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Abstract

The Buddha's teachings have been handed down in different Middle Indic forms (Pāli and Gāndhārī), in Sanskritized Prakrit and in Sanskrit itself, and various non Indo-Aryan languages like Tibetan and Middle Chinese. Comparing corresponding passages in the surviving witnesses uncovers linguistic ambiguities which are phonologically cognate, but semantically unclear, pointing to an earlier, underlying linguistic form of which the witnesses are translations. Sanskritizations of earlier Prakrit transmissions are particularly revealing as they fix arbitrary meanings to a more malleable, polysemous underlying speech-form. This is describable as a simplified lingua franca or koine gangétique containing elements of all dialects, but eliminating the most obtrusive dialect differences; the result was a more homogenized communication medium which allowed for rapid dissemination of the Buddha's teachings across dialect boundaries in northern India. This lingua franca was probably derived from, or had affinities with,
the existing language of trade, or the administrative language of government at the time.

Whether the Buddha spoke this language or not is impossible to tell, but, if we assume that he spoke an eastern Middle Indic dialect like Māgadhī or Ardhamāgadhī, his teachings were translated into this koine by his disciples, either during his lifetime or shortly thereafter. By tracing tradents' interpretations of these malleable linguistic forms, we are able to reconstruct some of the lexemic content of the koine and resolve old ambiguities or at least clarify the nature of the transmissional process. Although we can not recover the actual words that the Buddha spoke, we can, in selected instances, get back to a point earlier than the existing witnesses have recorded, which represents the earliest recoverable language of Buddhism. The final section of this study investigates the diffusional effects of indigenous, non-Indo Aryan languages on the phonological, semantic and formal structure of the Buddha's teachings in Middle Indic.
Akkheyyasaññino sattā, akkheyyasmiṃ patiṭṭhitā;

Akkheyyam apariṇāya, yogam-āyanti maccuno. Itivuttaka, Addhasutta (PTS 53⁴⁴-⁵⁴⁴)

“Beings perceive what can be expressed, they take their stand on what can be expressed; not understanding what can be expressed, they come under the bondage of death.”
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Part One

Introduction

At the beginning of Buddhaghosa’s commentary on the Brahmajālasutta (the Sumaṅgalavilāsinī), the author explains eight different usages of the word evaṃ: it can be used as a simile, for teaching, to express approval or reproof, as a summing-up expression, to express the form or manner in which something is understood, and finally it can be used as an example or for emphasis.1 Giving an example of the last usage - avadhāraṇatthena (“for the sake of emphasis”) - he quotes the Khippanisantisutta of the Aṅguttara Nikāya where Ānanda, the Buddha’s cousin, friend and memorizer of the Sutta Piṭaka, is described as atthakusalo, dhammakusalo, byaṅjanakusalo, niruttikusalo, pubbāparakusalo, that is “expert in the meaning, expert in the teaching, expert in the letters, expert in the terms and expert in the context.” “In this way [evaṃ],” continues Buddhaghosa, “Suitably praised by the general of the law (Sāriputta), Ānanda demonstrates the power of his memory, and generates beings’ wish to hear, by saying ‘Thus I have heard,’ [evaṃ me sutaṃ] and according to both the meaning and

1 upamūpadesa-sampahamsana-garahaṇa-vacanasampaṭiggaha-ākāra-nidassanāvadhāraṇādi anekattha-bheda. T. W. Rhys-Davids and J. Estlin Carpenter, The Sumaṅgalā-Vilāsinī, Buddhaghosa’s commentary on the Dīgha Nikāya. (London: Pali Text Society, 1968), vol. 1, 2617-18. Abbreviation Sv. All references to P writings are to the PTS edition page and line number unless otherwise stated; translations are by the author unless otherwise stated. Volume numbers are given in Arabic numerals, not Roman, following the Chicago Manual of Syle 14.154. Punctuation, capitalization or proper names, orthography, hyphens, commas, quotation marks, etc. follow the PTS editions, which, the reader will notice, are not always standardized amongst themselves. I have eliminated the use of the circumflex (-ā-) which the PTS sometimes uses to indicate vowel lengthening at compound junctures, sometimes to indicate a long vowel, because of possible confusion; the normal convention of -ā- is used instead. I also do not use the palatal velar symbol (-ṛ), but substitute the niḍḍahīta (S anusvāra, -ṛ) instead.
the letter, nothing lacking and nothing superfluous, that is to be seen just in that way \textit{[evameva]}, not otherwise.\textsuperscript{2}

Buddhaghosa was concerned about the accurate transmission of the \textit{dhamma}; Ānanda is the mythical “reciter” (\textit{bhāṇaka}) extraordinaire of the Buddha’s teachings. As a reciter Ānanda is perfect in every way: he knows the teachings themselves (\textit{dhammakusalo}, “expert in the teaching”) and therefore their meaning(s) (\textit{atthakusalo}), the phonology and morphology (\textit{vyañjanakusalo}),\textsuperscript{3} all the key terms (\textit{niruttikusalo})\textsuperscript{4} and the context (\textit{pubba-aparakusalo}). The purity of the teaching transmission was a constant concern of the \textit{sarīgha} and the monks entrusted with its preservation like Buddhaghosa were well aware of the various corruptions which could be introduced into the tradition. In his commentary on the \textit{Vinaya} (the \textit{Samantapāsādikā})\textsuperscript{5} for example, he talks about various pronunciation mistakes which would invalidate a \textit{kammavācā} (an official action of the \textit{sarīgha}), and there is the well-known story of Ariṭṭha in the \textit{Āgaddūpamasutta} (MN 1, 130f) who simply misunderstands the teachings.

Correct understanding is a constant concern of the Buddha, from the moment of his enlightenment, when he decides not to teach for fear of others not understanding the \textit{dhamma}

\begin{footnotes}
\item[2] Sv 1, 28\textsuperscript{1-7}: \textit{evam Bhagavatā, Āyasmā Ānando attha-kusalo, dhamma-kusalo, vyañjana-kusalo, niruttikusalo, pubbāpara-kusalo}’ti evam dhamma-senāpatinā ca pasattha-bhāvānurūpaṃ attano dhāraṇa-balāṃ dassento sattānāṃ sotkāmatāṃ janeti evam me sutam, taṅ ca kho attatho vā vyañjanato vā anūnam avadhikam, evam eva na aññathā, daṭṭhabban ti.
\item[3] literally \textit{vyañajana} means, “letters,” “consonants,” or “syllables.”
\item[4] The word \textit{nirutt} can also refer to dialect, although in most places in the \textit{suttas} it refers to “names, designations, terms.” For an examination of the word in context, see Bryan Levm, “\textit{Sakāya niruttiyā Revisited},” \textit{Bulletin des Études Indiennes}, 26-27, (2008-2009), 35f, and Chapter Four of this study. The corresponding S word \textit{nirukti} has more of the sense of “etymological interpretation.”
\item[5] Sp 1399\textsuperscript{3}-1400\textsuperscript{36}.
\end{footnotes}
which is “deep, hard to see, hard to understand, peaceful and excellent, not in the realm of reasoning, subtle, to be experienced by the wise”; indeed many of the suttas are stories of the Buddha trying to explain a difficult concept, like what happens to the Tathāgata when he dies. He recognized the importance of transmission accuracy by setting up four mahāpadesas, four criteria for recognizing whether something is the word of the Buddha or not. The four mahāpadesas involve comparing the putative words of the Buddha with those found in the suttas and the Vinaya, whether they were allegedly spoken by the Buddha, by the saṅgha, by many monks or even one. Ironically the mahāpadesas themselves have been the subject of some confusion, as is shown, for example, by the existence of different key verbs in the Pāli (P) and Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (BHS) traditions (osāretabbāni vs. otāretabbāni), and different interpretations as to the meaning of the rules.

