

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

should he find himself condemned, even though his judges be very different from the half-educated masses who have to decide on Christianity. And if such a course be possibly permissible, where only the man's own character is concerned, can it be so with a Church, whose condemnation means eternal ruin to souls committed to her charge?

To show that I am upholding no mere fancy of my own, I will quote one of the latest testimonies of Agnosticism. The following passage occurs in the *Nineteenth Century* for April, 1882:—

To turn to the Church for enlightenment in this dilemma is vain. It has no clear and certain teaching to offer regarding the true place of science in the economy of things; and the laity must themselves carve or shape out a new philosophy of life, which will harmonize and give consistency to conduct.

The writer of the above is a Mr. J. H. Clapperton. Of his position in science I know nothing. I do know that there are hundreds of scientific men, certainly more eminent than he, who have perfectly clear views regarding the true place of science in the economy of things, both material and immaterial; and who find "a standard of conduct and a harmonizer of knowledge" in that old philosophy of life which was set forth nearly 1,900 years ago on the hillsides of Galilee. But they are passing from us year by year: and if their place is taken by men of other views and another spirit; if culture and Christianity are divorced in England, as they have been divorced in Italy and in France; then I make bold to say it will not be the fault of science or her followers, but of a Church, who, shrinking from the conflict herself, will have refused the aid of those able and willing to wage it for her.

WALTER R. BROWNE.

ART. IV.—BUDDHISM.

THIS article is the substance of a lecture given at Sion College on the 22nd of June last, at the request of the Christian Evidence Society, in consequence of the assertions of Infidels and Secularists to the effect that Buddhism may be considered as equal if not superior to Christianity in its moral teaching and influence over the lives of its adherents. The authority with which such allegations are usually supported is, *as far as it goes*, unimpeachable; it is a portion of the Buddhist Scriptures, but it is only a portion. The remainder, which is neither inconsider-

able nor insignificant, is ignored for an obvious reason, namely, that its contents furnish a complete refutation of such statements.

Our sources of information on Buddhism are the Buddhist Scriptures, which are divided into three parts called *Pitakas* or Caskets; the *Vinaya*, the *Sutta*, and the *Abhidhamma Pitakas*, which are accepted by all Buddhists as the *ipsissima verba* of the founder of their religion. It is to the *Sutta Pitaka* that Secularists in England triumphantly point as affording proof of the equal excellence of Buddhism to that of Christianity. In what then does this excellence consist? Simply the inculcation of kindness to all animates, the subjugation of all desires, and annihilation. And this is what entitles Buddhism to be placed on a footing of equality with Christianity!

But this article is intended to supply the convenient omissions of the Secularists, and will take up and examine the other division of the Buddhist Scriptures, the *Vinaya Pitaka*, which deals with discipline, and is therefore of a more practical nature. Before entering on this task, however, it is necessary to a clearer understanding of Buddhism to give a short sketch of Buddha and his times.

The founder of this religion was an Indian prince named Siddhartha, the son of Suddodhana, the King of Māgadha, who reigned in Kapilavastu about B.C. 600. He is generally known as Gotama Buddha, the former name being the family appellation, the latter his official designation, signifying the *Omniscient Being*. This title, however, was assumed at the commencement of his career as a religious teacher. On his way to Benares in quest of disciples he was met by an *ascetic*, who asked him the name of his Superior and Teacher. To this he replied:—

“I am the Universal Subjugator and Omniscient,
 Uncorrupt in all Doctrines.
 I have forsaken all: I am free from all desire.
 I may declare what I have learned by myself.
 I have no teacher: there is none like me:
 Even in the divine world there is not my equal.
 I am the Rahat in the world, I am the unanswerable Teacher.
 I am the perfect Omniscient Being, and reside
 in the cool state Rahatship.”

He then proceeded on his way, and proclaimed to five Bhikkhus or Mendicants the discoveries he had made, and a method of emancipation from the ills of existence. His views were embraced with enthusiasm, and thus was inaugurated that system of religion which has numbered among its adherents untold millions of the human race. Its spread was very rapid; and at no great interval the new religion was adopted by all classes, from the king to the meanest subject in Māgadha: nor was it

confined to the domains of a single potentate, but on the contrary, it extended far and wide amidst the neighbouring principalities.

