Japanese Buddhism

Sir Charles Eliot

Japanese Buddhism

JAPANESE BUDDHISM

Sir Charles Eliot

With a Memoir of the Author by
Sir Harold Parlett

Edited and Completed by
G. B. Sansom

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group
LONDON AND NEW YORK

First published 1994 by Curzon Press Ltd.

Published 2014 by Routledge

2 Park Square, Milton Park, Abingdon, Oxfordshire OX14 4RN
711 Third Avenue, New York, NY 10017

Routledge is an imprint of the Taylor and Francis Group, an informa business

ISBN 978-0-7007-0263-3 (hbk)
ISBN 978-0-415-75987-8 (pbk)

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
A CIP record for this title is available on request from the British Library

CONTENTS

BOOK III. THE SECTS AND THEIR DOCTRINES.

Japanese Buddhism is complementary to Sir Charles Eliot's earlier work, *Hinduism and Buddhism*, which appeared in 1921.[1] It may be asked what influenced him in the selection of this particular field for investigation, why his choice did not instead fall on China, Tibet, Burma, or Siam, older adherents to the faith and closer to its cradle. A partial answer is perhaps to be found in certain advantages which Japan offered for his purpose. For although in all these countries alike a vast wealth of material existed,—canonical writings, exegetical literature, and the like,—the accumulation of centuries of patient and pious toil, not in every one was it equally accessible; and in China, in fact, it was scattered over a very wide area. In Japan, however, not only was this material available in a form both compact and complete; but also, owing to the insular position of the country, to its entire immunity from invasion, and to a practical isolation from the rest of the world extending over more than two hundred years, the practices, ritual, documents, and iconography of Mahayanist Buddhism had been preserved in singular integrity. To quote the author's own words, the Buddhism of Japan was "the lineal and recognized descendant of the creed held by Nâgârjuna, Vasubandhu, and Śântideva". Moreover, its history offered phenomena of peculiar interest to the student of religion in Europe,—the conflict between Church and State, the growth of protestant sects "casting aside ritual to offer the common man salvation by faith" or preaching national or universal religion, the evolution of an Established Church lapsing finally into comfortable torpor,—to mention only a few examples We may conjecture that these were all material factors in shaping his choice. To them might be added a deep and abiding interest in Japan itself and its people, the unique opportunities which his position offered for the collection of the data required, and, finally, the fact that he had been obliged, for reasons beyond his control, materially to abridge the section of his work on the religions of India devoted to the discussion of the history and development of Buddhism in Japan. For when Sir Charles Eliot wrote *Hinduism and Buddhism* he was still, so to speak, a private individual, responsible to none for his opinions or their expression; but before

[1] Published by Edward Arnold (1921). Reissued by Routledge & Kegan Paul (1954).

the moment arrived for its publication he had been appointed Ambassador in Tokyo; and, feeling that he was no longer a free lance, at liberty to write as he pleased, he decided that the chapters dealing with Japanese Buddhism must be drastically cut down and the subject treated only in the most general manner. The survey in *Hinduism and Buddhism* was therefore very brief. The material he had accumulated was nevertheless not to be lost; for he determined to make it the foundation of an entirely separate work, to be written in the distant future when his official connection with Japan should be severed.

It is on these rejected chapters, supplemented by a mass of additional information gathered during his six years' residence in the country, that *Japanese Buddhism* is based. The actual writing of it was begun in the autumn of 1926 at Nara, some months after his retirement, and, except for a brief interruption, when he turned aside to prepare two articles for the new edition of the Encyclopædia Britannica,[1] occupied most of his time till the spring of 1928. There followed a short visit to Europe; but early in 1929 he was back at work again in Nara; and by the close of the next year only the last chapter of the book, which deals with the Nichiren sect, remained unwritten. His task thus almost ended, he began to make arrangements to return to England, proposing to complete at home the final preparation of his MS. for the printer. But this was not to be. In December of 1930 he had a severe attack of influenza; and although he succeeded eventually in shaking it off, the disease had in the meantime wholly undermined a constitution never robust and already gravely impaired by another malady. He was thus really unfit to face the long and tedious voyage before him; but, despite the advice of his friends, he was determined to keep to his plans; and, accordingly, in February of 1931 he sailed from Kobe, travelling, as was his habit, via Suez in a Japanese steamer. At the start his health showed signs of improvement; but this, alas, was only momentary, and by the time the ship reached Singapore his condition had become so serious that it was clear to all that he would never live to reach his destination. Even then he insisted on continuing his journey. Two days later, on the 16th of March, he died and was buried at sea in the Straits of Malacca.

[1] He had already contributed to the 11th edition articles on Asia (History), Esthonia (in part), Hungary (language), the Tartars (in part), the Turks, etc.

It was at the close of the chapter on the Zen sect that he laid down his pen, not to take it up again. His executors have thus been faced with a dilemma. Must the book be published as it stood, incomplete, or should the missing chapter be added, written by another hand? It was decided after careful consideration that the latter was probably what he himself would have preferred; and thereupon Mr. G. B. Sansom,[1] of the British Embassy in Tokyo, who had read the manuscript in its draft form and had also supplied Sir Charles Eliot with a considerable amount of information on points relating to Japanese history and art, was asked to undertake the task. The last chapter is therefore his. He, too, has been responsible for the arrangement of the manuscript for the printer and, in particular, for the editing of the notes, many of which, as is indicated by marginal comments, the author meant to cut out entirely or greatly to abbreviate. The chapter headings and the index have been prepared under the superintendence of the publishers. It seems, however, almost superfluous to remark that *Japanese Buddhism* as it now leaves the printer's hands is not what it would have been had Sir Charles Eliot lived to complete it and to make those revisions he certainly contemplated; but at least it may be said that nothing has been added, nothing taken away, without careful study of all notes and other evidence which could be interpreted as showing his intention; and, except perhaps for two-thirds of the chapter on the Nichiren sect, the book is in his own words.

In the preparation of this work its author doubtless had frequent occasion to seek advice from friends and other scholars; but on this point our information is unfortunately incomplete. Among those, however, to whom he was certainly indebted are Professor Masaharu Anesaki and Professor Junjirō Takakusu,—those two great authorities on the religions and philosophies of the Far East,—Dr. Teitarō Suzuki, of the Ōtani University in Kyoto, the Reverend Kokai Kitagawara, of the Tōdaiji monastery at Nara, Professor Shōun Togao, of the Koyasan University, Mr. Sansom himself, as we have shown, and, last but by no means least, Mr. Shūten Inouye, of His Majesty's Consulate-General in Kobe. He must also have obtained much valuable material from the authorities of the innumerable temples and monasteries which he visited in the course of his travels in Japan; but here we have no names to guide

[1] Author of *Japan, a Short Cultural History*, the Cresset Press, London, 1931.

us. To all those friends, known and unknown, who helped him he would unquestionably have wished to express his indebtedness.

* * * * *

It is perhaps not unfitting that the preface of his last work should contain some account, however brief and imperfect, of the life and career of this great scholar and distinguished servant of the Empire.

He came of old and honourable stock, claiming on his father's side a distant kinship with two well-known houses of the west country,—St. Germans and Mount Edgcumbe,—and, on his mother's, descent from that Sir Thomas Wyatt, poet and courtier, who was sometime Ambassador of King Henry the Eighth at the Court of the Emperor Charles the Fifth and whose son, another Sir Thomas Wyatt, of name more familiar, died on the scaffold in the reign of Queen Mary. The family would appear to have remained through many generations closely connected with the county of its origin; but little is known of its fortunes. Towards the end of the eighteenth century, however, an Edward Eliot was Vicar of Maker, a village between Port Eliot and Mount Edgcumbe in Cornwall. His son Edward became a Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford, held for some years the post of Archdeacon of Barbados in the West Indies, then, returning to England, settled down finally as Vicar of Norton Bavant near Warminster in Wiltshire, a living in the gift of the Lord Chancellor. This Eliot in turn had a son, also named Edward, who, after a distinguished University career ending with a Fellowship at New College, decided to adopt the law as a profession, but, abandoning his intention before he had been called to the Bar, followed the family tradition and took Holy Orders instead. At Tredington in Worcestershire, where he was later curate, he fell in love with and married a very beautiful and clever girl, Elizabeth Harriet Wyatt Watling, the youngest daughter of the Rector of the parish. From Tredington the newly married pair went to live at Sibford Gower, a small independent cure in Oxfordshire; and, here, on the 8th of January, 1862, was born the subject of this memoir, Charles Norton Edgcumbe Eliot, the third, in direct descent, of a line of scholars, and destined to be by far the most distinguished. Shortly afterwards the family again moved, on this occasion to the living of Norton Bavant,—son thus succeeding father; and there the greater part of young Eliot's boyhood was passed.

At a very early age he began to show signs of mental ability

quite out of the ordinary; but he was delicate and highly strung, and for this reason his education during its early stages was left almost entirely in the hands of his father. Under the latter's scholarly guidance the boy made rapid progress, and not only mastered with ease the grammar of the two great dead languages, but in his leisure devoured as well the contents of every book upon which he could lay hands; so that when he finally left home for school he was already equipped with a store of knowledge, classical and other, far beyond his years. It is told of him, for instance, among other things, that he then already knew by heart most, if not all, of the Odes of Horace.

In 1872, at the age of ten and a half, he was sent to Cheltenham College, the Headmaster of which was at that time the Reverend Herbert Snow,[1] one of the finest classical scholars of the day. Here he quickly made his mark in form, the cleverest boy, so it was said, that Cheltenham had had within its walls for many a long day; but he lacked some of those qualities which are essential for success and popularity in an English public school, where the unusual is viewed with distrust and the athlete more esteemed than the scholar. He was studious and shy, already showing signs of that aloofness which was to become so conspicuous a characteristic later, and he had neither liking nor aptitude for games. The latter disability he never overcame; and throughout life his attitude towards sport in any shape or form was one of slightly amused contempt. Readers of *Turkey in Europe* will remember his gibe at the "peculiar pleasures" of that harmless personality, the angler. "I am no sportsman myself," he writes, "and cannot conceive why anybody should try to catch a big fish with a rod when he can pay a fisherman to catch him with a net." This idiosyncrasy is the more remarkable because he was quite devoid of effeminacy and, as his subsequent wanderings in remote and barbarous regions of the earth amply demonstrated, both willing and able, when the need arose, to endure physical hardship and discomfort. But to each his limitations; and on the Honours Boards of his school, at all events, no name, not even that of the boy who was later to become Lord Chancellor and Earl Loreburn, is so conspicuous as that of Charles Eliot. Outside the classroom he lived his own life and went his own way, occupying his leisure with the study of natural history or of strange languages and religions.