---

6 This statement is a repeated trope which occurs several times in the suttas, for example in the Mahāpadānasutta, DN 2, 36:\textsuperscript{1-3}: Adhigato kho me ayaṁ dhammo gambhiro dudḍaso duranubodho santo paṇīto atakkāvacaro nipuno pandita-vedanīyo. I use "the Buddha" throughout as a metonymy for "the Buddhist tradition," as obviously we do not know exactly what the historical personage actually thought; we only know his words as remembered and transmitted by his followers.

7 For example in the Aggivacchagottasutta, MN 2, 484f.

8 Mahāparinibbānasutta, DN 2, 123\textsuperscript{10}-126\textsuperscript{5}.

9 The P tradition preserves two readings osāretabbāni and otāretabbāni. These are both gerundives modifying padavaṇjanāni ("words & letters"); padavaṇjanāni ... sutte osāretabbāni [otāretabbāni], vinaye sandassetabbāni, DN 2, 124\textsuperscript{8-9}). The first word comes from the verb osarati in its caus. form meaning "to come into, enter, flow" and the second from otārati meaning "to enter, descend, betake oneself to." The BHS traditions has śrotram... sutre vatārayitavāṃ vinaye samdarśayitavyāṃ. See Ernst Waldschmidt, "Das Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, Text in Sanskrit und Tibetisch, verglichen mit dem Pāli nebst einer Übersetzung der Chinesischen Entsprechung im Vinaya der Mūlasarvāstivādins," Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin., Teil 1, 1950; Teil 2 & 3, 1951. (1950-1951), 238. Alexander Wynne discusses the meaning of these verbal forms in "The Oral Transmission of the Early Buddhist Literature," Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, 27, number 1 (2004), 100-104, disagreeing with L. S. Cousins, "Pali Oral Literature," in P. T. Denwood and A. Piatigorsky eds.,
Scholars today are well aware that the Buddhist transmission was not uniform, for a variety of reasons ranging from the traditions of the different schools, dialect variation within India, oral memorization problems, confusions in translation, the influence of non Indo Aryan (IA) languages on Middle Indic (MI), and manuscript copying mistakes. Even words with an impeccable pedigree are not exempt from question. Take for example the well-known word *tathāgata* which is the subject of a long diversion by Buddhaghosa in the *Sūmāṅgalavilāsinī* commentary on the *Brahmajālasutta* referred to above. One would expect that a common word like this - which occurs well over a thousand times in the *suttas* and *Vinaya* - would be clearly understood as to meaning and etymology. This is after all the word that the Buddha uses to refer to himself. According to a typical Buddhist Dictionary, the terms can mean either “one who has thus come” or “one who has thus gone,” interpreting the compound as formed from *tathā+gata* or *tathā+āgata*. The word *tathā* would mean “[gone or come] in the way of other Buddhas” before or after him. But the definition is not convincing and Buddhaghosa gives

---

*Buddhist Studies Ancient and Modern* (London, 1983), 2-3. Wynne argues that “the accuracy with which a body of literature called ‘Sutta’ was meant to be transmitted was very high, down to the letter” (103), while Cousins argues for a looser interpretation, at least as far as *sutta* is concerned - as long as the transmission in question conforms to a traditional pattern of teaching as outlined in the *Peṭakopadesa*, not necessarily to historical truth, it was acceptable (page 3).


11 The Sanskrit Wörterbuch suggests that, “In our opinion, the first meaning [*tathā-gata*] is better than all the rest as a designation for a Buddha: the attributes of that one are so manifold and at the same time so difficult to designate through a suitable expression that one preferred to simply designate him as such a one who really is” (einen solchen, wie er in Wirklichkeit ist). See Otto Böhtlingk and Rudolph Roth, *Sanskrit Wörterbuch* (New Delhi: Banarsidass Publishers Pvt. Ltd., 1990), vol 3, 209, s.v. *tathāgata*. Abbreviation: B&R.

12 Ordinarily one would see this expression as a correlative of *yathā*, as for example, *yathā subhāni karmāni ācaret, tathā svargaṃ gacchet*, (P *yathā subhāṇi kammāni ācare, tathā saggaṃgacche*), “As he
six additional possibilities to the conventional meanings of *tathā āgato* and *tathā gato*: 3) *tathā-lakkhaṇaṃ āgato* (“arrived at the true qualities”), 4) *tatha-dhamme yāthāvato abhisambuddho* (“awakened to real *dhammas* in their real essence”), 5) *tatha-dassitāya* (“because he is the seer of the real/true”), 6) *tatho aviparīto āgado assa* (“whose speech is true and unequivocal”), 7) *tathā kāritāya* (“because he practices what he teaches”), 8) *iti sabba lokābhībhavanena tatho aviparīto desanā-vilāsa-mayo c’eva puñña-mayo ca agado assa* (“thus by vanquishing all the world his medicine contains true undistorted elegance of teaching and merit”).

The long -ā- at the compound juncture offers four possibilities for exegesis (*tathā-gata; tathā-āgata; tatha-agata; tatha-āgata*), the first three of which are discussed by Buddhaghosa. The word *tatha* does not appear in Vedic or Sanskrit (S), but does exist in P with a meaning of “truthful, true, real,” often in association with *taccha* and *bhūta* with a similar meaning. Once the possibility of lenition of the intervocalic -t- in *gata > -d-* is acknowledged, two other possibilities present themselves: *tatha-āgada* (<ā + āg, “true speech”) and *tatha-agada* (“true does good deeds, so he may go to heaven,” or *yathā-nirāyāsaṃ-laddham, tathā-nirāyāsaṃ-gatam* “Just as it is easily gained, so it is easily lost.”


14 For example DN 1, 1917-8: *api ca samano gotamo bhūtam taccham tathāṃ patipadam paññapeti dhamma-ṭṭhitam dhamma-niyāmakam.* “But the ascetic Gotama teaches a true and real way of practice which is consonant with Dhamma and grounded in Dhamma,” Maurice Walshe, *The Long Discourses of the Buddha a Translation of the Dīgha Nikāya* (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1995), 165. The use of the word *tatha* immediately following *tathāgata* in the previous sentence, suggests that the *sutta* is providing a partial derivation for the first part of the compound. The Burmese edition has a variant for *niyāmakam* (“grounded in”), *niyāmatam* (“fixed in”), which suggests an earlier transmission without the stop, or with an intervocalic glide. See discussion below. All references to the Burmese recensions are from the Burmese Sixth Council edition (Chaṭṭhasaṅgīyana) which is available online at [http://www.tipitaka.org/romn/](http://www.tipitaka.org/romn/) Accessed May 2013.
medicine" < \textit{gada} = "sickness"; \textit{agada} = "healthy, medicine"), as Buddhaghosa has interpreted it in \#8 above.