The student of the history of that period and country cannot but attribute the rise and rapid development of Buddhism to the long-continued existence of *caste*. The fundamental rules of this system of caste determined the superiority of the Brahman over men of all other castes, who were called Kshattriya, Vaiçya or Kshuddra, according to their respective births in the governing, mercantile or menial families of the community. Buddha, at the commencement of his career, declared the necessity of disregarding all distinctions of caste, and accordingly received disciples from all castes into his religion on terms of equality; yet such was the esteem in which he held his own caste that he, not unfrequently, claimed for it superiority over the Brahman. For amongst the innumerable definitions found in the Buddhist Scriptures, we read the following with respect to caste:—"Jāti lesa nāma:" "Khattiyo dittho hoti—Brahmano dittho hoti." "Vesso dittho hoti—Suddho dittho hoti." "The meaning of race distinctions—there is the Kshattriya to be seen—the Brahman, the Vaiçya and the Kshuddra." Again, "Yāti: Khattiyī vā, Brahmanī va, Vessī va, Suddī va." "Any one (feminine) means, a Kshattriya, Brahman, Vaiçya or Kshuddra woman."

Such a movement as this could not fail to excite the sympathies of the lay-castes against the pretensions of the Brahmans; the result was that multitudes soon embraced this religion and entered the ministry of the new Kshattriya Teacher, who declared that birth was no bar to virtue, nor to the possession of the highest attainable position in the domain of religion and morality.

Buddhism is by no means exclusive. It admits the possibility of good existing in any religion, and even of good independent of religion, but it claims superiority over others, inasmuch as it professes to stand alone in pointing out a method of escape from all kinds of evil for all animates. It is recorded that Gotama, after a long and careful study of the religious systems of his age and country, expressed himself dissatisfied with them on account of the impermanency of the rewards they promised.

On the vexed question of the primary cause of matter and life he was content to remain an agnostic, hence we find that love and obedience to the ruler of the universe are unknown in Buddhism. Its worship is therefore simply an act performed in memory of Buddha, who *was* but now *is not*, and prayer is non-existent; for the mood of the verb in worship is not precative but indicative, thus, *Buddham saranam gacchāmi* means "I go to the refuge of Buddha."

It may be well now to give a short account of the Sutta Piṭaka, that part of the Buddhist Scriptures which Secularists tell us propounds a scheme of religion equal, at any rate, in excellence to that of Christianity. In this division Gotama Buddha appears in the character he delighted to assume: *Ahamasmim tilogoru*, "I am the teacher of the three worlds;" and enumerates his discoveries in ethics, morals, physics, and metaphysics. Here he enunciates what is the distinguishing feature of his religion, *Kamma* the result of action, as the *fons et origo* of all existence, with its attendant pleasure and pain, joy and suffering. According to this theory the *present* is the product of *the past*, and the germ of *the future*, and every creature in the universe by every act of his is welding the weal or woe of the generations which follow; and moreover, each individual is his own god or *genius*, and the life to come must depend solely on the actions here.

The Abhidhamma Piṭaka, or third division of the Scriptures, is of subsequent origin, and of less value than the Vinaya and Sutta Piṭakas. The subject treated of is similar to that of the two others, only amplified and more abstruse. Originally, only two divisions of the Buddhist Scriptures were known, the Dhamma and the Vinaya, which were collected, revised, and fixed, at the so-called second Council at Vaisāli, 383 or 443 B.C., *i.e.*, about 100 years after the death of Buddha. The Buddhists themselves assert that this was done immediately after his death at the first Council of Rājagaha; but whatever the time of compilation may have been, we doubtless have in them the doctrines and commandments of Buddhism, as they were known anterior to the Christian era. They are accepted by all Buddhists as the repositories of the Faith, and infallible sources of authority on all matters connected with their religion. It is quite possible that when these writings have been subjected to further European investigation and learned criticism, fresh attempts will be made to separate the *ipsissima verba* of Buddha from those which probably have originated from his followers; but the absence of very ancient manuscripts will render certainty an impossibility, and we shall doubtless have many conjectures totally at variance with one another. With regard to the Pāti Mokkha or Manual of Disciplinary Confession, which must be recited twice each lunar month, we have the *dicta* of Messrs. Rhys Davids and Oldenburg, in direct opposition. The former is of opinion that it was a subsequent compilation, an abridgment of the laws of the Vinaya Piṭaka; while the latter confidently affirms that this Pāti Mokkha was the original disciplinary code of Buddha, and that the Vinaya Piṭaka was a later—probably much later, emendation and debased commentary. And with regard to *Nirvāna*, the *summum bonum* of