[1] He later changed his name to Kynaston.

In 1879 he won an open scholarship at Balliol College; but this success was followed almost immediately by a serious nervous breakdown, and on the advice of a great specialist of the day, Sir James Crichton Browne, he was sent on a voyage to the West Indies. From this he returned speaking Spanish fluently. In 1880 he went up to Oxford, a contemporary of Sir Edward Grey,[1] the Hon. George Nathaniel Curzon,[2] Cecil Spring-Rice,[3] J. A. Hamilton,[4] W. R. Hardie,[5] F. W. Pember, Anthony Hope Hawkins,[6] Leonard Huxley,[7] Oliver Elton, D. S. MacColl, and Michael E. Sadler.[8] The last four, particularly Leonard Huxley, at whose home he was at this period a frequent visitor, were to become the most intimate of his friends, as far as intimacy was possible with one who walked so much in a world remote. He was very young, not yet nineteen, when he went into residence, but already an arresting personality. "A slim, willowy youth," so Dr. MacColl describes him, "bright-eyed ('like a hawk on its good behaviour' is Sadler's word), mobile-lipped and speaking with an anxious courtesy, punctuated with a laughing inflexion of the breath."[9] The "anxious courtesy" and the "laughing inflexion of the breath" were still noticeable forty years later. He was "full of the best jests (rather confidentially communicated)," writes Sir Michael Sadler, "but with a grave, sad look about his smile. . . . Perfectly unassuming, yet formidable, cordial but hardly ever intimate. . . . *Anima naturaliter intellectualis*, but sad, though without *accidie*; questing, critical, secretly ill at ease; cynical only when offended by pretentiousness or cocksureness; feeling his great power, but uncertain how to use it. Inwardly very old for his age; outwardly a gentle, rather diffident youth."

His career at Oxford was one of unusual brilliance, almost a triumphal progress, yet marked by no outward signs of the industry which is an expected ingredient of success. He seemed in fact to float effortless, the fortunate possessor of some magic talisman, from distinction to distinction. He took a First Class in Moderations; in 1881 he won the Hertford Scholarship, in 1883 the Boden

[1] The late Lord Grey of Fallodon.
[2] The late Lord Curzon of Kedleston.
[3] The late Sir Cecil Spring-Rice, at one time H.M. Ambassador at Washington.
[4] The late Lord Sumner.
[5] Late Professor of Humanity in the University of Edinburgh; no longer living.
[6], [7] Both died in 1933.
[8] Now Sir Michael Sadler.
[9] From an article in the *Week-End Review*, 9th May, 1931.

Sanskrit and the Ireland Scholarships, in 1884 the Craven Scholarship and the Syriac Prize, and in 1886 the Derby Scholarship. In 1884 he secured a First Class in *Literae Humaniores*, and almost immediately afterwards was made an Official Fellow of Trinity College, before he had taken his degree. There followed a year during which he took pupils in Classics; then he was nominated to a Research Fellowship, with the duty of studying Turkish or Arabic (subsequently, on his appointment to St. Petersburg, altered to Finnish); and when this expired he was elected to an "Extraordinary" Fellowship. He was thus greatly beholden to Trinity. Indeed he never severed his connection with that College, for he repeatedly revisited it on his return from his various wanderings; and finally, in 1924, it elected him to an Honorary Fellowship.

Beneath his seeming indolence, however, he was in reality ceaselessly industrious; but his brain was so acute and his memory so retentive (it has not inaptly been compared with a fly-paper) that no subject, however abstruse, held terrors for him; and what others accomplished only with heavy travail he took unconcernedly in his stride. He once said to a friend that a single thorough scanning of the page of a strange grammar was sufficient to imprint the contents on his memory. And his mind was as ready as it was keen. A story is told of him that, being on one occasion called upon by the Master of his college, the great Professor Jowett, to read an essay which had been set him but which he had neglected to prepare, he took up his note-book and without hesitation extemporized a faultless composition. Only when he was called upon to repeat a passage, and could not, was it discovered that the pages of the note-book were blank.

Many years later, on the occasion of his presentation for the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Letters at Oxford, to be described in an official oration as "*Mezzofantius alter*", he was already, while an undergraduate, an accomplished linguist, with a predilection, however, for the philological side of a language rather than the ordinary and conversational. It is uncertain how many languages he learnt in the course of his life, at least more than twenty, ranging from Finnish to Swahili, from Pali to Chinese. Before he left Oxford he was probably conversant with ten, among them Sanskrit, Pali, Hebrew, Syriac, and Russian. Arabic, Turkish, Persian, Hindustani, and others were to be acquired later. Chinese he began to study at an early stage of his travels in the Far East, and he is said to have acquired

a sound knowledge of the "mandarin" dialect and of the ideographs during his residence at Hongkong; but he came too late in life to that most difficult and complicated of Oriental languages, Japanese; and although he mastered its elements, he made comparatively little further progress in it. Various anecdotes, adorned perchance at times with arabesques of legend, are told in illustration of his uncanny familiarity with strange, exotic tongues. It is said, for instance, that once, while travelling in Central Asia, he and his companions spent the night round the camp fires of a band of nomad Kurds, and were asked by their hosts to contribute to the entertainment by singing songs. Eliot replied that he could not sing, but that he would instead recite; and thereupon, to the delight of the company, he rendered into Kurdish Andrew Lang's *Mark of Cain*. Again, long afterwards, when he was High Commissioner in Siberia. he visited Ekaterinburg after the temporary expulsion of the Bolsheviks, and was taken to see the house in which the ill-fated Imperial family had a little earlier been done to death. On the walls of the rooms were scribbled in the Hebrew character scandalous lampoons in Yiddish, and, turning to his guides, he asked if they could decipher them. They shook their heads; whereupon, to their amazement, he translated the inscriptions into fluent Russian.

In 1886 he left Oxford, with inclination vacillating between an academic life and one of action, but with no clear plans for the future. At this moment of indecision he paid a visit to India, where he was the guest of Sir Mountstuart Grant Duff, then Governor of Bombay, whose son, Arthur Grant Duff, had been a close friend of his at Oxford; and while in India he met Lord Dufferin. This meeting is believed to have turned his thoughts towards diplomacy as a career; at all events when he returned to England it was with his mind definitely made up in favour of the Diplomatic Service. A nomination was obtained for him through the late Lord Rosebery; and having passed the entrance competitive examination, he was appointed an Attaché at St. Petersburg under that remarkable and inspiring personality, Sir Robert Morier. His first step on arriving at his post was to qualify for the official Language Allowance for knowledge of Russian; and from that he proceeded to the study of Finnish, producing in 1890 his *Finnish Grammar*,[1] a work which attracted considerable attention at the time among philologists both for its own merits and because it was

[1] Published by the Clarendon Press.

the first study by an Englishman of the Ugro-Finnish languages. In 1888 he was made a Third Secretary.

At St. Petersburg he lived in close contact with the Ambassador and was in fact at one time the latter's personal Secretary; but in the intervals of his official and social duties he appears to have travelled over the greater part of the Russian Empire and of Central Asia as well, even to the remote frontiers of China. When in 1891 Prince Galitzin, the Governor-General of Russian Turkestan, made an expedition to the Pamirs, a region then beginning to attract the attention of the Chanceries of Europe, Eliot was one of the party; and, once. in the depth of winter, he made a journey to Obdorsk in Eastern Siberia to meet Mr. Victor Morier,[1] a member of the Wiggins expedition, who had left his ship in the Arctic Ocean to make his way overland to Europe. But with that capacity for silence, which was one of his marked characteristics (Sir Mountstuart Grant Duff once exclaimed to him: "You are the most silent young man I have ever met"), he has left no record of his experiences in Russia or of his impressions of the country and its people.

In 1892, after a residence of nearly six years, he was transferred to Tangier to act as Chargé d'Affaires during the interregnum between the departure of Sir Charles Euan Smith and the arrival of Sir West Ridgeway, who had been appointed a Special Envoy on a temporary mission to the Sultan of Morocco. His sojourn at Tangier, however, was brief, little more than long enough to enable him to qualify for the Language Allowance for Arabic; and, in 1893, having in the meanwhile been promoted to the rank of Second Secretary, he was moved to Constantinople. In the following autumn he passed the official examination in Turkish. With intervals, during which he was in charge of the Agency at Sofia and of the Legation at Belgrade, he remained in Turkey about four years, a participant in most of the stirring events then occurring. When the Imperial Ottoman Bank at Galata in Constantinople was seized in 1896 by a band of Armenian revolutionaries, he took an active part in the work of rescuing the fugitives in the massacre which followed this rash adventure; and he was a member of the International Commission sent to Thessaly in 1897, during the war between Greece and Turkey, to investigate the accusations made by the Greek inhabitants against the Turkish

[1] A son of Sir Robert Morier.

soldiery of pillaging and atrocities. On this occasion the Turk would appear not to have lived up to his accepted reputation; for the Commission came to the conclusion that the real culprits were Albanian irregulars or the Greek troops themselves. This task accomplished, Eliot was next instructed to draw up a census of the Greeks who would come under Turkish rule when, as a result of the terms of peace, Thessaly was ceded. For these and other services he was in 1898 created a Companion of the Order of the Bath.