Lenition of intervocalic stops was a very common change in the Pkt; an entire chapter will be devoted to this topic and an explanation of the reasons for it (Chapter 10). Buddhaghosa was well aware of this issue for it invalidated a \textit{Vinaya kammavācā}, although it was acceptable for the \textit{Sutta Piṭaka},\footnote{Oskar von Hinüber, "Buddhist Law and the Phonetics of Pāli: a passage from the \textit{Samantapāsādikā} on avoiding mispronunciation in \textit{kammavācās}," \textit{Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik} 13/14 (Festschrift für Wilhelm Rau, 1987) (Reinbeck, 1987), 108. Also in \textit{Selected Papers on Pāli Studies} (Oxford: Pali Text Society 2005), 208.} presumably because it was so common, with various monks pronouncing the words according to their different dialects; nevertheless, it could change the meaning, as in this case. Aspiration and de-aspiration could also have the same effect, and although Buddhaghosa did not explore this phenomenon, this kind of change is fairly common in P\footnote{See Wilhelm Geiger, \textit{A Pāli Grammar. translated into English by Batakrishna Bhosh, revised and edited by K. R. Norman} (Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2005), §40, hereinafter referred to as "Geiger." In studying the canon one comes across this interchange of aspirated stops and non-aspirated stops all the time, both in variant readings within the P canon (which can sometimes change the meanings as at DN 2, 130\textit{ sakāta-satthassa}, "of the caravan of wagons" in PTS vs. \textit{ sakāta-satassa}, "of a hundred wagons" in the Cambodian recension), and in comparing Pkt to Sanskritized Pkt, e.g \textit{anupādisesa} in P ("without remainder") vs. \textit{anupadhiśeṣa} in BHS, where the \textit{-d} and \textit{-dh} alternate. This interchange may be related to the influence of non-Indic (i.e. indigenous) languages on MI, who did not have aspirated stops as part of their phonology. See page 463 below.} and would lead to such interpretations as \textit{tata-gata}, "gone to the father" or "gone to the wind" (from \textit{tata} as noun < p.p. of \textit{v+tar} or "he who has manifested/diffused and departed" (taking both \textit{tata} and \textit{gata} as past participles). In addition, an aspirated stop often changed to \textit{-h-} only with the stop > \textit{Ø}, which in fact was the case for this word in Ardhamāgadhī (AMg) where it appears
as *tahāgaya*, with the intervocalic -t- also weakening to a -y-, another common Prakritic lenition. Thomas suggests that *tathāgata* was derived from *tatthagata* or *tatthāgata* < S *tatra-āgata* (“he who has arrived there, i.e. at emancipation”) and Buddhaghosa seems to have recognized this possibility in his fifth interpretation above (*tattha tatha-dassi-atthe*) with his juxtaposition of the two phonetically similar forms. Moreover, no one has examined the possibility that *gata* (which was probably transmitted as *gaya* with the intervocalic -y-, often written as -yā18 standing for the weakly articulated intervocalic stop) may have stood for *gaja* (“elephant”; *tatha-gaja*, “true elephant”) or *gaya* itself (“household, abode, family”; *tatha-gaya*, “one’s true family”).

I am only indulging in these last two fanciful derivations to make a point: we are not sure what the word *tathāgata* means, anymore than Buddhaghosa was 1500 years ago; and it is quite possible, since its etymology was never handed down, that neither were the original users of the term, except for the Buddha himself. Indeed, the word was probably transmitted in a Prakritized form as *tahāgaya* and later Sanskritized to *tathāgata*. Thomas even suggests it was originally a non-Aryan Munda word, which was Sanskritized, but this can not be proven.19 Nevertheless, the form and meaning of the word *Tathāgata* is a useful paradigm for some of the key questions involved in the transmission of the Buddha’s teachings, the subject of this

---


19 Thomas, “*Tathāgata*,” 786-787. Munda refers to the Austro-Asiatic language group which will be discussed in more detail in Chapters 11 and 12. See also Stanisław Schayer, “Notes and Queries on Buddhism,” *Rocznik Orientalistyczny*, 11 (1935), 211-13, who also wonders if the word is non-Aryan.
dissertation. In the end, all that we have to go on are the words that have survived, and knowing what they mean and how and why they mean what they mean is perhaps a scholar’s most important task.\textsuperscript{20}

Given the fact that the Buddhist teachings were, according to tradition, not written down until the 1\textsuperscript{st} century BCE,\textsuperscript{21} and that the transmission until then was almost exclusively oral, this dissertation will try to answer the following questions:

1) What can we know, i.e. reconstruct using standard historical linguistic techniques about the earliest language of Buddhism. How much, if any is recoverable?

2) What changes did the words of the teachings undergo, through evolution over time, dialect change, Sanskritization and other translation artifacts, and diffusion/borrowing effects from non-Aryan languages (Munda, Dravidian, Tibeto-Burman and others unknown)?

3) How did these changes affect our understanding of the meaning of the teachings, especially - as we have discussed above re: \textit{tathāgata} - of key Buddhist terminology?

The \textit{study} will be divided into 14 sections in three parts:

\textbf{Part One}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{20} K. R. Norman, "Philology and Buddhism," \textit{A Philological Approach to Buddhism, The Bukkyō Dendō Kyokai Lectures 1994} (Lancaster: Pali Text Society, 2006), 237. “I will repeat myself, and say again that, in my opinion, no worthwhile original work on early Buddhism, perhaps any sort of Buddhism, can be done by anyone who does not have a good grasp of the relevant languages. And by a good grasp I mean the ability not only to say what the words mean, but also why they mean it, …”

\textsuperscript{21} As recorded in the Sinhalese chronicles, \textit{Dīpavaṃsa} 20, 21 and \textit{Mahāvaṃsa}, 30, 111.
\end{flushleft}
1) A statement of the problem; history of research to date.

2) The oral nature of the transmission and an introduction to the surviving dialect witnesses.

3) A description of the methodology and its limitations; a note on editions.

4) The question of whether there was a single or multiple source for the Buddhist teachings.

5) What the Aśokan edicts teach us about linguistic evolution and the phonological structure of the Buddhist oral transmission in the fifth-third century BCE.

Part Two

6) Ambiguities in the Canon. A sample case

7) Ambiguities in the Canon 2 and the Transmission Process.

8) Ambiguities in the Canon 3 and the Transmission Process.

9) Ambiguities in the Canon 4 and the Transmission Process.

Part Three

10) Voicing and Devoicing of Intervocalic Consonants

11) Linguistic Diffusion

12) A Sample Case of Non Indo-Aryan influence

13) Transmission of the Dharma
14) Summary and Conclusions.

Part One looks at the background scholarship to date, the dialect witnesses, the methodology of this study, the question of the integrity of teachings’ oral transmission, and the linguistic tapestry at the time of the Buddha and Aśoka.

It has long been recognized that there was an earlier pre-canonic language (*langue précanonique*) underlying the Buddhist Theravādin canon. Sylvain Lévi first wrote about this in 1912 and Edgerton, Ji Xianlian, Lüders, Waldschmidt, Norman and von Hinüber have done a lot of work since then in uncovering and describing it (see Chapter 1 for references). The first part of this monograph will review existing work to date and concludes that while an Urtext, - an original core text, supposedly “what the Buddha actually said” - cannot be recovered, traces of an earlier language underlying the P and other Middle Indic (MI) writings can be reconstructed, at least partially in its lexemic content. This is an *earlier* language or dialect, but may not be the *earliest* language of Buddhism, of which the former itself is probably a translation. Chapter 1 will discuss research to date and the general academic scenario.

Chapter 2 discusses the oral nature of the Buddhist teachings and the implications thereof for its accurate transmission. This chapter will introduce the principal linguistic players in this story - the Middle Indic witnesses in which the Buddha’s teachings were transmitted, - and start to note some of the features of the pre-canonical language, described here as a type of pan-Indic *lingua franca* of northern India. By this term I mean a simplified language with dialect differences homogenized so that it can act as an effective medium of communication between
speakers of different Indo Aryan (IA) dialects, and speakers of different non-IA mother tongues, like Dravidian, Munda, etc. who are learning IA as a second language. Discussion of the indigenous non-Aryan languages will be deferred until chapter 11.

In chapter 3, the basic methodology of comparative linguistics will be discussed, a form of inductive linguistic stratigraphy, whereby the comparison of surviving witnesses in corresponding cognate passages identifies an underlying form which must have existed to account for the linguistic variation. It concludes that while the comparative methodology has some limitations, the results are still scientifically valid and can be depended on.

The first three chapters then lay the groundwork for the study. Except for the linguistic examples, and the discussion of P’s linguistic affinities, they are not themselves original, but provide the background information and overview that the reader needs to understand the arguments, and isolate the issues that will be discussed in the study.