Buddhism, the nature of which has engaged the attention of many oriental scholars, but hitherto with only this result, "*quot homines, tot sententiæ*," it is doubtful whether we shall ever arrive at a certainty, because many of Buddha's assertions on the matter of Nirvāna are contradictory, as are those on the higher nature of man. The belief in Atta or permanent personality had been declared by him to be heterodoxy; yet he has repeatedly asserted his own former existence in his Jātakas, or books of the former births. We have thus irreconcilable differences of opinion about the soul or spirit of man; Nirvāna, therefore, the final goal of the Rahat, is indeterminable.

Now we know fairly well what Buddhism is—theoretically; what are the teachings of the *Sutta Piṭaka*, in which Buddha is simply the teacher and exemplar? We know that he professes to have discovered the causes of the present orders of life with their attendant ills, and the means whereby they might be removed. We know that he asserts that he successfully applied them to himself, and that he announced them to the world in the hope that the most learned and best of mankind would adopt them, and by their unassisted efforts realize their fulfilment. We know also that he declared that Kamma was the unfailing Arbiter of all states of existence, and that there was no escape from this Nemesis but by the complete subjugation of all cleaving to life, which, when done, would introduce the successful aspirant to the calm state of Rahatship. As this is the portico of Nirvāna, it is sometimes called the Savupādisesa nibbāna, or the Nirvāna of *parts*, in contradistinction to the great eternal, Nirupādisesa nibbāna, the Nirvāna, of *no parts*, which immediately follows the death of that individual.

But when we look at Buddha, as he appears in the *Vinaya Piṭaka*, we see him under a new aspect, as the hierarch, ruler, and judge of his body of clerics, who, under the appellation of Bhikkhus, have renounced the world and entered on a state in which the reproduction of the species, and the acquisition of property beyond what is barely necessary for the preservation of life, are inadmissible. It is a state of Ascetism and Seclusion, without any of the elements of corporeal torture, which commonly distinguished the devotees of other religions in those countries. It was considered the best possible aid to the efforts of the individual who longed for release from the sorrows inseparable from every state of existence. Impossible it was not, but nevertheless incalculably more difficult for the Layman to accomplish this deliverance, on account of the claims which the outer world made through his senses; and without doubt the aims of Buddhism would be attained if all the world were to become celibates, and subject to the *Vinaya*, as well as the *Sutta Piṭakas*; and also if all other animates were to cease

from producing their own species, because all known phases of life are undesirable, for they originate in ignorance, they continue inseparably connected with sorrow and pain, and each one ends only to be repeated under similar circumstances. For this reason the man or woman who becomes a Bhikkhu is immeasurably superior to the rest of mankind, because such a one has entered on a course of discipline which will prove a material help in working out the longed-for self-emancipation.

All the laws of the Vinaya were Buddha's own, which were promulgated as occasion required; and it is remarkable that he who posed as the great Censor of the taking of life should have frequently used the verb *Nāseti*, to kill, to indicate that an irrevocable decree of excommunication should be pronounced on a Bhikkhu who had been guilty of one of the four greatest possible breaches of discipline.¹ It was not the custom of Buddha to make regulations for the conduct of his followers until the necessity arose, so that his first disciples—both lay and cleric—were at first without any directions as to the manner in which they should spend their time.