The same year saw him transferred to Washington as Second Secretary in charge of the Embassy Chancery there; but he had barely settled down in his new post before he was again moved, this time to Samoa in the distant South Pacific, where trouble had arisen over the succession to the "kingship". These islands had already some ten years earlier been the scene of a similar dispute between two rival chieftains named Malietoa Tanu and Mataafa, which had eventually terminated in foreign intervention and the conversion of the group into a virtual Protectorate under the joint control of Great Britain, the United States, and Germany. Malietoa Tanu was at the same time proclaimed king; and Mataafa, permanently debarred from all right to the succession, was banished to Jaluit in the Marshall Islands. But when Malietoa died in 1899, Mataafa, notwithstanding the ban, promptly returned to dispute the possession of the vacant "throne" with the rightful heir, the late king's son. Unable to compose their quarrel, both sides requested the European Chief Justice of the islands to act as arbitrator; but when he gave his verdict against Mataafa the latter refused to accept it, and, appealing to arms, succeeded in defeating his rival and seizing the reins of power. At this point the three Powers again intervened; and a Commission, of which Eliot was a member, was despatched to assume control and to make arrangements for the future. Arriving in Samoa early in 1899, the Commission decided, after investigation, that the most satisfactory solution of the difficulty would be to abolish the kingship entirely, substitute for the existing system of joint control that of a single Power, and entrust the actual work of government to an Administrator assisted by a Council and a subordinate body of native chiefs. The first of these proposals was unanimously approved by the Governments interested, and to the second Great Britain, compensated elsewhere, offered no objection; but Germany and the United States were unable to come to terms, neither being willing to yield

to the other, with the result that in the end the islands were divided into two zones, one under the ægis of the United States and the other under that of Germany. For his services on this occasion Eliot was made in 1900 a Knight Commander of the Order of St. Michael and St. George.

In the autumn of 1900 was published over the *nom de plume* of "Odysseus" his *Turkey in Europe*[1]; and with its appearance he at once took his place among the foremost authorities on the Near East. It is a remarkable work, alike for its erudition, its singular freedom from prejudice, and the accuracy and shrewdness of its comment. The title hardly does it justice; for it is not merely a record of the doings of the Turks but an epitome as well of the history of the motley of peoples inhabiting that cockpit of south-eastern Europe—the Balkan Peninsula—with illuminating sidelights in the shape of brilliant little essays on the fall of the Byzantine Empire, the schisms of the Orthodox Church, Mohammedanism, and various other subjects, and punctuated at intervals with excursions into recondite problems of philology. The author is signally fair in his treatment of the Turk, who emerges from the ordeal, if not a model of all the virtues, at least as less "unspeakable" than repute had pictured him, and, indeed, as in certain respects a more refreshing character than some of his Christian victims. And with all its learning the book is easy reading, terse, graphic, and vigorous in style,—like all the author's work,—and flavoured with a number of most amusing anecdotes. Who having once read them will forget, for instance, the story of the Albanian Bey and his gargantuan entertainment which opened with a fat goose, sent by way of *hors d'œuvre* to meet the approaching guest, or the tale of the Imam Khoja Nasreddin Effendi, or the vivid thumb-nail sketch of the secretariat in the Yildiz palace, or, last and perhaps best, the inimitable interview between the bagman and the Vali, which forms the introductory chapter to the book?

But a fresh field was about to open for his energies. In the autumn of 1900 he was appointed Consul-General at Zanzibar and Commissioner for the British East Africa Protectorate; and there, occupied in laying the foundations of a new colony, he was now to spend what he afterwards described as perhaps the four "happiest and most interesting" years of his life. The task awaiting him was one completely unfamiliar and beset with difficulties; for the

[1] Published by Messrs. Edward Arnold and Co., London.

Protectorate was almost virgin territory, not even properly surveyed, the administrative service was too small for the duties it was expected to fulfil, and the funds urgently needed for development were entirely inadequate. But from the outset he found the work congenial, nay more, so absorbing that before he had been a year in Africa he declared that he wished for none but colonial appointments in future. Its charm, he wrote in one of his letters to Lady Elcho,[1] whose acquaintance he had made a little earlier and who was to prove for the rest of his life one of his staunchest friends, lay in its extreme variety :—" the law, the church, military matters, commerce, administration occupy me one after another, and I seem to become successively a judge, a clergyman, a soldier, a merchant, and a Governor."

Nor was this the sum of his activities. In the intervals of his official duties he contrived to find leisure to learn Swahili, even to write a grammar of that language,[2] and to take up again the studies of Buddhism which he had commenced at school ; while from time to time he made those extensive tours through his territory which were later to furnish most of the material for his work on the Protectorate.[3] Indeed, so deep was his interest in these comparatively unknown regions of Africa that once, when going home on leave, he even travelled overland from Mombasa into Egypt. " I started," he writes, " from Mombasa by train at the end of June, 1903, crossed Lake Victoria in the Steamer *Winifred*, then drove in a buckboard right across Uganda and Ungoro from Lake Victoria to Lake Albert. Here I took a sailing boat at Butiaba and went by river to Nimule, where began the highest rapids of the Nile. As no boat can pass through these the traveller has to march about six days from Nimule to Gondokoro, where the rapids terminate, in the hope of meeting there a small steamer to take him through the swamps of the Southern Sudan to Khartum. In all the journey to Khartum occupied about six weeks."

The years which began with such happy auspices were fated nevertheless to end disastrously in his tragic and premature retirement from the public service. A difference of opinion with the Foreign Office over certain grants of land was the immediate cause ;

[1] The present Countess of Wemyss and March.

[2] He also wrote a preface to Mr. (now Sir Claude) Hollis's *Grammar of the Masai Language*.

[3] *The East African Protectorate*, published by Messrs. Edward Arnold and Co., London.

but in the background a question of policy was at issue. Sir Charles Eliot's plans for the development of the territory committed to his charge may be summed up in the two words " white settlement ". He wished to see the country thrown open to colonization by Europeans; and for the attainment of that object he laboured unceasingly from the moment of his arrival in Africa. In this he had the support of the Government at home; but there were practical difficulties in the way. The only part of the Protectorate adapted for permanent habitation by Europeans was the high plateau land in the interior; and there the region most attractive to prospective settlers, the Great Rift Valley, was already occupied by nomadic pastoral tribes of Masai, whose rights must admittedly be protected. How to secure this and yet at the same time satisfy the legitimate needs of the colonists was the problem which confronted him. Must the Rift Valley become a native Reserve, closed for ever to the white man, or was there room in it for both races? And the situation was still further complicated by the fact that the Foreign Office, under the administration of which the Protectorate then lay, had only a little earlier made a grant of five hundred square miles of land in the very heart of the country to a corporation called the East Africa Syndicate. The position of the native occupants was thus at the outset already compromised.

Sir Charles Eliot himself was opposed to the creation of a Reserve, except as a last resource, because he believed that it would only confirm the Masai in their revolting social habits and help to perpetuate a tribal organization which he wished to see broken up; and, while admitting that native rights must be safeguarded, he also maintained that the interests of the white population must always remain paramount. He considered moreover that the Masai were wasteful in their methods, occupying more land than they could properly utilize, and that even when their reasonable requirements had been satisfied a substantial balance available for other purposes would still remain. For these reasons he favoured opening the valley to white settlement. With his view the Foreign Office at first on the whole agreed; but the applications for grants, sometimes of considerable extent, in the coveted area increased so rapidly that the Government began to fear that the rights of the native occupants might be endangered; and it was accordingly suggested to him that it would be " more prudent to postpone consideration of further grants on a large scale ".

Out of this arose the difference which ended in his retirement.

He had a little earlier received two separate applications for thirty-two thousand acres of land, mainly, yet not entirely, in the Masai territory; but with the immense grant to the East Africa Syndicate in his mind, he did not interpret these comparatively insignificant areas as coming within the proscribed limits set by his instructions; and he therefore allowed negotiations to proceed, practically agreeing that, subject to conditions, the applications would be granted. It happened, however, that at this moment two District Officers of the Protectorate who held views on the land question, and particularly on the Masai problem, opposed to his own, were in England on leave; and the Foreign Office, already perturbed, was so influenced by their arguments that it suddenly repudiated the policy it had hitherto countenanced, and decided not only to create a Reserve but also to refuse all further grants of land. This decision was thereupon communicated to Sir Charles Eliot, with instructions to reject the two applications just mentioned. Deeply hurt at this unexpected rebuff and resentful of the action of the Authorities in London in allowing themselves to be guided by the advice of his subordinates rather than by his own, he declined to comply. Sooner than acquiesce in such treatment or stultify himself by refusing land in one case while giving ten times as much in another,[1] he preferred, he said, to resign from the public service. His resignation was accepted; and a few weeks afterwards, in the early summer of 1904, he returned to England.

Before his departure he made a vain appeal to the Prime Minister for a public inquiry; but a little later a collection of documents bearing on the case was published in the form of a White Paper[2]; and it is from this, practically the sole source of information now available, that these facts are taken. It should, however, be added that he himself steadfastly refused to accept this official presentation of the incident, protesting that it was in some directions inaccurate and in others one-sided.[3] The whole story of this unhappy episode has never been told, probably never will be, and at that it must rest; but there is reason to believe that his original appointment

[1] The two rejected applications were for 50 square miles each; but in a dispatch to the Foreign Office on the 5th March, 1904, he said that they would probably be reduced.

[2] *Africa*, No. 8, 1904. Sir Charles Eliot's own version of the circumstances leading up to his retirement was given in a letter to *The Times* on the 4th August, 1904, and a brief statement on the same subject appears in the preface to his work on the East African Protectorate.

[3] Cf. the preface to *The East African Protectorate*.

as Commissioner was unwelcome in certain quarters at home, that he knew this and resented it, and that it was not without influence on the subsequent course of events. Be the facts as they may, it was not less than a tragedy that so brilliant an intellect should have been lost to the state at the very moment when it was approaching its fullest maturity. On the arrival of his successor preparations for the creation of a native Reserve were at once started; but it quickly became evident that the Masai could not live in proximity to Europeans without friction; and as they were willing to move elsewhere if given suitable land in exchange, two new Reserves were established for their accommodation in other parts of the Protectorate. Thither they were transferred; and the Rift Valley was then thrown open to white settlement as Sir Charles Eliot had consistently advocated.