Chapter 4 discusses the oral nature of the transmission in more detail and the question of whether there was a single or multiple transmission. This part of the study concludes that, - at

\[\text{\textsuperscript{22}} ~ I \text{ use } \textit{lingua franca} \text{ in the general sense of } "\text{Any language that is used by speakers of different languages as a common medium of communication; a common language" (OED). Technically } \textit{lingua franca} \text{ refers to an interlanguage for people of different mother tongues, while } \textit{koiné} \text{ is an interlanguage for people of different dialects. See R. L. Trask, } \textit{The Dictionary of Historical and Comparative Linguistics} \text{ (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000), 179, 196. But since elements of both IA dialects and non IA languages are involved in this common language and so little is known of its nature, I use the terms almost interchangeably in this dissertation.}\]
least to the redactors of the canon now available to us, - there was indeed an attempt to
preserve and standardize the teaching of the Buddha, and to memorize the terms and
expressions of his *dhamma* as transmitted; this was to be learned by his disciples precisely and
literally, whether as given in the *Pātimokkha*, the *Āṭṭhakavagga* or the *Sāṃgīti*. It is however
undeniable, that despite this attempt at standardization, translations of his teachings were
undertaken within his very lifetime, or soon after his *parinibbāna*.

Chapter 5 discusses the phonological nature of the underlying earlier language and shows that
many of the features it possessed - intervocalic elision or lenition of stops, loss of aspirated
stops, interchange of glides, interchange of labials, etc. - were already present in the Aśokan
Prakrits (Pkts) of the edicts, engraved within 150 years of the Buddha’s passing. The Aśokan
Pkts, which are themselves based on an underlying “UrPrakrit,” the administrative language of
the Aśokan empire, show the linguistic canvas of India in the mid 3rd century BCE and share
many of the features of this earlier Buddhist language.

Part Two is the core of this study; it begins at Chapters 6 and continues to Chapter 9, analyzing
about sixty different linguistic ambiguities whose meanings can be clarified by comparing
cognate forms and isolating the earlier transmission source. At the end of chapter 9 (page 460)
I try to describe the nature of this underlying language in detail.

Part Three (Chapters 10-14) examines the influence of non-IA languages on Old and Middle
Indic, discusses transmission issues, and provides a summary and conclusions.
Chapters 10 to 12 branch off in a new direction, the influence of linguistic diffusion from non-IA Indic languages on Old and Middle Indic. While extensive work has been done on defining the nature of the India Linguistic Area, this body of knowledge has for the most part not been brought to bear on the philological study of Buddhism. I focus on two areas where non-IA languages have influenced the Buddhist dialects - in the loss of the voiced/voiceless distinction in the Buddhist Pkts, and in the obfuscation of the meaning of non-IA terminology incorporated into OI (Old Indic or Vedic) and MI. Chapter 10 deals with the question of voicedness; chapter 11 with the India Linguistic Area’s shared features and their influence on P; and chapter 12 gives an example of “linguistic archaeology” with respect to the meaning of a fairly common non-IA word (*muṇḍa/muṇḍaka*).

While Tibetan (Tib) and Chinese (Ch) translations are examined wherever they are available, most of the cases in chapters 6 to 9 focus on conflicting MI translations which reveal an earlier protoform, or later, back-translations from MI to S. In chapter 13 I examine a Ch translation of the *Lotus Sutra* which reveals the underlying, lost, Prakrit (Pkt) language, in which it was transmitted to China. The surviving MI redactions of the sutra are largely Sanskritized, and only remnants of the earlier version are available in one (Central Asian) recension.

Chapter 14 is the conclusion, outlining what we have learned about this earlier recoverable language of Buddhism; it was a simplified, *lingua franca* type form of communication which, by removing the major dialect differences, made itself understandable to a wide variety of MI speakers of different dialects. Because it was a “lowest common denominator” dialect, interdialectic ambiguities necessarily resulted, when the context did not make the meaning
clear. These ambiguities crystallized in the Sanskritization process which often chose the
“wrong” meaning, or only one of several possible meanings, thus narrowing the semantic range
of the words. As well as the confusion caused by Sanskritization issues, the
translation/transmission process is also affected by a whole host of other oral and text critical,
phonological, morphological and semantic anomalies.
Chapter One, an Outline of Previous Scholarship

Introduction

What does the P word pācittiya mean? It occurs throughout the Vinaya and indeed there are ninety-two pācittiya rules, the transgression of which require “expiation”\(^{23}\) or “repentance”\(^{24}\) which is how the term is normally translated. It is usually derived from the S prāyaścitta (“relating to atonement or expiation”),\(^{25}\) but the word has come down to us in many diverse forms which render its derivation and meaning problematic. In 1912 Sylvian Lévi pointed out that the Mūlasarvāstivādin form of this word is pāyantika, which is explained by pacati (an offence which “burns”) and pātayati (an offence which “causes one to fall”). The word pāteti is also used as a gloss on the P word pācittiya.\(^{26}\) The Ch routinely translated it by duò (墮, “to fall”) as did the Tibetans (ltung, “to fall” or ltung byed, “to cause to fall”).\(^{27}\) Lévi points out that the sense of “expiation” for the term seems wrong as the only requirement for the purification of


\(^{25}\) R. C. Childers, *A Dictionary of the Pali Language* (London: Trubner & Co., 1875), 312, s.v. pācittiyo; Geiger §27, footnote 2, defines it as “transgression requiring penance.”

\(^{26}\) Vin 5, 148-149: pācittiyan ti yaṃ vuttaṃ taṃ suṇohi yathātathāṃ pāteti kusalaṃ dhāmaṃ, ariyamaggaṃ aparajjhati, trans. by Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, vol. 5, 241, "Listen to that which is called Expiation as it really is: He throws off a skilled rule, offends against the ariyan Way." The commentary, Sp 7, 1352-14-17, states: yaṃ pana cittam pāteti, taṃ yasmā ariyamaggam aparajjhati citta-sammoha-kāraṇaṁ ca hoti. “which causes the mind to fall because it transcends against the noble path and is a cause of mental confusion.”

these sins is confession - no atonement or reparation is required; he derives the word from
prāk-citta (“directed mind”) which the PED claims is the “most likely” source.

In his Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary (BHSD) Edgerton says that there are so many forms of this word that “it is obvious that the original form and meaning of the word can not be confidently reconstructed.”28 He cites a host of variant forms (pātayantika, pāyantika, pāpāntika, pāpātmika, pāyattika, pāpattikā), some of which von Hinüber identifies with the various schools,29 adding even more variant forms (pāyacchittiya, pacchittiya, pātayaṃtika and pāyitti) and in the end suggesting that the source of all the forms is to be found in the compound prāyaścitta. This would indicate a derivation (at least for the P word) of prāyaścitta > *pāyaścitta > pāyacchittiya (AMg.) > pacchittiya (AMg. with -āya- > -ā- > -a- because of double consonant -cch- which makes the vowel long) > pācittiya (P, with lengthening of vowel and shortening of -cch- > -c- because of long vowel)30 - certainly a long list of changes, but possible.

The recent discovery of the G form payati (=pāyatti) in the new Bajaur Collection from Pakistan, shows yet another intermediary stage in the word’s evolution from pācittiya/pācittika/pācattika > pāyitti/pāyatti (G) > pāyatt(nt)ika (Mūlasarvāstivādin) > pātayantika (Sanskritized

30 Ibid, page 65. For the Law of Morae, see Geiger, Pāli Grammar §5(b)
Presumably some of the other variants are due to a misunderstanding of the 
-y- in -āya- taking the glide as an intervocalic stop substitute, and replacing same with -t- or -p-; however this does not explain the change from -aści- > -atti- or -anti- present in so many forms, as -aśc- normally changes to -acch- in Pkt (e.g. S āścarya, "wonderful") > acchāriya in Jaina-Mahārāṣṭrī). The purpose of this exercise is not to solve the issue, which may well be intractable, only to point out that - like the word Tathāgata described in the Introduction - we are not sure of the meaning of this common Buddhist word; although we know it refers to some kind of minor misdemeanour, we do not know how it gets its meaning. Nor does it solve our problem if we are content with the derivation from prāyaścitta, for the reader will quickly discover that the meaning of prāyah is not clear either, sometimes denoting an adverb “mostly” and sometimes a noun, “death” or “seeking death by fasting.”