In the Mahā Vagga we are told that other religionists observed the Lunar Festivals, or the days of the Full or New Moon, with those of the other quarters, thus having what nearly amounts to the weekly sabbath, but Buddha's disciples did nothing of the kind until he was exhorted to issue commands to this effect by one of the most famous of his adherents, Bimbisāra, King of Rājagaha, who thought that other systems would prosper, while Buddha's failed by reason of his lack of festivals. Buddha readily complied, and ordered assemblies to be convened on the quarter days of the Lunar Month. The assemblies met, but there was no religious service, because none had been authorized. This gave offence to the laity, who called the clerics *dumb pigs*, and Buddha then commanded the Pātimokkha, or the Confessional Service, to be recited on these occasions. In this service the various breaches of discipline are enumerated, defined, and explained, with their several degrees of punishment, suspension, and absolution. Numberless regulations are given with regard to the time, place, and manner of these services; regulations which were rendered necessary by reason of the persistent determination of some of the clerics to evade every command, or prohibition, if a method of doing it without breaking the letter of the law could be discovered.

Buddha established two orders of disciples, Lay and Cleric. The former are called *Upāsaka* lay devotee, the latter Pabbajito ascetic, or Bhikkhu mendicant. The lay devotee is a person who

¹ These four are called Pārājikā offences, and relate to cohabitation, theft, murder, and the false assumption of superhuman powers. *Vide infra*.

has betaken himself to the three refuges, Buddha, the Law and the Church, and resolves to observe the first five commandments which prohibit killing, theft, impurity, lying, and the use of alcoholic drinks; but the cleric, or Bhikkhu, is one who has separated himself from the world on account of Buddha and his doctrines, in order to imitate him in the complete subjugation of the cleaving to existence, and thus eventually arrive at Nirvāna. There are two orders of clerics in the Buddhist Church, Sāmanero and Upasampadā, corresponding closely to the Deacon and Priest in the Episcopal Church. The first mentioned, the Sāmanero, must be old enough to scare away crows—*i.e.*, about eight years of age—to receive the first ordination; all his hair must be shaven off, he must put on the orange-coloured robes in the prescribed manner, and falling at the feet of the duly qualified Bhikkhus, thrice declare his acceptance of the Three Refuges. He is then a Sāmanero cleric, and must be attached to some Upasampadā Bhikkhu, to whom he must stand in the relation of son and servant. He must observe the ten commandments, five of which are binding on the Upāsaka, and the other five relate to prohibitions of the eating of food after mid-day, attendance at balls, concerts, and public shows, the use of perfumes and sweet unguents, sitting on high and great seats, and the receiving of silver and gold. If he transgress any of the first five, or revile Buddha, his law or his church, entertain heterodox views, or cohabit with a female Bhikkhu, he must be destroyed—*i.e.*, excommunicated.

In order to be admitted into the second order, the Upasampadā, a chapter of duly qualified clerics must be convened, and an Upasampadā mendicant, who has authority to do so, must thrice request the assembly to admit the candidate to this order of the priesthood. The candidate also must thrice for himself request the same thing, and when by their silence he understands that there is no objection, he must submit to an examination as to his qualifications for the office. If this prove satisfactory, the chapter must be requested thrice that he may be admitted to the second order of the Priesthood by a certain Superior.

When a number of mendicants live together, one of their number must be elected as their Upajjhā, or superior, and to him the others must pay a respectful obedience, as if they were his children, while he must have the status of parent towards them.

On the Uposatha Festival, the day of the New or Full Moon, the assembly must be convened in the prescribed manner, and the Pāti Mokka or manual of confession read. If any Bhikkhu finds that he has been guilty of any breach of discipline, he must confess it and submit to the penalties prescribed, and at the expiration of the punishment request and obtain reinstatement.

Another important season in the Buddhist Church is the *Vas*, which lasts three or four months during the rainy season, from June to October. Throughout this season the *Bhikkhus* may not travel to collect alms, but must remain in a fixed temporary hut, and instruct the people who come to them and bring them the food they require. At the end of this season it is customary to furnish the *Bhikkhus* with the robes they require for the ensuing year.