Cut now adrift from the public service and without private fortune of his own, it was necessary for him to find other occupation. For this he had not long or far to seek. In 1905 the University of Edinburgh conferred on him the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws; and a little later in the year he was offered and accepted the Vice-Chancellorship of the University of Sheffield, which had just been founded by Royal Charter. The post was one of considerable responsibility, for on the wisdom with which the new institution was guided through its infancy much depended; but in Sir Charles Eliot the University Authorities had secured precisely the type of Vice-Chancellor required,—a scholar yet also a man of action, of broad vision and an open mind, and with a wide knowledge of affairs. To these qualities were added a record of brilliant achievement in the service of the Crown. He was quick to realize that on his prudence and tact depended the success of his administration, that he must ride with a loose rein, be content to deal with main issues only, and, above all, allow teachers the fullest freedom in their own departments to foster original research. On these principles accordingly he based his governance; and the steady growth in the prosperity and the repute of the young University during the seven years of his Vice-Chancellorship proved how wise and prudent was his policy.

But he was of too energetic a temperament to rest content with the direction of affairs alone. He shared in the duties of the class-room as well; and, going beyond the University walls, he played an active part in the educational work of the city outside, delivered from time to time courses of lectures for the general public

on the peoples and the religions of the East, and once, in 1909, even served on a Royal Commission for Electoral Reform. His conception of hospitality was Oriental; and in Sheffield, as later in Tokyo, he kept open house for his friends and all wandering scholars. The Long Vacation he spent as a rule in India, China, or Japan, collecting material for his great life work on Hinduism and Buddhism; and it was during one of these visits, made in 1906, that he wrote, for the ephemeral purposes of a London daily paper, the series of articles which were later published in book form under the title of *Letters from the Far East.*[1] They are, alas! all too brief, covering less than two hundred pages of large type; but whatever their subject,—personal experiences on the journey, descriptions of places visited, or dissertations on the languages, religions, literature, or national characteristics of the peoples of those remote regions,—they are unfailingly entertaining and full of information of absorbing interest to the student of things Oriental. The author has no prejudices and assumes no airs of Western superiority; to him there is nothing "inscrutable and mysterious" in Eastern mentality; and he boldly avows that he would "as soon trust a Chinaman as an Englishman". Beneath the staid surface of the scholar he is full too of boyish laughter and hawk-eyed to mark the whimsical and the ludicrous, whether he is motoring in Cochin China, feasting in the Hall of Concentrated Fragrance, discoursing with the maker of images who did not worship the gods because he knew what they were made of, or watching, *spectator ab extra*, the pranks of a sudden whirlwind on the city dyke at Hankow. Among the multitude of works on the Far East this slim volume is of the small and elect number of those which are worthy to be read and re-read again and again.

Much of his leisure at Sheffield was occupied with the preparation and arrangement of the material gathered on his journeys; for relaxation he would turn to his laboratory and the study of marine zoology. Here is a notable illustration of the variety of his talent and the wide range of his intellectual curiosity. Interested from boyhood in natural history, his attention was drawn during his visit to Samoa to the shell-less molluscs found in the seas of the islands; and he became so fascinated by their unusual forms that he made a collection of specimens and wrote a monograph on them, which was published in 1899. From this he proceeded to specialize

[1] Published by Messrs. Edward Arnold and Co., London, 1907.

in one particular branch of the family, the Nudibranchiata, and during the next three years wrote seven papers on the forms found in East African waters and in the Maldive and Laccadive archipelagos. By that time he had become recognized as the leading British authority on the group. This, however, was only a beginning ; and between 1903 and 1918, when his appointment as High Commissioner in Siberia forced him to put aside his studies, more than forty papers appeared over his name dealing with collections made in all parts of the world, from the Antarctic Ocean in the south through the seas of the tropics to Japan in the north. But his most important contribution to scientific literature was the monograph published by the Ray Society in 1910, a large quarto volume, admirably illustrated, in which he reviewed the whole field of research in this subject and at the same time discussed critically in the light of modern knowledge and his own investigations the work of his two most distinguished predecessors in England, Joseph Alder and Albany Hancock. It is on the results of the labours of these three students that all future research into British forms of the Nudibranchs must admittedly be based. Altogether it was a notable achievement for one who was only an amateur, without any training in natural history or marine zoology, and moreover already deeply immersed in other affairs. In scientific circles abroad the value of his work was equally recognized ; and as early as 1909 his name, bracketed with that of another distinguished student of the Mollusca, had been given to a new specimen, the " Eliotia Souleyeti ", discovered by the French naturalist, Vayssière, in the Gulf of Lyons.

Yet, with all these outward activities, in secret he chafed. His environment was uncongenial. After the burning suns of Africa and its great empty spaces the bleak atmosphere and the crowded ways of the grim northern manufacturing city were infinitely depressing, and his spirit wilted in his new surroundings. The work itself, too, was distasteful, not of his choice but thrust upon him by unavoidable circumstance, and his heart was not in it. Instead his thoughts reverted constantly to the service he had left, with its wider horizons and its greater opportunities for conspicuous achievement, and, confident in the justice of his case, he could not abandon the hope that a way would open for his return. Official memories, however, are long, and all the efforts of his friends, foremost among them and indomitable Lady Elcho, to procure his reinstatement were fruitless. Then unexpectedly in 1911 came a qualified

release in the shape of the offer of the Vice-Chancellorship of the newly founded University of Hongkong. This was not the road of his desire, and the prospect of further indefinite confinement in an educational groove was distasteful; but at least it meant return to the East that he loved, and after a little hesitation he accepted.

In the summer of the following year he arrived in Hongkong, to find a formidable task awaiting him, with financial difficulties its dominant feature. The total revenue of the new University amounted to barely ninety thousand dollars, a sum so hopelessly inadequate that when the first session opened in the autumn of the year only two Faculties were working; and even those were practically without permanent teaching staffs. There was a Professor of Engineering and a Lecturer in Physics; but that was all. None of the Chairs in the Faculty of Medicine had been filled because funds were lacking; and for a considerable period the University Authorities were in consequence obliged to rely for instruction in this branch of knowledge on such help as could be obtained from medical practitioners in the Colony. In other directions preparations were similarly inadequate. The University was in fact still in the embryonic stage; and, as only limited assistance could be expected from the Colonial Treasury, this threatened to be protracted unless fresh sources of income were quickly discovered.

To this work accordingly the Vice-Chancellor directed his energies. His first step was to enlist the sympathy of the many wealthy Chinese living in Hongkong; and from them and their compatriots in Malaya and the Netherlands East Indies he succeeded in obtaining substantial contributions. Generous help was also given by some of the great British merchant houses interested in the China trade; but the sum total even then was far short of the University's needs. With the approval therefore of the Governor, Sir Henry May, he sent the Professor of Engineering on a special mission to England to appeal for a grant from the Boxer Indemnity Fund; but although the Government was sympathetic it professed itself unable to help, and the mission was unsuccessful. Repulsed in this direction, he turned to the Chinese in their own country. It was his custom to spend the Long Vacation in Peking, studying the language; and he now made these visits an occasion for propaganda, losing no opportunity to impress on every Chinese official he met on his wanderings the duty of supporting an institution which had been founded for the express benefit of their countrymen and which stood at their very doors. Thanks in no small measure to his personal

prestige as an Oriental scholar, his efforts were not unsuccessful. A number of scholarships were founded with funds subscribed by the Chinese Government; and as the name and the reputation of the University spread, students from the most distant parts of the country were gradually attracted to it, until at last all the Eighteen Provinces were represented on its roll.

Yet, despite his utmost endeavours, he was never able to place its finances on a stable basis; and even when he left Hongkong in 1918 it was still in great difficulties. These, however, have now happily vanished. The work which Sir Charles Eliot started his successors carried on; and as the cultural value of the University became more evident, new and more substantial endowments were created, among them the vainly sought grant from the Boxer Indemnity Fund, with the result that to-day the revenues of the institution are ten times as great as they were in 1911. But although others completed what he had begun, to him still is the chief credit due; and in a memorial address shortly after his death in 1931 the present Head of the University, Sir William Hornell, confessed that he had "sometimes wondered if the institution would have survived the dangerous years of its neglected infancy, had it not been for the personality and reputation of its first Vice-Chancellor",—a doubt which is shared by others also well qualified to form an opinion.

In the class-rooms at Hongkong he was less often seen than he had been at Sheffield, and although he lectured at intervals, mainly on Chinese history, he took no part in the routine work of the University. But his eye was always watchful for the backward student who showed signs of promise. Of these there were a number, youths who had come from remote provinces of the Republic, with a knowledge of English lamentably inadequate for their needs; and for them, in their struggles with an alien tongue, he had always time and sympathy to spare, helping them individually with their studies, correcting their essays, and even on occasion, particularly in the early days, when the teaching staff was very small, stooping to give them exercises in so humble a subject as spelling. He was too remote to court or to win personal popularity; but in China learning has always been reverenced, and in the reputation of their Vice-Chancellor as a scholar the students took an intense and personal pride. An amusing exhibition of this occurred on the occasion of his presentation in 1924 for the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Laws, when, at the end of the ceremony, he was mobbed

by an excited crowd of undergraduates, hustled into a motor-car, and, to his infinite discomfort and embarrassment, drawn in procession through the streets of the city.

Outside the University walls in the Vice-Chancellor's Lodge he led a detached and tranquil existence, accessible always and to his friends anxiously hospitable, but immersed as a rule in his own private studies, in which the Chinese language now took an important place. At home in the meanwhile his friends still continued their efforts on his behalf, with so little result, however, that some were beginning to despond. "I have," wrote Lord Curzon to him in the winter of 1917, "on many occasions recommended you for posts (among them Bengal). . . . I have never been successful." At that very moment hope, so long deferred, was on the eve of fulfilment.