Roth points out that the Mahāsāṃghika version of this word (pācattika) is much closer to the Theravādin/P version (pācittiya) than are the Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin form (pātayantika), confirming the

32 Pischel, §138.
33 Manfred Mayrhofer, Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen, A Concise Etymological Sanskrit Dictionary (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag., 1963), 377-78. Hereinafter KEWA. The word is pre-Buddhist in origin and Pandurang Vaman Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra (Pune: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute. Five volumes, 1977-1997), vol. 4, 59-60, discusses its etymology according to the brahmanical tradition: prāya = tapas and citta = belief, i.e. “to undertake tapas;” or prāya = sin and citta = purification, i.e. “to purify sin;” or pra-ayah = happening or finding and citta = knowledge, i.e. “knowledge of what is not to be done;” and others.
earlier provenance of the former two schools, the latter two being an offshoot of the Theravādin
tradition.34

What we appear to have here is the linguistic evidence for two separate traditions - one based
on prefix + citta and one on the verb pat, patati and perhaps the noun pāpa (“evil deed”).
Indeed, there are several instances in the P canon where this appears to be the case, where
the words are so different, they can not be traced to any single source point.

**Single vs. Multiple Transmission?**

In his comparison of different versions of the *Rhinoceros Sūtra*, Richard Salomon says,

> Since the differences between the recensions of the Khvs [Khaggavisāṇasutta] are
> almost certainly ultimately rooted in an early, exclusively or primarily oral stage of
> transmission, the possibility of reconstructing a single “urtext” is virtually ruled out from
> the beginning. Recent scholarship in Indology and other areas has established that
> traditional Western modes of text criticism rooted in the urtext-stemma codicum model
> of tracing back to a single archetype by comparing derivative texts are inapplicable to

34 Gustav Roth, "Particular Features of the Language of the Ārya-Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādins and
their Importance for Early Buddhist Tradition," in Bechert, H., *The Language of the Earliest Buddhist
Tradition*, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische
Klasse, Dritte Folge, Nr. 117 (1980), 90. The Sthaviras (Theravādins) and the Mahāsāṃghikas diverged
sometime after the Second Council, approx. 100 years after the Buddha’s death, which occurred about
400 BCE, based on current scholarly thinking.
oral literature or to written literature whose historical roots lie in an originally oral tradition.³⁵

Although the author does not cite the “recent scholarship” to which he refers there are several possibilities. In 1964, Albert Lord published his important study on the oral epic, *The Singer of Tales*, carrying on Milman Parry’s interrupted work on the formulaic structure of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* and Yugoslav epics. Using Parry’s definition, Lord defined the formula as “a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea.”³⁶ It was the formula in its various forms of descriptive epithets, verbal action forms, lists, descriptions of times and places, etc., that formed the specialized poetic grammar of an oral epic narrative, which the performer drew on to spontaneously compose his/her version of the poem. Every performance is unique - one cannot say it is a “variant” as there is no “original” to be varied (p. 101). In this respect the great Greek poems represent only one particular performance of many that have happened to be preserved; a masterpiece no less, but a masterpiece that owes as much to the oral medium of transmission and the spontaneous poetic grammar which informs it, as it does to the genius of the poet performing it.

Lord’s work was continued by, amongst others, Walter Ong and Jack Goody, whose theories are not always consistent with the form orality takes in Buddhism. Ong lists nine useful characteristics of orally based thought and expression³⁷, only some of which are applicable to

Buddhist orality; conservatism and agonistic tonality, for example, are not characteristic of Buddhist oral expression. Goody believed that the Vedas could not have been orally transmitted because their fixed form and great length contradicted his theory that such a feat could only be accomplished with the aid of writing. So he proposed, against all evidence, that writing was current in India in Vedic times.\(^{38}\) Although his argument was effectively refuted by Falk,\(^{39}\) it makes one deeply suspicious of any claim of universality with respect to the usefulness of the oral vs. literate duality. K. R. Norman specifically disputes the comparison between the Buddhist teachings and the western epic:

...the very nature of Buddhist verse texts, and the metres in which they were written, demanded complete accuracy of memorizing, whereas the oral literature which has been studied is essentially of an epic nature where, as I said earlier, it is alleged that no two performances are ever identical because the reciter is free to insert, at any point, material of a formal nature, the so-called formulae which can be used to keep the recitation going while he remembers what happened next in the story. The great majority of Pāli canonical texts, however, are in prose, and complete accuracy of


reproduction is required at each recitation. In these circumstances the findings of modern investigators of oral epic literature seem to have little relevance.\textsuperscript{40}

Although most of the material examined in this study purports to be the actual words of the Buddha as preserved in the \textit{gāthās} (see page 75 where I argue that the \textit{gāthās} are preserved even more carefully than the prose), some of it also comes from the prose narratives. In a recent (2009) article, Daniel Selden studies “Text Networks” which flourished in late antiquity up to the invention of printing circa 1500 CE. Text networks are multiform texts on various religious and popular themes which are autopoietic - they are self-organized, self-regulated and self-perpetuating, responding to the different cultures contexts where they are found, without an author and without a unique source. Selden describes them as “translations without an original.”\textsuperscript{41} The \textit{Mahāparinibbānasutta} (MPN), which may be the first and oldest prose narrative in India, about the last days of the Buddha leading up to his parinibbāna, definitely has some similarities with this model. We know of at least nine different versions of the story that have survived (one in P, one in Gāndhāri (G), one in BHS, one in Tib and five in Ch), and although they share a commonality of theme, the details and language can be quite different, even amongst the cognate language groups. Nevertheless a core story common to all versions is easily identifiable and the correspondences in language, syntax and narrative certainly

\textsuperscript{40} K. R. Norman, "Buddhism and Oral Tradition," In \textit{A Philological Approach to Buddhism, The Bukkyō Dendō Kyōkai Lectures 1994} (Lancaster: Pali Text Society, 2006), 64. See also Wynne, "Oral Transmission," 121, and Bhikkhu Anālayo, "Oral Dimensions of Pali Discourses: Pericopes, other Mnemonic Techniques and the Oral Performance Context," \textit{Canadian Journal of Buddhist Studies}, 3 (2007): 5-33, who concludes that “the formal aspects of the Pali discourses - the use of pericopes, the occurrence of metrical and sound similarities, the application of the principle of waxing syllables, and the recurrent use of repetition - testify to the nature of these discourses as the final product of a prolonged period of oral transmission whose aim was to preserve texts as accurately as possible” (20).

outweigh the differences. Although one can probably never uncover an “original” account of the Buddha’s passing, comparison of parallel passages can yet reveal important facts about the phonological evolution of the language, and study of the literary strata can illuminate the stratigraphy of the content and chronology of its composition.\(^{42}\)

Dead Sea Scrolls

Salomon may also be referring to what scholars have learned from the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls early in the last century, discoveries which revolutionized our understanding of the process of scriptural formation in the Hebrew Bible. Although not directly comparable to the Buddhist transmission, which was at least until the first century BCE exclusively an oral process, the Dead Sea Scroll works show a varying textual transmission where each stage in the continuum is accepted as authoritative at the time and used by the community until added to or replaced by a new editions. Repetitions, additions, combinations and conflations, enhancements, theological corrections, exegesis, leveling and harmonizations are part of the normal on-going process of a biblical book’s development as it moved from a fluid, adaptable

\[^{42}\text{In a recent unpublished study of the MPN, for example (Bryan Levman, "The Transmission of the Story of the Buddha’s parinibbāna, and Evidence for Authochthonous Language Influence"), I identify six varying levels of correspondence of cognate MPN texts: ranging from complete phonological correspondence, the only difference being the natural dialect differences between the Pkt and Sanskritized forms; correspondence but with different verbal or nominal forms form the same root; correspondence with verbal or nominal forms from different roots but with the same meaning; correspondence with phonologically cognate words, but with different meanings; semantic correspondence, but key words and grammatical structure different; and sixth, limited correspondence in terms of the incident described, but no or very little grammatical or lexical correspondence, including contradictions.}\]
form towards a fixed form. As one goes back in time, this fluidity and variation increase, so, the further back the textual tradition is followed and the more ancient the records, the wider is the overall range of textual divergence.\textsuperscript{43}