We now come to the regulations passed by Buddha of a disciplinary character as we find them recorded at great length in the *Vinaya Piṭaka*.

There are 227 rules and prohibitions affecting the male *Bhikkhus*, divided into eight classes, according to the magnitude of the offence committed, or the importance of the subject embraced. They are the four *Pārājikās* or irremediable breaches of discipline; the thirteen *Samghādisesa* offences which although serious are expiable; the two *Aniyata*, or indeterminate faults; the thirty *Nissaggiya Pācittiya* breaches of discipline which necessitate confession and forfeiture; the ninety-two *Pāṭidesaniya* offences of less degree than the preceding, but requiring confession; the seventy-five *Sekhiyas*, irregularities relating to dress, deportment, food, the monastery, &c., and the seven rules to be adopted in settling questions. As thus indicated, the gradation in the above-mentioned classes of offences is from the greatest to the least, and the most heinous offences are included under the first name *Pārājikā*, which means defeat, and implies permanent exclusion from the order of clerics. This, according to the custom of Buddha, is emphasized by well known and opposite similes—viz., It is impossible to rejoin a severed human head to its trunk and thus restore life; to reunite a withered fallen leaf to its stem and make it green; to unite a broken rock; and the *Palmyra*, whose head has been cut off, cannot again bear fruit, so the *Bhikkhu* who has been guilty of either of the four *Pārājikā* faults can never be reinstated as a member of that order.

I. *Pārājikā*. The subjects treated of under these four Rules are cohabitation, theft, murder, and false assertion of the possession of virtues and superhuman powers.¹

¹With regard to the first—cohabitation, a long account in the *Pārājikā* book is given of the venerable *Sudinno*, the only child of a banker, who, in opposition to the wishes of his parents and young wife, renounced the *Lay* state and donned the orange-coloured robes of the *Bhikkhus*. After many entreaties from his parents and wife he consented to cohabit with her in order to preserve the family name; and on being reproved by Buddha, justified his conduct on the ground that no prohibition to this effect had been issued. The latter told him that he was without excuse, because he had acted contrary to the principles of

(1) About twenty pages of the Pārājikā book are filled with details of fearful vices which display the state of society in the time of Buddha, and the appalling results that attended his efforts to run counter to the laws of Nature.

It is often said that these sins of the Bhikkhus are not chargeable to Buddha; admitting this, what can be said of the legislation which makes vices almost inconceivably abominable, of less degree in guilt than actions which result in the reproduction of the species?

(2) The second Pārājikā regulation, which relates to theft, was first proclaimed and defined by Buddha on his hearing complaints that one of his Bhikkhus had taken Government timber to build a hut without having obtained permission. Accordingly, it was proclaimed that as a thief would be subjected by the king to death, or imprisonment or banishment, so the Bhikkhu who, had been convicted of this kind of theft, was guilty of a Pārājikā offence, and, consequently, excommunicated.

The Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus, who were most troublesome to Buddha and famous for their ingenuity in discovering methods of evading his prohibitions, then went to the washermen's gardens and stole the cloths they found there, and when told that this was prohibited by the above-mentioned law, replied that the inhibition related only to property in the jungle, whereas these cloths were stolen in the village. Buddha then included village-property in this regulation. He also defined the value of the thing stolen, declaring that it must be either five māsakas or more to make the offence a Pārājikā fault (a māśaka is stated to be a small coin of $4\frac{1}{2}$ grains of either gold or silver). Numerous instances are then given of attempts made by Bhikkhus to steal beyond the limits of the prohibition, and as with the first Pārājikā offence, they eventually succeeded. In some cases