It was then the fourth year of the war, and the Allied Powers were embarking on their ill-fated attempt to stem the tide of Bolshevism. A British Commissioner had already been installed at Archangel, the base of operations in European Russia; and His Majesty's Government were now looking for some one to fill the corresponding post of High Commissioner in Siberia, the eastern base, whither an Allied Expeditionary force was being dispatched. At this moment they bethought themselves of Sir Charles Eliot in Hongkong, and, with the acquiescence of the Authorities of the University, offered him the post. The appointment was only temporary, for the duration of the war; and it thus left the future still uncertain; but to him it meant a step in the direction of his desire, and he accepted it with alacrity. In the summer of 1918 he left for the north.

For the next twelve months he led the life of a nomad, at times in the security and comparative ease of Vladivostock or Harbin, once, for a brief period and at a hazardous moment, even as a householder at Omsk,[1] but for the most part in the cramped space of a railway carriage, and not infrequently in conditions of considerable physical discomfort. But his work kept him occupied; and he accepted everything, even the arctic rigours of the interminable Siberian winter, with pessimistic philosophy.

There is space here for no more than the most cursory survey of the events in which he played a part, or of which he was a despairing and helpless spectator. When he arrived in Siberia a Provisional

[1] He rented a house at Omsk at the moment when Admiral Kolchak's front had actually crumbled, and this courageous action helped to allay the general panic which then prevailed.

Government, the precursor, it was hoped, of something more permanent which would embrace all Russia, was already established at Omsk under the ægis of the Allies and of the Czech troops, who had marched across Asia from Europe. Even at this early stage, however, dissension was rife among the discordant elements of which it was composed or by which it was supported; and in the autumn of 1918, to prevent a *débâcle*, Admiral Kolchak, the Minister of War, was persuaded, much against his will, to assume the post of Dictator. A gallant man, able, honest, and single-hearted in his devotion to his country, he might in happier circumstances have accomplished much for Russia; but Fate had loaded the dice against him. The virus of Bolshevism was already spreading into Siberia; the Dictator himself was surrounded by a horde of dishonest and greedy place-hunters and of rabid reactionaries to whom bitter experience and adversity had taught nothing; some of his subordinate commanders, so-called, were completely beyond his control; and between him and the Czechs relations were always unhappy. Well might he exclaim in black moments of despair: "Who will deliver me from this cross?" From the outset he was doomed to disaster. "I regard myself," wrote Sir Charles Eliot to Lady Elcho in the winter of that year, "as one of a medical staff watching a patient who has a virulently infectious disease. I hope he may be prevented from infecting others and perhaps cured of Bolshevism; but I have little hope of his being restored to normal general health."

Notwithstanding, therefore, a successful offensive on the Ural front in the spring of 1919, the position of the new Government was precarious; and the suspicion and distrust with which it had from the beginning been regarded by the mass of the population was quickly turned into bitter hostility by the excesses of Ivanoff Rinoff—the commander of the Russian troops in Eastern Siberia—and of the two Cossack Atamans, Semenoff and Kalmikoff. Adherents in name of the Omsk Government, they were in reality independent freebooters and brigands, each playing his own hand, and, when occasion demanded, not hesitating to defy the authority to which he owed allegiance. For a régime which depended on such allies there could be no permanency; but it was left to the Czechs to deliver the blow which precipitated its downfall. Only indirectly interested in the cause in which they found themselves entangled, and discontented with the conditions around them, they suddenly declared that they would fight no longer, and demanded to be

repatriated. The front along the Urals had already given way; but with their defection all was lost; the Bolshevik armies poured unresisted into Siberia; and the Government at Omsk collapsed like a house of cards. With its fall ended the chapter of intervention. At the beginning of 1920 the foreign Missions and troops were in full retreat towards the sea; a few weeks later the ill-starred Admiral Kolchak, deserted by his allies, was handed over by the French general Janin and the Czechs to the Bolsheviks to meet his inevitable fate[1]; and before March closed British, French, American, and Czech forces had all been withdrawn. Alone the Japanese remained behind, involved in an adventure of their own against the Reds.[2]

In the closing scenes of this ill-fated and barren enterprise Sir Charles Eliot had no part. Early in the summer of 1919 he was offered the Embassy in Tokyo; and almost immediately afterwards he sailed for England to prepare to take up his new post. The years of exile had ended.

Hinduism and Buddhism, on which he had spent so many years of patient labour, was now at last in the press, though it did not actually leave the hands of the publishers till the autumn of 1921. In this, his *magnum opus*, the author traces the history and development of the two great indigenous religions of India from their origin almost up to the present day, reviewing with an ample wealth of reference every important phase of each, and in the case of Buddhism carrying his investigations far beyond the confines of India to the remotest regions into which that great missionary religion has penetrated. The field covered is vast both in space and time; but to those who would object that it is "too large, that to attempt a historical sketch of the two faiths in their whole duration and extension over Eastern Asia is to choose a scene unsuited to any canvas which can be prepared at the present day", he replies that "wide surveys may sometimes be useful and are needed in the present state of Oriental studies. For the reality of Indian influence in Asia—from Japan to the frontiers of Persia, from Manchuria to Java, from Burma to Mongolia—is undoubted

[1] He died bravely,—in the words of his executioner, "straight up, like an Englishman."

[2] For most of the information here recorded the writer is indebted to Sir Bernard Pares, the Head of the School of Slavonic and East European Studies in the University of London. A detailed account of the Siberian expedition will be found in *The Far Eastern Republic of Siberia*, by H. Norton (publishers, Messrs. G. Allen and Unwin, Ltd.).

and the influence is one. You cannot separate Hinduism from Buddhism. . . . Neither is it convenient to separate the fortunes of Buddhism and Hinduism outside India from their history within it . . ."

His method of approach to the stupendous task he had set himself is worthy of his great reputation as a scholar. He is without bias, consistently cautious, dispassionate, and critical. Though himself sceptical in temperament and devoid of any ingredient of mysticism, he is never less than tolerant in his attitude towards the mysticism and occultism which are so conspicuous a feature of Indian thought or religion; and he is just even when dealing with aspects of Hinduism repellent to the Western mind. Towards Buddhism, to which he was profoundly attracted by the breadth of its conceptions, its humanity, and its almost complete freedom from dogma and sectarian spirit, he is unreservedly sympathetic. Indeed, the key-notes of his work are sympathy, tolerance, and a complete absence of spiritual or intellectual arrogance. "Religion," he writes, "depends on temperament," [1] and "in studying Oriental religions sympathy and a desire to agree if possible are the first requisites".[2] And again :—"I cannot share the confidence in the superiority of Europeans and their ways which is prevalent in the West. . . . In fact European civilization is not satisfying, and Asia can still offer something more attractive to many who are far from Asiatic in spirit." [3]

It is difficult to determine what most compels admiration in this book,—the infinite industry, the encyclopædic knowledge, the austere accuracy, the conciseness and clarity of statement, or the unerring skill with which the author sifts the grain from the chaff in the confused mass of fact, theory, and doctrine before him. Truly it is, as the late Sir Richard Temple declared, "a mighty work of the deepest research and insight." [4]

In November of 1919 he was sworn a member of the Privy Council; and in the spring of the year following he arrived in Tokyo to take up his appointment. It was not without apprehension that some at least of those about to work under him welcomed this Ambassador who was already a legendary figure. Tall and rather heavily built, younger in appearance than his years, but walking a little uneasily,

[1] *Hinduism and Buddhism*, I, p. xcvii.
[2] Ibid., I, p. lxiv.
[3] Ibid., I, p. xcvi.
[4] *Transactions* of the Royal Asiatic Society, 1921.

the result of an injury to a kneecap during his early days in Russia, with thick dark hair growing in a level line low across his forehead, full, searching, critical eyes, and of a somewhat frosty address, he looked remote and redoubtable, a "chief" who might prove exigent in his standards of efficiency and hard to satisfy. And first experiences seemed to justify this impression.

He came to Japan at the moment when the fate of the Anglo-Japanese Alliance hung in the balance. For nearly twenty years this great stabilizing influence had been in existence, to the material benefit of both parties and to the general advantage of the world at large; now, in the changed conditions following the war, its future had suddenly become uncertain. Was it to continue or must it lapse? In England, and notably among those best acquainted with the Far East, the general feeling was in favour of its maintenance, with such modifications as altered circumstances might necessitate; and this was the course which Sir Charles Eliot himself advocated. But powerful forces were also arrayed in opposition,—public sentiment in one at least of the Dominions, American hostility, and the new internationalism working through the League of Nations at Geneva. In the end these prevailed; and at Washington in the winter of 1921 the Alliance was abrogated. It can hardly be said that the path of peace in Eastern Asia has been made smoother by its disappearance. In Japan the dissolution of a bond which had been confidently regarded as permanent was received with dismay and profound disappointment; but the Japanese are a proud people, and, deeply though their feelings were wounded, they accepted the accomplished fact, outwardly at least, with dignity and restraint. The blow was a little softened by the timely visit of His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales in 1922; but the position was nevertheless uncomfortable, and that not least for the new Ambassador, on whom now fell the duty of building up relations afresh on an entirely altered basis. With signal success he accomplished this delicate and difficult task; and to his skill, to his intimate knowledge of the East, and to the undeviating friendliness and understanding which marked all his relations with the Government and the people of the country to which he was accredited is it mainly due that the years following the abrogation of the Alliance were so smoothly traversed and so substantial a measure of the ancient friendship between the two nations preserved. Truly a "solid if not outwardly brilliant achievement".[1]

[1] Obituary notice in *The Times*, 17th March, 1931.