At first glance the polyvocality model of textual plurality may appear counter-intuitive. For years scholars have worked on the “tree” model of the Urtext - a core literary trunk (which itself may be more like a multi-trunked \textit{ficus religiosus} of intertwisting literary traditions) which when complete branches out in several textual directions. The task of the textual scholar was to get back to the point where the trunk began to branch out; the literary scholar would analyze the structure of the trunk itself. However, as Tov has pointed out, “the differentiation between these two types of readings is very difficult, and sometimes almost impossible," plus there probably never existed any period of textual unity as the image of the trunk suggests.\textsuperscript{44} The Dead Sea Scrolls have taught us that a more accurate visual representation for biblical development is a grid or lattice\textsuperscript{45} - a founding historical event is immediately interpreted by different constituents of the believing community and transmitted in multiple strands with significant interrelational

\begin{flushleft}
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{44} Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 314, 189.
\end{flushleft}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{45} Salomon uses the image of a bush, as opposed to a ladder to describe the relationship between the three versions (S, P and G) of various Buddhist texts. See Richard Salomon, "Recent Discoveries of Early Buddhist Manuscripts and their Implications for the History of Buddhist Texts and Canons," in Patrick Olivelle, ed., \textit{Between the Empires} (New York, 2006), 352.
\end{flushleft}
cross-talk from father to son, from teacher to student, from clergy to parishioner, according to their relevance and applicability to everyday life. This model takes fully into account the norma normans (normative) aspect of religious literature, how it functions to “provide ever-new generations with identity (faith) and direction for life (obedience).” The socio-historical situation changes and sacred literature, must change with it. This was the normal state of affairs in the Second Temple period and the literature may well have continued to develop along these lines, were not the closing of the canon in approximately the 2nd century CE precipitated by various cataclysmic events, like the Roman destruction of the Temple.

The tradition of Biblical text formation is only partially relevant to the Buddhist transmission. As Norman has indicated, the texts were expected to be memorized verbatim. Many other Buddhist scholars have come to the same conclusion and there are numerous instances in the writings themselves which prove that the Buddhavacana, - the Buddha’s teachings - were expected to be memorized and recited precisely as they were learned: for example, 1) the


Mahāpadesa, standards of authenticity criteria discussed above, which call for a word for word comparison of the new material with the existing Sutta and Vinaya teachings; 2) the pāṭimokkhas which were recited every fortnight; 3) the Kintisutta (MN 2, 239f) where the Buddha is concerned about disagreements over the meaning and the letter of his teachings and provides means for resolving them; 4) the Dīgha Nikāya suttas intended for recitation - DN33 Sangītisutta and DN 34 Dasuttara Sutta; 5) the Dutiya Vinayadharasutta (AN 4, 140) where the monk is expected to know the teachings “sutta by sutta, in detail” (suttaso anuvyañjanaso); 6) the Soṇasutta of the Udāna (5.6), also preserved in the Vinaya (Mahāvagga, Vin I, 194), which tells the story of a monk, Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa, who visits the Buddha and recites the complete Āṭṭhakavagga, the fourth vagga of the Sutta Nipāta; 7) also in the Sn (Pārāyanavagga, v. 1131-a) is the statement by the monk Piṅgiya, pārāyanam-anugāyissam (“I will recite the Pārāyana…”), showing that this earliest of vaggas was to be memorized and recited as well. Nor, as is sometimes stated, did the earliest Buddhist tradition allow the Buddha’s teachings to be translated into different dialects, although it is clear that this was done after his death, as the teachings rapidly spread to different parts of India.

Symposium on the oldest Buddhist Transmission

By “recent scholarship” Salomon may also have been referring to a symposium held in Göttingen in 1976 entitled, “Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung” (“The

---

49 See Bryan Levman, "Sakāya niruttiyā Revisited," 33-51, a version of which is given in Chapter Four below.
language of the oldest Buddhist tradition"). Heinz Bechert, in his introductory paper to the conference papers, suggests that the Buddha had never intended to create a linguistic standardization and therefore asks the question:

Liegt es nun nicht nahe, gerade für die älteste Überlieferung eine sprachliche Vielfalt anzunehmen, so dass es eine bestimmte “Sprache der älteste buddhistischen Überlieferung” gar nicht gegeben hat? Danach wäre es vielleicht gar nicht sehr sinnvoll, weiter nach dieser Sprachform zu suchen, sondern die Richtung unserer Fragstellung müsste dann eher auf den Vorgang der “Normalisierungen” der sprachlichen Gestalt der Überlieferung als solchen zielen.

Certainly Bechert was not alone in his views; Brough agreed with him and even Norman, - much of whose career was devoted to uncovering pre-P dialects - suggested in his conference paper that “it seems clear that there was no single language or dialect used by the Buddha for his preaching, and it is therefore incorrect to talk of an ‘original language’ of Buddhism,

50 Heinz Bechert, “Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung,” Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, Nr. 117 (1980). Participants included inter alia Ludwig Aldsdorf, John Brough, Colette Caillat, Étienne Lamotte, K. R. Norman, Gustav Roth and Ernst Waldschmidt - at the time, the foremost Buddhist philologists in the world. Oskar von Hinüber (then aged 37) is not listed as a conference participant, although Bechert cites some of his work.

51 Heinz Bechert, "Allgemeine Bemerkungen zum Thema "Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung," Die Sprache der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung, Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, Nr. 117 (1980), 33-4. English version in Buddhist Studies Review, 8 1-2 (1991), page 18: "Does it not seem reasonable, then, to assume that the earliest tradition actually consisted of a linguistic multiplicity, and that a specific 'language of the earliest Buddhist tradition' does not exist at all? In view of all this there would hardly seem much point in continuing to look for this language; instead we should redirect the thrust of our enquiry towards the process of 'standardization' of the linguistic form of the tradition as such."

52 See John Brough, The Gāndhārī Dharmapada (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), 27 (abbrev. GDhp): "...it would be futile to attempt to reconstruct a ‘primitive Dharmapada’ which was the ancestor all three texts. It may even be felt that the differences are so extreme that it is almost impossible even to believe that such a common ancestor ever existed."
although it may be possible to deduce something about the characteristics of the language in which one particular text was composed. Since the synonymous variant readings may all have been uttered by the Buddha at varying times, as circumstances demanded, it does not seem possible to say that one, and only one, version of a verse or phrase is correct, or ‘original.’”

