, and Prof Lanman the Visuddhimagga.

APPENDIX IV.

References to Rebirth as an Animal in the Pāli Suttas.

In the Book of the Great Decease, i. 8, 9, 10, Gotama is said to have described to Ānanda a so-called Mirror of Truth, which, if an elect disciple possess, he can predict of himself that rebirth as an animal, or as a ghost, or in any place of woe, is rendered impossible for him. The Mirror of Truth is consciousness of faith in the Buddha, the Dhamma, and the Saṅgha; and the whole doctrine is allied to the Christian doctrine of the final perseverance of the saints.

The Pañca-gatiyo, or Five States into which the unconverted man can be reborn, are purgatory, the animal kingdom, and the condition of ghosts, gods and men. These Five States are referred to in several passages of the Suttas.

In the first Vagga or Chapter of the Sotāpatti-saṃyutta of the Saṃyutta Nikāya occurs the following passage :

“What though a king of kings, O Bhikkhus, who has exercised rule and sovereignty over the four continents, on the dissolution of the body, after death, be reborn into a happy state in heaven, into a state of union with the Tāvātīma Gods. And there, in the Grove of Delight, surrounded by crowds of houris, should pass his time in the possession and enjoyment of the five pleasures of sense. If he be not possessed also of the Four Qualities, he is not set free from (rebirth in) purgatory, or in the animal race, or as a ghost. He is not delivered, I say, from (rebirth in) evil states.

And what though a disciple who has entered upon the Excellent Way (an Ariya-sāvako) live upon morsels of food and in much [237] poverty. If he be possessed of the Four Qualities, he is set free from purgatory, and from life as an animal or a ghost. He is set free, I say, from (rebirth in) states of woe.

And what are these Four Qualities? They are faith in the Buddha, in the Dhamma, and in the Saṅgha, and the practice of those virtues which are unbroken, intact, unspotted, unblemished; which make men free, and are praised by the wise; which are untarnished (by the desire after a future life, or by a belief in the efficacy of outward acts); and which are conducive to high and holy thoughts.”

The last clause is one of the stock descriptions of the higher life of the morality of the Noble Path. Compare the Book of the Great Decease, i. 11, above, p. 31.

Origen on Metempsychosis.

I am indebted to my father for the following note on Origen's references to Metempsychosis.

Palladius of Cæsareia, who suffered martyrdom A.D. 309, in his "Apology for Origen", which, with the exception of a few fragments, only survives in a translation made by Rufinus of Aquileia (died A.D. 410), thus explains the position taken up by the great Alexandrian upon the subject:

"The most recent charge is that of [Greek] (trans-incorporation), that is, the transmutation of souls. To which, as we have done with regard to other charges, we will reply in his own words." He then quotes Origen as saying, "But these things, so far as we are concerned, are not dogmata but spoken of for the sake of discussion, and that they may be rejected,"⁹⁶ [239] and proceeds to allege four other passages from his writings in proof that he really held them to be false.

1. From Origen's seventh book on the Gospel according to Matthew: Some, indeed, have been of the opinion that the soul of Elias was the same as that of John, because it is said He is Elias which was to come. For since he said He is Elias, they thought that it could not be referred to anything else than his soul; and, from this saying alone almost, they brought in the dogma of [Greek], that is, the transmutation of souls, as if Jesus himself were confirming this. But it ought to have been seen that, if this were true, something similar should be found in many writings of the Prophets and the Gospels as well. . . . It should be added that, according to what they think, the transmutation of souls takes place because of sins; for what sins was the soul of Elias transmuted into John, whose birth was predicted by the very angel by whom that of Jesus was? How then is it not most evidently false, that he who was so perfect as not to even taste that death which is common to all, should come to a transmutation of soul, which according to their allegation cannot take place except because of sins?"⁹⁷

2. From the eleventh book of the same work, where Origen alleges that the opinion that "souls are passed over from human bodies into the bodies of animals", to be that of those who are "strangers to the catholic faith", and explains his own to be, "that as it is the virtue of the mind that bestows on any man that he may become a son of God, so it is evilness of mind, . . . that, according to the authority of Scripture, makes any [240] one to be called a dog"; and that "in like manner are the designations of other dumb animals to be understood."⁹⁸

⁹⁶ E.g. in Migne, *Patrol. Graec.* xvii. 608, and Routh, *Relig. Sacr.* iv. 383. The passage is probably taken from his *De Principiis*, i. 8, in Migne, u.s. xi., Rufinus's translation of which is thus rendered by Dr. Crombie in the *Anti-Nicene Christian Library*, x. 70: "We think that those views are by no means to be admitted which some are wont unnecessarily to advance and maintain, viz. that souls descend to such a pitch of abasement that they forget their rational nature and dignity, and sink into the condition of irrational animals, either large or small; and in support of these assertions they generally quote some pretended statements of Scripture, such as, that a beast, to which a woman has unnaturally prostituted herself, shall be deemed equally guilty with the woman, and shall be ordered to be stoned; or that a bull which strikes with its horns shall be put to death in the same way; or even the speaking of Balaam's ass, when God opened its mouth, and the dumb beast of burden, answering with human voice, reproved the madness of the prophet. All of which assertions we not only do not receive, but, as being contrary to our belief, we refute and reject." The original Greek is given by Migne (u. s.) from a letter addressed by the Emperor Justinian to Menas, Patriarch of Constantinople, A.D. 536-552. Rufinus, as usual, translates with great freedom.