With more intimate acquaintance first impressions of him changed, and the earlier chill respect for his talents gradually gave place to a warmer feeling of genuine admiration and affection. The mask of aloofness which discouraged approach at the outset, and the air of cynical disillusionment hid in reality a very human personality, with an unsuspected capacity for winning the attachment of those who worked close to him. He gave his confidence very slowly, almost indeed grudgingly; but to those whom he trusted he was unswervingly loyal; he was impatient of delay, witheringly contemptuous of the slightest slovenliness in thought or expression, and often exacting; and he demanded industry unrelenting with impeccable accuracy; but he was at the same time intensely, almost pathetically, appreciative of service rendered, and he thought no effort too great if thereby he could prevent merit in a subordinate passing unregarded. And to any in trouble he was always accessible and generous. In his personal relations, too, with his staff he had habits of formal courtesy, inherited from a generation more punctilious in ceremonial than this, which were as engaging as they were unusual; and despite his great intellectual gifts and his immense learning he was completely unaffected and unassuming. His modesty indeed was one of the most attractive traits in his character.

Apart from the question of post-Alliance relations the term of Sir Charles Eliot's Ambassadorship was comparatively uneventful. Following his usual habit, he commenced immediately on his arrival in Japan to learn the language; and while his progress fell short of his hopes, the knowledge he acquired proved of material value to him in his work. In his leisure he travelled much about the country, generally in search of material for the present work; but, with the exception of isolated visits to Korea and Formosa, his journeys were within a narrow radius, rarely extending north of Tokyo or west of Kyōto; and he could never be persuaded to follow the traditional practice of migrating to the hills in the summer months. A confirmed lover of heat and sunlight, he preferred to remain in the capital even during the torrid dog-days and to make at intervals short visits to resorts like Kamakūra, Miyanoshita, or the mineral springs of Shusenji in the Idzu peninsula. His way lay often outside the beaten track with its amenities of Europeanized hotels; but this was no hardship to one of such varied experience; and although he chafed under some of its taboos and inhibitions, he took on the whole very kindly to the national mode of life, and even to the stark simplicity of some of its domestic arrangements.

His reputation for learning had long preceded him; and with his arrival in Tokyo the Embassy became at once a centre of attraction to scholars. In 1921 the Asiatic Society of Japan, an association founded under foreign auspices in 1872 for purposes of research, elected him as its President; and this post he retained until he left Tokyo in 1926, taking an energetic part in all the Society's activities and, except during his absence on leave, almost invariably throwing open his house for its meetings.

His conception of his duty as Ambassador, particularly towards the people of the country in which he lived, was strict, and he was at infinite pains to gain their goodwill and their confidence. In his own habits of life simple, and in secret averse from social pomps with their burdensome paraphernalia of ceremonial, he nevertheless more than worthily upheld the hospitable traditions of the Embassy, though it must also be confessed that in an atmosphere of banalities he was prone to become abstracted and to retire within himself. He could speak wittily and well when occasion or duty demanded; but he preferred silence to speech-making; and he was probably at his best and happiest in limited gatherings of his more intimate friends and acquaintances, when he would readily expand, to delight his listeners with the infinite variety of his information, his pungent comment, and the humour and fecundity of his anecdote.

Yet in one respect his intellectual equipment seemed curiously lacking; he was almost completely indifferent to the appeal of the visual arts. In matters of form and colour his predilection inclined to the ornate and, perhaps, slightly barbaric,—a cause, in Tokyo, of not infrequent heartburning and mortification to a household bred in the austere simplicity of the Japanese canon; and although so much of his life was spent in countries renowned for the achievements of their craftsmen, he would seem to have remained unmoved and completely uncovetous in the presence of the procession of beauty which passed before his eyes. Through all his Odyssean wanderings he acquired no treasures of bronze, or painted scroll, or porcelain; and a small collection of Medici reprints, regarded somewhat contemptuously as furniture, represented practically his only adventure in the realms of the artistic.

Towards the end of the spring of 1923 he left for England on leave, and while at home was made a Knight Grand Cross of the Order of St. Michael and St. George and given the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Letters by the University of Oxford. In October he returned to the East and a scene of pitiful desolation. On the

1st of September occurred one of those catastrophic disasters of earthquake and fire to which Japan seems fated to be periodically a victim; and in a few short hours a prosperous countryside was devastated, the city of Yokohama reduced to a heap of smoking ashes, and more than a third of the capital destroyed. In the Embassy itself not a building remained securely standing; two were burnt to the ground; and the Ambassador's own house narrowly escaped the same fate. Fortunately this danger was averted; and of his possessions only a few comparatively unimportant manuscripts in his valuable library were slightly damaged.[1] But he was homeless. A temporary lodging was, however, found for him close at hand while a bungalow of lath and plaster was hurriedly put up for his permanent accommodation on a lawn in the Embassy grounds; and in these confined yet not uncomfortable quarters he lived during the last two years of his official stay in Japan.

There is little more to add. The term of his Ambassadorship ended in 1925; but he remained at his post awaiting the appointment of his successor, his many friends hoping the while that his appointment might be renewed. Their hope was not realized; and in February of 1926 he bade a final farewell to the public service, though not to Japan. The rest has already been told elsewhere in this memoir.

So ended a career of great distinction and notable achievement, though perhaps, in the opinion of some, fallen short of its opening promise. Almost, if not quite, the most brilliant student of his generation at Oxford and, as he was later to prove, endowed in addition with administrative capacity of a very high order, he might reasonably have aspired, when he entered the public service, to its most coveted prizes. Certainly the augury of those earlier years was of the happiest; to be Governor of a vast territory at the age of thirty-eight is good fortune such as befalls few. Yet at the very moment when the future seemed most auspicious, disaster irremediable overtook him, and all his hopes and ambitions were shattered.

"Cut is the branch that might have grown full straight . . ." Many years later he was recalled, to do useful work for his country in Siberia and Japan; but it was then too late; the ground lost could not be recovered or the days spent in exile retrieved. For him the end came not in 1926 but in 1904. It is therefore by his contributions to knowledge, and they are outstanding, that Sir Charles

[1] His library was later acquired by the Imperial University of Tokyo.

Eliot will best be remembered. This was perhaps not where his early ambitions lay; but who shall say that in *Hinduism and Buddhism* he may not have raised to himself a monument more enduring than the fame of a satrapy?

H. P.

Note.—To all those who have generously supplied him with material the writer of this preface wishes to offer his grateful acknowledgments,—in particular to the relatives of the late Sir Charles Eliot, to the Countess of Wemyss and March (who kindly allowed him access to a long series of letters), to Professor Oliver Elton (Honorary Fellow of Corpus Christi College, Oxford), Dr. Ponsonby Fane, Mr. W. J. Hinton, Sir William Hornell (Vice-Chancellor of the University of Hongkong), Dr. D. S. MacColl, Dr. C. H. O'Donoghue (Department of Zoology in the University of Edinburgh), Dr. F. W. Pember, Mr. J. U. Powell (Fellow and Tutor of St. John's College, Oxford), Brigadier F. S. G. Piggott, D.S.O. (a member of Cheltenham College Council), Professor C. A. Middleton Smith (University of Hongkong), and to Mr. Stephen Gaselee, C.B.E. (Librarian of the Foreign Office).

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

The following are the principal abbreviations used :—

B.E.F.E.O. *Bulletin de l'École Française d'Extrême Orient.*

J.A. . *Journal Asiatique.*

J.R.A.S. . *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society.*

N. . . *Nanjio's Catalogue of the Buddhist Tripiṭaka.*

S.B.E. . *Sacred Books of the East* (Clarendon Press).

T.A.S.J. . *Transactions of the Asiatic Society of Japan.*

BOOK I

A SURVEY OF BUDDHISM IN INDIA AND CHINA

CHAPTER I

THE CANONS

CHRISTIANS and Mohammedans are alike in acknowledging the authority of one sacred book, the Bible or Koran. Sects may differ as to its interpretation and as to the authority possessed by tradition apart from scripture, but they all appeal to the same texts which they regard as a divine revelation. But in Buddhism there are not only different sects, but they use different scriptures composed in different languages, and though some of these works are obviously later than others, they are not related to one another as are the Old and New Testaments, for in the New Testament a new teacher appears who changes and develops the old law. But in the Buddhist scriptures there is no such avowed change. All important tenets are referred back to the Buddha himself and he is represented as having preached on the same sacred mountain in India doctrines which seem to be of very different ages and provenance.

The ideas of India and Eastern Asia about scripture and revelation are more fluid than those prevalent in Europe at any period. Not that dogmatism is wanting: the four Vedas are said to be the divine word, existing before the universe came into being and from time to time revealed to human sages. The text has been most carefully preserved by memory, but it is almost universally admitted that these ancient scriptures of the golden age are not suited to the needs of degenerate modern times, and century after century Indian writers have not failed to produce new revelations and to meet with respectful acceptance. These works often take the form of discourses put into the mouth of some deity, such as Kṛishṇa or Śiva, but no historical justification is either attempted by the writer or expected by the readers. The Bhagavad Gîtâ and even the Bhâgavata Purâṇa are relatively ancient works, but the Râmâyaṇa of Tulsi Das and the Prem Sagar[1] and many others are modern. All, however, have millions of devout readers at the present day and are unhesitatingly accepted

[1] Tulsi Das lived from 1532 to 1623. The Prem Sagar is a free translation of the tenth book of the Bhâgavata Purâṇa made in 1803.

as what we call revelation.[1] Nor is it merely popular works which attain this high position. The Brahma-sûtras, a set of aphorisms containing a compendium of Upanishadic philosophy, are for most sects of unquestioned authority.

Buddhists, Indian and other, have shown a similar readiness to accept new scriptures. Even in the Pali Piṭakas we hear of new sayings claiming to be the word of the Buddha and of the standards by which they are to be judged. These standards are not always the same. Sometimes[2] the Buddha is represented as declaring that such sayings must be tested by comparing them with the Sutta and the Vinaya, which seems to imply that at the time when these passages were composed there were already collections of sayings and rules, recognized though doubtless unwritten, which could be used for reference and comparison. But in other passages[3] he is made to state emphatically that a doctrine is not to be judged by its conformity to tradition and scripture or by intellectual tests, but by the moral sense of the hearers—does it tend to remove covetousness, ill-will, and folly or to increase them?