There was however, a long European scholastic tradition that believed that within or underlying P might be found the original words of the Buddha. As is well known, Buddhaghosa maintained that *buddhavacanam*, i.e. P, was Māgadhī, and Geiger seems to agree with him, asserting that P was not pure Māgadhī, but a form of *lingua franca* (*Verkehrssprache*) whose fundamentals were based on Māgadhī and which the Buddha used himself. Most scholars however have not taken this position, recognizing that P as a composite language of various western, eastern and northern dialects could not be identical with the language the Buddha spoke. Sylvain Lévi was the first to propose that within P could be found preserved an earlier layer which he called “une langue précanonique du bouddhisme,” identifying that Buddhist Sanskrit and P “n’apparaissent plus que comme les héritiers tardifs d’une tradition antérieure, récitée ou rédigée dans un dialecte disparu, qui avait atteint déjà un stage avancé d’usure phonétique” (‘... they appear only as the late inheritors of an earlier tradition, recited or compiled in a dialect which has disappeared, which had already attained an advanced stage of


54 Sp 1214: *ettha sakā nirutti nāma sammāsambuddhena vutta-ppakāro Māgadhika-vohāro*, translated by Horner, *Book of the Discipline* Vol V, 194, footnote 1, as “the current Magadhese manner of speech according to the awakened one,” but see Levman, “Sakāya niruttiyā,” 35, for discussion on the meaning of nirutti.

phonetic change [lit: “wear and tear”]. Helmer Smith called it a *koine gangétique* of which Pāli and Ardhamāgadhī represent the oldest normalisations. This principle, that P is a translation of earlier dialects has been generally accepted by all modern scholars, perhaps the strongest statement of which is by K. R. Norman: “It cannot be emphasized too much that all the versions of canonical Hīnayāna Buddhist texts which we possess are translations, and even the earliest we possess are translations of some still earlier version, now lost.” The scholar who attempted the most systematic work on this underlying strata was Heinrich Lüders who called it an “Urkanon”: “Dem Kanon der buddhistischen Schriften im Pāli und in Sanskrit liegt ein Urkanon zugrunde, der in einem östlichen Dialekt abgefasst war. Dieser Dialekt stimmt im

57 Helmer Smith, "Le futur moyen indien," *Journal Asiatique*, (1952), 178, "dont l'ardhamāgadhī et le pali représentent les normalisations les plus anciennes."
58 K. R. Norman, "Pāli philology and the Study of Buddhism," in Tadeusz Skorupski, ed., *The Buddhist Forum, Volume I* (London, 1990), 34. Also found in *Collected Papers 4* (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1993), 84. See also Bechert, “Allgemeine Bemerkungen,” 26: “Wir können davon ausgehen, daß kein uns erhaltener kanonischer Text die Sprache des Buddha oder auch nur der ältesten buddhistischen Überlieferung genau repräsentiert und daß dementsprechend die uns vorliegenden Textfassungen in irgendeiner Weise auf ältere Überlieferungsstufen in einer abweichenden sprachlichen Form beruhen, so daß wir annehmen müssen, daß eine Übertragung der Texte aus einer sprachlichen Form in eine andere - mit oder ohne Zwischenstufen, in Form einer bewußt vorgenommenen Übersetzung oder aber durch eine allmähliche Umsetzung in mündliche Überlieferung - stattgefunden hat.” Translated in *Buddhist Studies Review*, 8 1-2 (1991), 6, as “We can proceed from the above on the assumption that none of the canonical texts exactly reflects the language of the Buddha or even of the earliest Buddhist tradition and that accordingly, the various textual versions are based in one way or another on earlier stages of the tradition couched in a different linguistic form. Thus we must further assume that there has been a transference of the texts from one linguistic form to another, with or without intermediate stages, either in the form of a deliberate translation or a gradual transformation in the oral tradition.” See also Étienne Lamotte, *History of Indian Buddhism from the origins to the Śaka Era, translated from the French by Sara Webb-Boin* (Louvain-la-Neuve: Université Catholique de Louvain Institut Orientaliste, 1958, 1988), 587: “Both [the S and P canons] were derived from prototypes in a Magadhan dialect.”
wesentlichen mit der Māgadhī der Aśoka-Inschriften überein, steht zum Teil aber schon auf einer weiteren Stufe der Entwicklung.” (“An Urkanon lies at the base of the canon of Buddhist writings in P and S, that was composed in an eastern dialect. This dialect essentially agrees with the Māgadhī of the Aśokan inscriptions, but in part is already at a further stage of development”).

59 He called this original language “Alt-Ardhamāgadhī,” with which he equated Aśoka’s "Kanzleisprache," the administrative language of the kingdom.

60 Alsdorf called it “Ardha-Māgadhī,” Norman “Old Māgadhī” and von Hinüber “Buddhist Middle Indic,” a common Buddhist language from which both P and Buddhist Sanskrit branched off, but one which von Hinüber believed was later than the earliest language of the canon.

61 Much important work has been done in the last few decades by these last two philologists in uncovering and

59 Heinrich Lüders, Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1954), 8.

60 Heinrich Lüders, Philologica Indica, (Göttingen, 1940), 288; Beobachtungen, 7.


62 Norman, “The Dialects in which the Buddha Preached,” 71. Also available in Collected Papers 2, 140.

63 Oskar von Hinüber, “The Oldest Literary Language of Buddhism,” Saeculum 34 (1983), 9. Also published in Selected Papers on Pāli Studies, (Oxford: The Pali Text Society, 2005), 193. See also Oskar von Hinüber, "Pāli and Paiśācī as Variants of Buddhist Middle Indic,” 65. Also available in Kleine Schriften, Teil I, 509, where the author says the P and BHS “have branched off from the same root, a language obviously earlier than both, but later than the earliest language of the Buddhist tradition. For the linguistic movement from east to west had taken place already at this stage of development of a language, which might be called Buddhist Middle Indic.” In Oskar von Hinüber, "Linguistic Considerations on the Date of the Buddha," in When did the Buddha live? The Controversy on the Dating of the Historical Buddha, H. Bechert, ed., (Delhi: Sri Satguru Publications, 1996), 188, the author separates BMI from Lévi’s "langue précanonique" and Lüder’s "Alt-Ardhamāgadhī" (the latter two being each a "still older language"), but I am not sure, given the scarcity of data, that these fine distinctions can be made; for we can not be sure that the Buddha himself (or his immediate disciples) did not speak in some kind of koine which levelled dialect differences, which I take BMI to be.
explicating the nature of this underlying linguistic stratum and the process of change through transmission. Nevertheless most scholars have given up the hope of ever establishing Lüders’ “Urtext” or “Urkanon”; the most that can be hoped for is establishing some of the words and their meaning in the earliest language of Buddhism, some of which may have been actually uttered by the Buddha himself. \(^{64}\) Whether this language was a lingua franca or koine, as suggested by Geiger and Smith, a Kanzleisprache, \(^{65}\) one of the eastern dialects, or a lost eastern dialect, as Norman has proposed (or a combination of these), \(^{66}\) is impossible to pinpoint. But we know of no eastern dialect which regularly simplified its intervocalic consonants and aspirated stops (a characteristic phonological feature of the underlying language), and we do have a lot of coeval evidence for the use of an administrative and trade

\(^{64}\) K. R. Norman, "Four Etymologies from the Sabhiya-sutta," in Buddhist Studies in honour of Walpola Rahula, eds. Somaratna Balasooriya (et al.), (London: Gordon Fraser, 1980), 179. Also published in Collected Papers 2 (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1991), 156. “Tradition, both Northern and Southern, has recorded the story that the five groups of four verses which form the answers to Sabhiya’s questions were uttered by the Buddha, and there is no reason to doubt that this was so...” von Hinüber, “Oldest Literary Language,” 9, “The very earliest language of Buddhism, which most likely was close to the language of the Buddha himself, was an eastern Middle Indic...”

\(^{65}\) The term “Kanzleisprache” which Lüders anachronistically used to describe the underlying language, actually denotes the official court language of the early middle ages in Germany, which reconciled the various dialects by suppressing dialect variation, so the directives could be understood across wide geographical regions. For a discussion see, J. Boase-Beier and K. Lodge, The German Language: a linguistic introduction. (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Co., 2003), 210-14. Thanks to Prof. Max Deeg for pointing out the origin of this term.