the Order, which enjoined the complete subjugation of all carnal desires. Buddha then issued his first disciplinary prohibition, and declared that henceforth if any member of the order of Bhikkhus cohabited with a woman he was guilty of a Pārājikā offence, and was permanently excluded from that body. Immediately following this, we meet with details of attempts made to evade this prohibition, and every subsequent enlargement of it, too vile for publication and displaying a state of corruption almost inconceivable. Thus, after the promulgation of the above mentioned law, the record proceeds to tell of bestiality. Then all female creatures were included in the prohibition. Some clerics in every possible way exercised their ingenuity to satisfy their brutish lusts on the living, and, when Buddha's prohibitions followed them there, they turned to dead and inanimate matter with the hope of escaping the extreme penalty. Their efforts were futile, but eventually were crowned with success, for we find full descriptions given of horrible sins which Buddha has declared not Pārājikā, but Samghādisesa, Thullaccaya, or Dukkata—i.e., breaches of discipline, remediable after suspension and penance, or evil actions to which no penal consequences appear to have been attached.

a Bhikkhu desirous of obtaining the property of another, would ask a brother cleric to steal it for him ; if he consented, and took the thing specified, both were guilty of a Pārājikā offence ; but if the agent stole a different object, the originator of the theft was not guilty.¹

(3) When Buddha on a special occasion had delivered a most impressive address to the Bhikkhus in the Vesali on the ills and sorrows of life, they were so influenced by his speech that they desired immediate death, and requested a priest, Migalandiko, to kill them. He complied with their wishes, and then went to the Vaggamuda river to wash the blood from his sword. While there, he was overcome with remorse ; but a god of the chase knowing his thoughts assured him that he was quite mistaken, that the deed he had performed was meritorious, and exhorted him to persevere in the same beneficent course of action. He then went from monastery to monastery offering to carry to the other shore all who had not reached it. This went on till the number of his victims amounted to sixty a day. When this was reported to Buddha he convened an assembly, reproved the offender, and enacted the following law—namely, that if any person knowingly take the life of a human being, he is guilty of a Pārājikā offence and excommunicated.

The Chabbaggiya Bhikkhus, who had become attached to the wife of a lay devotee, who was sick, pictured out to him the pleasures of heaven, and told him that in consequence of his blameless life he was certain to arrive there. He therefore refused to take nourishment and died. Buddha, on hearing of this, expanded the above inhibition to make it include this kind of action.

Many devices were resorted to as before to evade this prohibition, by employing others to commit the murder. Instigation itself was an "evil act." If the murder were perpetrated as the prompter intended, both the perpetrator and prompter were guilty of a Pārājikā offence ; if otherwise, the prompter was not guilty of any breach of discipline.²

(4) On a certain occasion, when some Bhikkhus had met together to observe the Vas season on the banks of the Vaggamuda river, there was a famine in the land, and they thought that in consequence they would find great difficulty in procuring food, unless they resorted to some device to make the people willing to give. Accordingly, they resolved to make it known that they were Bhikkhus distinguished for their possession of the noblest

¹ About twenty pages are filled with the account of attempts thus made by the Bhikkhus to steal, and of Buddha's decisions as to the degree of culpability or innocence of the person concerned.

² Many pages are occupied with the record of cases of administering medicine to women with criminal intent.

virtues attainable by their order, virtues which would certainly enable them to reach Nirvāna; and that some of them actually possessed superhuman powers. The people believed them, and furnished them with abundant supplies of food. At the end of three months these Bhikkhus, according to custom, returned to present themselves to Buddha, who asked how it was that they were so fat and sleek, while the rest, on account of the famine, were weak and emaciated. They confessed that they had duped the laity with the assertion of their possession of certain virtues and powers, and met with a severe reproof from Buddha, who now passed his Fourth Pārājikā Enactment, forbidding the false assertion of the possession of the highest virtues and powers attainable by the aspirant to Nirvāna. This regulation also the Bhikkhus attempted to evade in many ways, and occasionally with success.