Similarly on different occasions he is represented as taking very different attitudes as to private judgment and the questioning spirit in disciples. Once when a disciple asked an apparently reasonable though perplexing question about the soul and its deeds[4] he received no answer but brought upon himself a most violent rebuke. "Is it possible that some senseless fellow sunk in ignorance and led astray by greed may think to go beyond the Master's teaching, etc." And the Kîṭâgiri-sutta[5] insists on the necessity of absolute obedience. Yet in another discourse[6] we

[1] Thus Mallik in his book called *The Philosophy of the Vaishnava Religion* (1927) states categorically that the Bhâgavâta Purâṇa possesses "supreme authoritativeness" and "if one wishes to acquire true definite knowledge of the Absolute he should look to this Purâṇa" (p. 39).

[2] Ang. Nik., iv, 180 (= vol. ii, p. 167); Dîg. Nik., xvi, 7 (= vol. ii, p. 124).

[3] Ang. Nik., iii, 65; iii, 66; iv, 193. The wording is the same but the hearers are different in these three suttas. Compare, too, the advice given to Mahâpajâpati in Cullavag., x, § 5. Whatever teachings conduce to a good life, you may say of them *Eso dhammo eso vinayo, etam satthu sâsanam*: "This is the doctrine, this the discipline, this the message of the Master".

[4] Saṃ. Nik., xxii, 82 = vol. iii, p. 103. The whole passage is extremely curious and interesting.

[5] For the faithful follower it is a principle that "the Lord is Master and I his disciple: the Lord knows and I do not know". *Satthâ Bhagavâ sâvako'ham asmi: jânâti Bhagavâ nâham jânâmi.* Maj. Nik., lxxii.

[6] Maj. Nik., xxxviii.

read : " Will you say that you affirm this out of reverence for your teacher ? No, Lord. Do you affirm only what you have of yourselves known, seen and discerned ? Yes, Lord. Quite right." On the whole, the view expressed in the Piṭakas is that doctrines and precepts are not to be judged too strictly by the standards of traditional orthodoxy or of reasoning but rather by their results as shown in a good life, such a life including spiritual experiences which are beyond the comprehension of ordinary men. Thus in the Sandaka-sutta Ânanda lays it down that both orthodoxy and pure rationalism are uncertain guides. They are both " partly sound and partly unsound : right here and wrong there ".[1] Whereas a natural ecclesiastical instinct, common to all churches, prompts the Buddhist clergy to say like Asoka [2] that all the words of the Buddha are well said, this liberality and willingness to recognize good wherever it is found lead to the admission that everything which is well said may be considered as a word of the Buddha, a principle which is actually laid down in Mahayanist works [3] and clearly prepares the way for a very extensive canon.

At the present day Buddhists in Ceylon, Burma, Siam, and Cambodja accept the three Piṭakas in the Pali text and do not recognize or even know of the Mahayanist works venerated as scripture in the Far East. The Mahayanists are more liberal. In China and Japan large monasteries generally possess a copy of the Chinese Tripiṭaka which contains among other things translations of works similar to the first four Nikâyas, though not identical with them and originally composed in Sanskrit, not in Pali. But this Tripiṭaka, though treated with external reverence,[4] is not really equivalent to the scriptures of other religions. It is a vast collection of theological literature consisting of more than 1,600 works mostly in many volumes made by order of the Emperor of China (or to be strictly accurate it is one of many such collections), and it represents not the books approved by any section of Buddhists for purposes of devotion or doctrine but the treatises which learned Chinese thought worth preserving for any reason. Thus it often contains several translations of one Indian

[1] Maj. Nik., lxxvi.

[2] In the Bhabra Edict.

[3] Śikshâsamuccaya, p. 15 (Bendall's edition), quoting the Adhyâśayasaṃcodana-sûtra : " Everything that is well said, Maitreya, is a word of the Buddha."

[4] For instance, it is often placed in a revolving bookcase, which the devout reverently turn round, hoping to acquire the same merit as if they had read the contents.

text, and includes with wide tolerance both Hinayanist and Mahayanist writings of all schools. One considerable section consists of works composed by Chinese authors and obviously corresponding to what we should call Church history. But certain books contained in this library have a reputation and influence far greater than that enjoyed by any text known in the lands of the Hînayâna. It must be confessed that in those countries, though the Tripiṭaka is studied by the clergy and read to the laity on certain occasions, it has not the same influence as the Bible or Koran in Christian or Mohammedan countries. But in the Far East and within the limits of certain sects, some books such as the Lotus[1] and the three treatises about the Paradise of Amitâbha,[2] do enjoy a somewhat similar position. This high status is occasionally accorded to Chinese and Japanese compositions. Thus Hōnen, the founder of the Jōdo sect, expressly declares[3] that the writings of the Chinese teacher Zendō (Shan-tao, A.D. 613–681) are the direct teaching of Amitâbha and of the same value as sûtras. So, too, the Shōshinge and Wasan of Shinran are revered by millions in Japan.[4] But most Mahayanist sacred books which have influenced the Far East are Chinese translations of Indian originals. They arrived from the West claiming to be the word of the Buddha and a revelation of the truth and had been accepted as such in their native land according to the easy-going principles described above. But the Chinese have more of the critical spirit than the Hindus, and their scholars were accustomed to discuss the history and authenticity of classical texts. They could not fail to be struck by the fact that the various discourses put into the mouth of the Buddha obviously teach very different doctrines. The T'ien-t'ai sect devised an explanation of these divergences which is in substance accepted by most Buddhists in China and Japan. It is that the Buddha's teaching was progressive and that at different periods of his life he taught various

[1] The Saddharmapuṇḍarîka-sûtra commonly called Hokke-kyō in Japan, N., Nos. 134–9.

[2] The Long and Short Sukhâvatî-vyûhas and the Amitâyurdhyâna-sûtra, see N., No. 23 (5), Nos. 199, 200, and 198.

[3] In his book called Senchakushū. Compare *Hōnen the Buddhist Saint*, tr. by Coates and Ishiyuka, p. 347.

[4] The Shōshinge is written in Chinese but the Wasan or hymns are in Japanese. Rennyo, a celebrated doctor of the Shinshū, quotes in one of his Epistles (i, 2) the Sukhâvatî-vyûha and the Wasan as if they were of the same authority, and these Epistles are read in Shinshū temples as St. Paul's are in Christian churches.

doctrines, none of course erroneous, but some suited to the comprehension of simple hearers and others approximating more and more nearly to absolute truth. Five periods[1] are distinguished in the teaching of the Master and are called by the names of the sûtras in which the special doctrine revealed in each period is supposed to be preserved. The first period, extending for three weeks after he attained enlightenment, is known as 華嚴 Kegon or Avataṃsaka. In these days of ecstasy he is supposed to have preached the complete truth to nine assemblies of spirits and mortals, appearing miraculously in different places while his body remained motionless under the Bo tree. But he found that only the higher intelligencies among superhuman beings could grasp his meaning and accordingly he entirely changed his style of preaching. During the next twelve years, known as the 阿含 Agon period, he expounded the doctrine now contained in the Âgamas, that is the four treatises roughly corresponding to the Pali Nikâyas. In the third period, which lasted eight years, he preached the 方等 Hō-dō or Vaipulya-sûtras, and in the fourth, which lasted no less than twenty-two, the 般若 Hannya or Prajñâpâramitâ. In the fifth and last period, estimated as eight years, he revealed the Lotus or 法華經 Hokke-kyō, regarded as the crown and quintessence of all revelation.[2] These five phases are compared to the five forms which milk may assume, namely, ordinary milk, cream, fresh butter, clarified butter, and the ultimate essence or extract of milk.

Only a robust faith can believe that the Avataṃsaka-sûtra, which teaches a thorough-going idealism and is obviously a product of mature Mahayanism, can represent the first teaching of the Buddha. But the oldest accounts of that teaching contain two traditions which seem to be undisputed and in themselves probable. The texts which describe the Enlightenment agree in saying that at first he hesitated to preach because he thought the truth which he had learnt was too hard for mankind to grasp. It was only after an internal struggle—described in the legend as an appeal made

[1] Go-ji in Japanese. A common phrase is 五時八教 Go-ji hak-kyō. The five periods and eight methods of teaching. The theory is explained in vols. i and x of the 妙法蓮華經玄義 Miao-fa-lien-hua-ching-hsüan-i, a commentary on the Lotus written by Chih-I (Nanjio, 1534). See also Nanjio, Nos. 1568–9 and 1551. Also the 天台四教儀集註 T'ien-t'ai-ssŭ-chiao-i-chi-chu of Mang Jun (Nanjio, 1635).

[2] In the last day and night of his life he is said to have revealed the Mahâparinirvâna-sûtra (see Nanjio's catalogue, class v, Nos. 113 to 125). This is not the same work as No. xvi in the Pali Dîgha Nikâya.

by Brahmâ—that he resigned himself to the heavy task of making difficult truths intelligible to minds of very various capacities. Secondly, many expressions in the oldest documents imply that he knew more than he thought it wise to teach.[1] His persistent refusal to reply to several fundamental questions—such as are space and time finite or infinite and what is the condition of a Buddha after death—seems to indicate that there are subjects with which human language is inadequate to deal. Taking such passages into consideration, it is perhaps not illegitimate to imagine that after the Enlightenment he believed he had a full and complete vision of the truth, but that, when he was confronted with the practical problem of preaching, he felt that much of the vision was above and beyond all human speech and deliberately circumscribed his teaching, limiting his message to what ordinary men could make use of and understand.[2]

At first sight, too, it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that during the Buddha's long career as a teacher his views underwent some change and development or, as the orthodox would prefer to put it, that his disciples grew in wisdom and spirituality and were able to receive more and more of the truth. Certainly such a supposition would be necessary if, like Far Eastern Buddhists, we were to accept the great Mahayanist sûtras, the Lotus, the Prajñâparamitâ, and so on, as accounts of what he actually said. But the unanimous verdict of European scholars is that these works were composed many centuries after his death and that, if we desire historical information about his preaching, our only chance is to seek for it in the older parts of the Pali Piṭakas and in the Chinese translations of those Sanskrit works which cover much the same ground. It is generally agreed that these older parts are the four Nikâyas and some works (e.g. the Sutta Nipâta) included in the fifth Nikâya, as well as portions of the Vinaya. If we limit ourselves

[1] In the Saṃ. Nik., lvi, 31, it is related how he once when walking in a forest plucked a bunch of leaves. The truths, he said, which he had taught his disciples were like the leaves which he held in his hand, while those which he knew but had not taught were as many as the leaves of the forest. The parable of the blind men and the elephant (Udâna, vi, 4) seems to imply that ordinary human intelligence is incapable of grasping the Universe as a whole.