It is to this passage in the *De Principiis* that Jerome refers in his letter to Avitus (*Ep.* 124, al. 59, c. i. s.f. in Migne, *Patrol. Lat.* xxii. 1063), where he quotes Origen much as Palladius has done according to Rufinus. The date of the letter is c. A.D. 410.

⁹⁷ C.x. in Migne, u.s. 609. This passage only survives in the translation of Rufinus.

⁹⁸ The original Greek is given in Migne, u. s. xiii. 963, and Routh, u. s. iv. 384. Tertullian discusses the same subject at great length, *De Anima*, c. 32: Now our position is this, that the human soul cannot by any means at all be transferred to beasts, even when they are supposed to originate, according to the philosophers, out of the substances of the elements. Now let us suppose that the soul is either fire, or water, or blood, or spirit, or air, or light; we must not forget that all the animals in their several kinds have properties which are opposed to the respective elements. There are the cold animals which are opposed to fire. . . . In like manner, those creatures are opposite to water which are in their nature dry and sapless. . . . So, again, some such creatures are opposed to blood which have none of its purple hue. . . . Then opposed to spirit are those creatures which seem to have no respiration. . . . Opposed, moreover, to air are those creatures which always live under ground and under water and never imbibe air. . . . Then opposed to light are those things which are either wholly blind, or possess eyes for the darkness only. . . . I maintain that, of whichever of the before-mentioned natures the human soul is composed, it would not have been possible for it to pass for new forms into animals so contrary to each of the separate natures, and to bestow an origin by its passage on these beings, from which it would have to be excluded and rejected rather than to be admitted and received, by reason of that original contrariety which we have supposed it to possess; . . . and then, again, by reason of the subsequent contrariety, which results from the development inseparable from each several nature."

[150]

APPENDIX VIII.

Plato on the Soul.

As this volume is likely to fall into the hands of readers in the East who may not be able to refer to the passage for themselves, I here add the context of the passage quoted above, pp. 95 – 97, from the Phædo:

“And this is the reason . . . why the true votaries of philosophy abstain from all fleshly lusts, and endure and refuse to give themselves up to them, — not because they fear poverty or the ruin of their families, like the lovers of money and the world in general; nor like the lovers of power and honour, because they dread the dishonour or disgrace of evil deeds . . . Therefore they who have any care of their own souls, and do not merely live moulding and fashioning the body, say farewell to all this, they will not walk in the ways of the blind; and when philosophy offers them purification and release from evil, they feel that they ought not to resist her influence, and whither she leads they turn and follow.

. . . The lovers of knowledge are conscious that their souls, when philosophy takes them in hand, are simply fastened and glued to their bodies: the soul is able to view real existence only through the bars of a prison, and not of herself unhindered; she is wallowing in the mire of all ignorance; and philosophy, beholding the terrible nature of her confinement, inasmuch as the captive through lust becomes a chief accomplice in her own captivity, — for the lovers of knowledge are aware that this was the original state of the soul, but that when she was in this state philosophy adopted and comforted her, and wanted to release her, pointing [251] out to her that the eye and the ear and the other senses are full of deceit, and persuading her to retire from them in all but the necessary use of them, and to be gathered up and collected into herself, and to trust only to herself and her own pure apprehensions of pure existence, and to mistrust whatever comes to her through other channels and is subject to vicissitude, — philosophy, I say, shows her that all her own nature is intellectual and invisible. And the soul of the true philosopher thinks that she ought not to resist this deliverance, and therefore abstains from pleasures and desires and pains and fears, as far as she is able; reflecting that when a man has great joys or sorrows or fears or desires, he suffers from them, not merely the sort of evil which might be anticipated, — as, for example, the laws of his health or property, which he has sacrificed to his lusts, — but an evil greater far, which is the greatest and worst of all evils, and one of which he never thinks.’

‘And what it that, Socrates?’ said Cebes.

‘Why, that when the feeling of pleasure and pain in the soul is most intense, all of us naturally suppose that the object of this intense feeling is then plainest and truest; but such is not the case. . . . And this is the state in which the soul is most enthralled by the body¹⁰⁵ . . . because each pleasure and pain is a sort of nail which nails and rivets the soul to the body, until she becomes like the body, and believes that to be true which the body affirms to be true; and from agreeing with the body and having the same delights, she is obliged to have the same habits and haunts, and is not likely ever to be pure at her departure but is always impeded by the body; and so she sinks into another body and there germinates and grows.

[252]

APPENDIX IX.

Further Note on the word Piṭaka.

In connection with the remark on p. 49, as to the use of the word Piṭaka, or Basket, for the Buddhist canon, it has been pointed out to me that Epiphanius of Salamis, the well-known Hæresiologist of the fourth century, entitled his great work [Greek], which is the Latin pannarium, originally used of a breadbasket, whence our English pannier. He, however, explains the sense in which he used the word by the addition, “sive capsulam medicum.” The parallel is curious and perhaps suggestive.

Schlagintweit informs us, in his Buddhism in Tibet (pp. 97, 98) that an image of one of the Buddhist Upāsakas, put up in the monastery of Gyungul, “carries a basket filled with the sheets of a religious book . . . This very ancient mode of using a basket for the palm-leaves . . . is said to be still in use in Tibet, the single volumes of larger works being put together into a common basket.” No information is given as to the age of the image, but it is certainly very late, perhaps a century or so old. I only quote the passage as evidence of modern Tibetan ideas on the subject.

¹⁰⁵ Rep. x. : Jowett, iii. 516 seq.