II. The second class of breaches of discipline—Samghādisesa offences—are so called because a complete chapter of Bhikkhus must carry out the punishment and restoration connected with these faults. There are thirteen divisions of offences so named, the first five of which may be denominated sins of self-defilement and approaches to adultery, or actions which are not breaches of the first Pārājikā rule, because, although their tendency lay in that direction, they stopped short of the actual commission of cohabitation. Under each head many varieties of these vices are recorded, each of which was a Samghādisesa offence, or, in some cases, an offence of less importance. It may be doubted whether any other religion in the world has in its authoritative Scriptures such a disgusting record of fearful vices indulged in by the priests of that religion, and declared by its founder to be minor breaches of discipline and easily remediable. If the accuracy of this assertion be challenged, a perusal of the account of the above-mentioned five rules must be made, and a darker picture sought elsewhere. Nor should it be overlooked that although Buddha cannot be held as responsible for the abominable practices of his clerics, yet the fact is undeniable, as we have said, that he classed these vices among the *minor* offences, and declared that any one who had been guilty of any of them might remain a member of the order of Bhikkhus.

The remainder of the Samghādisesa offences relate to the taking of property, suborning false witnesses, rape or adultery innuendos, attempts at schism, abuse, and the participation in games and public amusements.¹

¹ After the commission of a Samghādisesa offence a Bhikkhu's duty was to confess it immediately, in order that a chapter of the qualified members of his order might be convened, and the punishment be determined and pronounced. If there had been no delay in confessing, the preliminary suspension called Parivāsa was shortened; if otherwise, this first disci-

III. The two Aniyata—undefinable breaches of discipline—are so called because it might not be possible at the time to say to which class—Pārājikā, Samghādisesa or Pācittiya—they belonged. From the illustrations given they appear to signify association with a female in private, in such a friendly manner as to give rise to suspicions that a serious breach of discipline has been committed or contemplated; and if after inquiry it was discovered that such was the case, the offenders were punished according to their degree of guilt.

IV. The next order of offences is denominated Pācittiya, and is divided into two classes—Nissaggiya Pācittiya and simply Pācittiya. They are respectively thirty and ninety-two in number, and the former relate to offences against property, in atonement for which the Bhikkhu must repent and forfeit what he has acquired; for the offences contained in the latter class he must submit to censure and show penitence.

Most of the Nissaggiya Pācittiyas were connected with the robes, cloths, bowls, comforts for the sick, the receipt of money, and the abuse of lawful privileges. In every case the offender was obliged to restore his stolen possessions and show sorrow for his misconduct. Here also acts of filthiness and indecency are described, but no further censure of them is intimated than that implied in the forfeiture of the robes which have been thus defiled.

The ninety-two Pācittiyas relate to lying, ridicule, mischief-making, evil associations, whisperings, backbitings, tale-bearing, giving pain to animals, familiarity with female Bhikkhus, misuse of the furniture, &c., of the monastery, and similar matters, many of which belong rather to the laws of etiquette and good manners than to morality.

plinary state was imposed for a time equal to that which had elapsed between the commission of the sin and its confession. In some cases it was necessary for other members of the fraternity who were not offenders to take the initiative, and perform several acts preliminary to that of suspension, but this must be done in the prescribed manner. The culprit was then charged with his offence, reproved, reduced to a state of submission, separated from his companions, and temporarily subjected to a sentence of exclusion. While under Parivāsa-suspension he had no rights of fellowship with the innocent Bhikkhus, and could perform none of the official acts which were part and parcel of their privileges. If while under this Parivāsa-suspension the offender were found guilty of a similar fault or remembered having committed one, he was obliged to submit again from the beginning to this state of discipline.

The second stage of punishment was called Mānatta, a state of exclusion from the society of the Bhikkhus for six nights. The disabilities under which he laboured at this time were much the same as those of the Parivāsa-stage; and if in this interval he were guilty of a like offence, he was forced to renew his penance. At the end of this stage the Abbhāna ceremony, that of restoration to all the privileges of his order—was performed by a Chapter of the Assembly in the prescribed manner.

There does not appear to have been any penance imposed nor separation enforced on account of these acts; but when the offender was conscious of any of them, he was required to confess his fault, repent, and promise to amend.

V. The four Pāṭidesaniya rules relate to irregularities about food, and, as the name implies, it was necessary that the breach of discipline should be confessed, and similar actions for the future avoided.