[2] The well-known passage in the Mahâparinibbâna-sûtta (ii, § 25) in which the Buddha says that there was no such thing as a closed fist in his teaching and that he had made no distinction between esoteric and exoteric may seem to contradict these ideas of gradual or partial revelation. But the saying may be fairly interpreted as applying to useful knowledge only. The Pali texts distinctly represent the Buddha as refusing to answer apparently important questions when he felt that the answer would merely perplex the questioner, e.g. Saṃ. Nik., xliv, 10.

to them, we find that they contain little which supports the idea that the later sayings of the Buddha as compared with the earlier show growth, advance, or progress. It is true that the account of the last months of his life represents him as using constantly a new formula[1] which extols the blessedness of virtue, meditation, and wisdom when found together, but except for the prominence given to paññâ or wisdom—the prajñâ which plays so prominent a part in later works—there is no approximation to Mahayanist doctrine. Nor does the discourse which he is said to have preached in the hall at Mahâvana near Vesâlî[2] and which is apparently intended as a last epitome of his teaching show any tendency towards transcendental or idealistic views. It lays stress on mindfulness, energy, and meditation: it emphasizes the idea that the spiritual life is a struggle (padhâna, vayâma) and also emphasizes wisdom (paññâ) and joy (pîti), but it cannot be said to give any revelation of the final truth which is not contained in earlier discourses.

Some passages give a picture of him in his youth as a man of boundless intellectual activity who spared neither mind nor body in the work of testing by practice as well as argument any system which seemed worthy of his attention. But when once he had made up his mind and believed that he had discovered the truth, he is represented as filled with a calm confidence in his own power and knowledge which left no room for change or development. He taught, but did not consult. There is no indication that he accepted and worked into his system ideas derived from either intelligent disciples to whom he gave explanations or opponents with whom he argued. Nor need this assurance and self-sufficiency seem strange. It is probably a gift natural to great teachers, for, like the Buddha, Christ and Mohammed do not seem to have been influenced during their ministry by either friends or opponents. They said what they felt they had to say.

But if the most ancient texts do not indicate that the Buddha changed his teaching during his lifetime, still they do not give a simple and continuous narrative. Though the varied materials of which they are composed may be all relatively old, they present obvious differences of style and date: they contain inconsistencies,[3]

[1] D.N., xvi, 1, § 12 (= ii, p. 81).

[2] D.N., xvi, iii, § 50. The same summary is also given in Maj. Nik., ciii, and Dig. Nik., xxviii, § 3.

[3] e.g. it is both stated and denied that women can become saints. Contrast Cullavag., xi, 1, 3, with Maj. Nik., cxv, near the end.

so that the question at once arises what part of them, if any, can be regarded as the *ipsissima verba* of the Master or even a correct statement of the original teaching.

We talk of the Mahâyâna showing growth, or perversion, but do we know the starting point? What is the original doctrine by which we test what we consider to be later developments? In order to answer this question it will be well to state briefly the little which we know about the history of the Pali Canon and our even more meagre information respecting the origin of the version now known in Chinese translations.

The Vinaya Piṭaka professes to describe the collection and composition of the Canon, for the last two chapters of the Cullavagga contain accounts of the Councils of Râjagaha and Vesâlî. The first [1] was held immediately after the Buddha's death in order to fix what was his teaching both as to the discipline to be observed by his followers and as to doctrine: the second, which met a hundred years later, considered and ultimately condemned certain innovations in discipline. This passage was obviously written some time after the second Council which it describes, but it is introduced without any intimation that it is later than the rest of the Vinaya. But we know that the Vinaya received additions. The authenticity of the work called Parivâra was disputed in Ceylon in the first century B.C., and though it was accepted by the orthodox, it was apparently composed in the island about that time. The last chapters of the Cullavagga may have a similar origin.[2]

European scholars have received the story of the Councils with much scepticism, but there is nothing improbable in its main outlines. There can be no doubt as to the respect felt for the rule of life and the doctrine enjoined by the Buddha. After his death, what more natural than to fix what that rule and doctrine were while those who had lived in the Master's company were still alive and could relate their experiences? The procedure said to have been followed by the Council was eminently reasonable. They first examined Upâli as an acknowledged expert in the Vinaya and asked him when and in what circumstances each rule had been laid down. Then in the same way they proceeded to question Ânanda "through the

[1] See especially *Le Concile de Rajagaha* by Przyluski in the series *Buddhica*.

[2] Many books of the Pali Canon, particularly some (though not all) which are included in the Khuddaka Nikâya, are undoubtedly late. e.g. the Peta-vatthu alludes to a king called Pingalaka who lived about two centuries after the Buddha's death. S. Lévi (in *Études Asiatiques*, É. F. d'Ex. Or., 1925) thinks there is proof that the Niddesa was composed "entre la fin du Ier siècle et la fin du iiime".

five Nikâyas", his replies about the first two suttas of the Dîgha Nikâya being quoted as an example. There is some resemblance between the style of the Buddhist suttas and of the philosophic discourses or dialogues reported in the Upanishads, but whereas these latter are interested only in the doctrines of Yâjñavalkya and others and not in those sages themselves, it is the personality of the Buddha which dominates the Pali scriptures. Did He say this and, if so, when and where? This importance attached to a personality is without parallel in Indian literature, which is singularly lacking in human detail and has preserved no portrait of kings like Asoka or philosophers like Śankara. It seems reasonable to believe that the words of the Master who made such an impression on his age have been correctly preserved, though it is also only too certain that innovators used his name to give authority to their new doctrines. Oral tradition and trained memories such as are common in India can preserve ancient texts with wonderful accuracy, but there is a universal tendency to enlarge them with later additions.

The Cullavagga itself indicates that the authority of the first Council was not undisputed. When the members had finished reciting the Dhamma and Vinaya in the form approved by them, an elder called Purâṇa arrived with a large following. They asked him to accept their version but he politely refused.[1] "The Dhamma and Vinaya have been well recited by the Theras. Nevertheless, as I heard them and received them from the very mouth of the Lord, in that form will I keep them (in my memory)." According to the Cullavagga, the first Council was concerned only with the Dhamma and Vinaya,[2] but in the account of the second Council the Mâtikâs or indexes are mentioned. They doubtless represent the beginnings of what was afterwards known as the Abhidhamma or third Piṭaka. The name Abhidhamma occurs in the Pali text of the Nikâyas,[3] but there is abundant evidence to show that this Piṭaka is later than the others and different sects included quite different works under this title.

Of the second Council one may say as of the first that the account given, though not confirmed by external evidence and though

[1] Cullavag., xi, i, ii.

[2] But the Asokâvadâna, the Vinaya of the Mûlasarvâstivâdins, and the Chia-ye-chie-ching 迦葉結經 (Nanjio, 1363) mention also the third Piṭaka which is said to have been recited by Kâśyapa.

[3] e.g. Dig. Nik., xxxiii, 10; Maj. Nik., xxxii, lxix, ciii; Ang. Nik., vi, 50. It is often in the compound form *abhidhammakathâ*, talk about the higher or more abstruse parts of the doctrine.

containing some exaggerations,[1] is in its general outlines eminently probable. It is natural that changes and relaxations of discipline should have arisen and that a meeting should have been summoned to consider them. Two points deserve notice. First the Cullavagga emphasizes the differences between the Bhikkhus of the East and the West,[2] indicating that there were already two schools with geographical limits. Secondly, Ceylonese tradition as reported in the Dîpavaṃsa [3] adds to the account given in the Vinaya the statement that the defeated party held a council of their own called the Mahâsangîti which compiled a new version of the scriptures and was the origin of the important Mahâsanghika sect, apparently the precursor of the Mahâyâna. The Chinese pilgrims Fa-Hsien and Hsüan-Tsang also know of this sect, but connect it with the first not with the second Council. Hsüan-Tsang says,[4] apparently on the strength of information received in Magadha, that the schismatic Council included laymen as well as monks and accepted as scripture additional matter including dhâraṇîs or spells. Though these traditions present inconsistencies, the substance of them is probable enough, namely, that in opposition to the strict monasticism of the Theravâda, the sect which edited the Pali Piṭakas, there was a large (Mahâsangha) and popular party, which was disposed to tolerate mythology and magic.[5]

The reign of Asoka, say about 250 B.C., is an important epoch for the history of the Buddhist scriptures. Among his inscriptions is one known as the edict of Bhabra or Bhabru in which he recommends the clergy to study seven passages, most of which have been identified with parts of the Pali Piṭakas. The passages are not quoted but are referred to by descriptive titles such as Future Dangers, the Discourse to Râhula beginning with the subject of lying and the verses about the Sage. Though some of the titles are rather vague, it is noticeable that they all suggest topics familiar

[1] e.g. the age of some of the participants.

[2] Cullavag., xii, 2, 2 ff.

[3] Dîp., 32–8. The monks of the Great Council are said to have made a Sutta Piṭaka and Vinaya Piṭaka of their own and to have rejected certain works. But these rejected works are all relatively late.

[4] Watters, *Yüan Chwang*, 2, pp. 159–161.

[5] The Mahâvastu describes itself as belonging to the Lokuttara branch of the Mahâsanghikas. It apparently corresponds to the Vinaya but, unlike the Pali text, consists chiefly of miraculous narratives, not of monastic rules. Fa-Hsien thought that the Vinaya of the Mahâsanghikas was the fullest and most complete of all the versions and he translated it into Chinese in collaboration with Buddhabhadra.