

CORRESPONDENCE.

1. THE SŪTRA OF THE BURDEN-BEARER.

*Wurzburg.**April 22.*

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—It will probably not have escaped your notice that the “Sūtra of the Burden and the Burden-bearer,” which Professor de la Vallée Poussin, in his letter in your last issue (p. 308), refers to as quoted by the Pudgalavādins as an authority on their side, is actually to be found in our Pali Pitaka, at vol. iii, p. 25, of the Saṃyutta Nikāya.

The manner in which this ancient sutta was appealed to by the opponents of the Bauddhas as being against the Bauddhas’ doctrine of the *non-ātman* is very instructive.

Far from being entitled, on the ground of this sutta, to consider the *pudgala-vāda* as a genuine portion of the ancient doctrine, it is just the other way. For we have in it a proof that *puggala* in the sense of a soul (*attā*) was unknown to the author of the sutta. He uses the word quite clearly as referring simply to the five skandhas, and indeed states so in so many words. To him *bhāra* and *hāra*, Burden and Bearer, form one inseparable unity, and the laying down of the Burden, that is of the skandhas, is synonymous and simultaneous with the laying down of the Bearer (*Bhāranikkhepana* = *hāranikkhepana*).

Uddyotakara, in his use of the sutta, is guilty of what we call, in logic, a *subreptio*.—Yours sincerely,

E. HARDY.

[M. Poussin has already informed me, since he wrote his letter, that he has found the sūtra in the Saṃyutta. It has been translated by Warren.

The 'last words' of Uddyotakara, quoted by M. Poussin, seem to mean merely that, in his opinion (which, as Professor Hardy points out, is wrong), the conclusion to be drawn from the sūtra is that one who denies the existence of the soul is heretic from the Buddhists' own point of view.—Ed.]

2. ON A PASSAGE IN THE BHABRA EDICT.

Gwynfa, Cheltenham.

April 30, 1901.

DEAR PROFESSOR RHYS DAVIDS,—Permit me to point out that Professor E. Hardy, when writing his letter about the Bhabra Edict which appeared in our Journal for April last (p. 311), was to some extent misled by overlooking the amended reading and interpretation of the Bhabra Edict published by Messrs. Grierson and Senart in *Ind. Ant.*, vol. xx, pp. 165–168 (1891).

M. Senart, when writing in 1891, was able to avail himself of a rubbing taken by Dr. Burgess, and an imperfect rubbing taken by Dr. Hoernle. The amended reading, instead of *diseyām*, is *diseyam*, but for the interpretation this is immaterial. The correction *taṃ vatave*, instead of *tavitave*, the form which Dr. Hardy discusses, is material, and supplies the needed infinitive to be constructed with *alahāmi hakāmi*. M. Senart expressly notes that *vatave* "is equivalent to Sanskrit *vaktum*." *Taṃ* corresponds to the relative *e*. Dr. Hardy's ingenious identification of *tavitave* with *thapetum* thus disappears. M. Senart, in 1891, agreed with Dr. Hardy in regarding *sadhamme* as equivalent to *saddharma*.

On the other hand, the principal point of Professor Hardy's contention, viz. his taking the words "*hevaṃ sadhamme cilathitike hasatīti*" as a quotation, seems, so far as I can judge, to be established, and is of considerable importance.—Yours truly,

VINCENT A. SMITH.