VI. The seventy-five Sekhiya regulations are about dress, deportment, food, &c., of the most trifling character, which, like some of the preceding, were rendered necessary by the almost incredible stupidity and lethargy of many of the Bhikkhus. As an illustration of the extent to which this legislation was carried we find it recorded that, on *permission* being accorded by Buddha, the Bhikkhus caused houses or sheds to be erected for their own use, and that when these houses were flooded in the rainy season, on account of the lowness of the floors, the poor Bhikkhus would not exert themselves to keep out the water until *permission* had been gained from Buddha by the enactment of a law *permitting* raised floors. These were now made, but yet more terrible calamities were in store for the wretched Bhikkhus. Some of their body were constantly falling off these raised floors for the want of a railing to keep them in. This inconvenience, however, was not remedied till *permission* by law had been granted to surround the raised floors with railings. Their troubles did not end here. For considerable difficulty was experienced in mounting the floors, but no Bhikkhu dreamed of making steps to the floors until *permission* was gained from a law made for that purpose by Buddha himself; and even then some Bhikkhus fell down these law-granted steps because they had no law-granted hand-rail.¹

This review of Buddhism must now draw to a close. It has necessarily been but partial on account of the wide field it covers. It has been a review of the disciplinary laws of Buddha and the causes which led to them. From these we learn how

¹ It may be briefly stated that similar disciplinary laws were issued for the female Bhikkhus in consequence of their criminal irregularities. This order was most unwillingly founded by Buddha after the earnest solicitation of his foster-mother and his favourite disciple Ananda. The female Bhikkhus were separated from the world, and subjected to almost all the laws affecting male Bhikkhus, to whom they were subjected and inferior. Numerous regulations are given about the relative duties of the male and female Bhikkhus to prevent familiarity and association except for certain well-defined public religious duties. In every case the nun, or female Bhikkhu, was inferior to the male cleric. Thus the female Bhikkhu who may have been 100 years in the Upasampadā order is bound to be submissive and respectful to a male Bhikkhu who may have had but one day's service.

he endeavoured to regulate the actions of his clerics and punish their misdeeds. It is, indeed, a wearisome and painful task to wade through the mass of revolting and frivolous details of the crimes, follies, peccadillos, and innumerable irregularities of Buddha's mendicants, and the laws he made accusing or else excusing them, but this is what must be done to obtain a comprehensive and true view of his religion and character. Hitherto he has been presented to the European reader and student as he appears in the Sutta Piṭaka, in the character of the Discoverer and Preacher of Dhamma and Kamma, Law and Result; but we must also look on his portrait in the Vinaya Piṭaka where we see in him a legislator and ruler of a body of clerics.

If this be done, there can be but one result. If thus put in the balance and weighed he will be found wanting; and although we cannot but admire many of his utterances relating to virtue and kindness to all creatures, yet we are disappointed to find that his greatest doctrines and highest rewards are all negative. He was an agnostic about the origin of life and matter, and the King of Pessimists. He declared that Nirvāna, or the cessation of change, thought, and, according to his own views of man's higher nature, even of life itself, was the *summum bonum*, only attained after infinite exertions and countless lives spent in joy and suffering.

It is desirable that his character and religion should be fully known, so far as the laws of decency and propriety will admit of details being given, from his own Scriptures, and the verdict will certainly then be just. He will be acknowledged as one of the greatest reformers of hoar antiquity, who in several countries and in the various stages of the early development of civilization endeavoured according to the lights they had to improve their fellow men and make them obedient to moral law. But they all failed because they could not remove the sins already committed, nor implant a new Nature in man which could engender in the heart a love of virtue for its own sake, and still more a love of God the Author and Giver of all good. This has been done by Jesus of Nazareth, whose religion has in it all the elements of good, and is sufficient for all the requirements of humanity. He is the bright Sun of Righteousness still rising with Healing in His wings, and appears as such to all who fear and love Him whether as nations or as individuals. His rays are now lighting up Eastern and Southern Asia, and the light of Buddhism is waning and paling as do the stars in the incomparably superior glory of the rising orb of day.

S. COLES.