\(^{66}\) K. R. Norman, "Buddhism and Regional Dialects," A Philological Approach to Buddhism, The Bukkyo Dendo Kyokai Lectures 1994 (Lancaster: Pali Text Society, 2006), 95, maintained that the earlier linguistic forms was a "mixture of dialects or sub-dialects...employed in the East at the time of Aśoka and probably earlier." Norman disagreed with the notion of a lingua franca (which he characterized as a form of "standard Middle Indic"). See his review of von Hinüber's Untersuchungen zur Mündlichkeit früher mittelindischer Texte der Buddhisten, in Acta Orientalis, 56 (1995), 310; also available in Collected Papers 7 (Oxford: Pāli Text Society, 2001), 177.
Greek koine in the Mediterranean world (4th century BCE and onwards) and the use of an Aramaic lingua franca in the western Persian empire (5th - 3rd century BCE), which certainly may have paralleled and influenced their IA usage.67.

Discussion
In the Kaccānagottasutta of the Samyutta Nikāya’s Nidānavagga (SN 2, 1634-1730), Kaccāna asks the Buddha to explicate sammādiṭṭhi (“right view”). The Buddha explains that the world is dependent on a dualistic understanding of the notion of existence (atthitam) and non-existence (natthitam), and he recommends steering a middle course between the two: ete te Kaccāyana ubho ante anupagamma majjhena Tathāgato dhamman daseti, "Without having approached these two extremes of yours, Kaccāna, the Tathāgata teaches the Dhamma of the middle [way]." In a similar teaching to Soṇa Koliviṣa (recounted in the Mahāvagga, Vin 1, 1791-18527) he uses the analogy of a lute whose strings are too taut or too loose as examples of extremes. Only when the strings are neither too taut nor too slack, but same gune patiṭṭhā ("keyed to an even pitch")68 is the lute tuneful and fit for playing. The Buddha concludes: tasmāt iha tvam, Soṇa, vīriyasamataṁ adhiṭṭhaha, indriyānaṁ ca samataṁ paṭivijjaṁ tattha ca nimittaṁ gaṇhāhīti.

67Greek koine was the language of the Septuagint and the Greek New Testament. Some of the significant simplifications included the loss of vowel length distinction, the replacement of the pitch accent system by a stress accent system, the monophthongization of several diphthongs, regularization of irregular verbs (a desire to avoid morphological irregularity in inflectional endings, apocopation of prepositions and preverbs, etc. See Geoffrey Horrocks, Greek: a history of the language and its speakers. (Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2010), Chapter 4 ("Greek in the Hellenistic World’), 79-123 and Chapter 6 ("Spoken Koine in the Roman Period’), 160-188.

“Therefore do you Soṇa, determine upon evenness in energy and pierce the evenness of the faculties and reflect upon it.”

Recognizing the applicability of the Buddha’s samatā principle as a general methodological - not to mention epistemological and psychological - principle, this monograph will also avoid the two end-points discussed above: that the language of the Buddhist canon can be traced to a single source, an Urtext, i.e. the speech of the historical Buddha is one extreme; that the source is hopelessly multifarious and nothing further can be said known about the history of its transmission, is the other. Both views are extremes and a more accurate picture lies somewhere in the middle, as this study demonstrates - although we can not re-construct “the original language” of Buddhism, we can glimpse traces of an earlier language of Buddhism underlying the received canonical transmissions. The witnesses that have come down to us are all translations of earlier writings, as has been oft noted. By comparing parallel passages, we can learn a lot about the nature and process of linguistic change over time. In certain cases, using standard historical linguistics techniques, we can clearly isolate an earlier stratum to the language which must have existed as source to account for the variant forms - unless one is prepared to accept the far less parsimonious explanation of random chance, which of course is no explanation at all. We will see that this earlier layer which von Hinüber calls Buddhist Middle Indic, can indeed be isolated and reconstructed with some degree of confidence, although only with individual words, certainly not in its entirety. In part, our hypotheses can be corroborated by reference to the language of the Aśokan edicts which shows that many of the diachronic changes in the language of the teachings were already actualized in the Pktś of the mid 3rd

69Vin 1, 1831-3: Horner, ibid, 241.
century BCE, less than 150 years after the Buddha’s death. We can also show how later Sanskritization of the teachings led to semantic confusion and how and why this happened. At the same time we make no attempt to assert that “these are the very words of the Buddha” and recognize that some language changes are not recoverable. In this respect, whether the Buddha or his direct disciples wanted his words translated or memorized in the exact form he taught them is a moot point; for in fact, the teachings spread very quickly after his death and they were translated into different MI Pkts and different non-IA languages. Although each of the schools had their bhāṇakas which tried to preserve the individual nikāyas, in an oral tradition the introduction of change is unavoidable. Faulty memory is certainly a major factor and despite the much-vaunted prowess of the Vedic textual specialists in memorizing the samhitās, for example, that tradition has still handed down thousands of variant forms.\textsuperscript{70} Arguably, memorizing the Veda - where the reproduction of the correct ritual sound was paramount and the meaning of lesser importance if any at all - was an easier task than memorizing the sound and meaning of the Buddha’s teaching where both factors were equally essential. Modern psychological research shows that this type of memorization often involves an imaginative reconstruction where the memorizer draws inferences which are stored together with the original material; often he or she is unable to distinguish between what was read or heard and what only inferred: “memory of something that was only imagined may turn out to be so vivid that it is taken to be real beyond any doubt,” perhaps explaining why impressive degrees of

\textsuperscript{70} Maurice Bloomfield and Franklin Edgerton, \textit{Vedic Variants, Volume 2 Phonetics} (Philadephia: Linguistic Society of America, 1932).
similarity in the Buddhist tradition stand side by side with considerable variation. Not to mention the possibility of deliberate alteration of the text to suite a particular community’s needs as Sanders recognized in his model of the continuing relevance of the Bible, adapting itself through various tradents to the changing needs of the religious community.

Faulty memorization whether accidental or deliberate is one important factor which would account for variability of the teachings at or close to the source. Faulty hearing on the part of the scribe is another. There are several other issues as well: unfamiliarity with divergent dialects, insufficient mastery of Vedic or Sanskrit in the case of later translators, tradents (dhamma transmitters) for whom MIA was a second language (i.e. native speakers of Munda, Dravidian or Tibeto-Burman background) or whose MIA dialect lacked voiced stops (see Chapters 10 and 11 below), and who therefore did not recognize phonemic differences between for e.g. voiced, voiceless or aspirated stops, manuscript mistakes and/or faulty corrections, a complex transmission tapestry that renders the discovery of a single, unified source an impossible task. Brough maintains that the text tradition can not be disentangled without positing a very early written transmission; nevertheless, many, if not most of the changes this monograph will discuss seem inexorably linked to a the oral process, where phonetically similar words are understood in different ways, something which simply could not happen if the tradent had a manuscript in front of him or her to refer to. Take, for example the phrase from the P Dhammapada verse 414-b saṃsāraṃ moham accagā (“[whoever] has overcome… saṃsāra,

72 James Sanders, "Canon," 848.
73 Brough, Gāndhārī Dharmapada, 29. Hereinafter GDhp.
delusion...”) where the comparable S form in the *Udānavarga* 33.41-b is *samsāraugham upatyagāt* (read *upātyagāt*, “[whoever] has overcome... the flood of *samsāra*’). This seems to be the result of a faulty oral/aural transmission where the final -ṃ of *samsāram* was transferred to the anlaut (initial sound) of the following word -oha, which, although not a P form, is a valid eastern form (AMg) for *oghā* meaning “flood,” with -gh- > -h-; it also occurs as *oha* in the Gīḍhp (78-d, 85-b and 294-c). At the same time the final -a in *samsāra* was nasalized with a

74 See *Sūtrakṛtāṅga* (AMg, *Sūyagaḍam*, a canonical book of the Jainas), 1, 11, 1d *ovah tarai duttaram* compared to Sn 176: *oghām tarati duttaram*. “He crosses over the flood which is difficult to cross.” For a brief discussion of this verse see also K. R. Norman, “The nasalisation of vowels in Middle Indo-Aryan,” *Philosophy, Grammar and Indology (Essays in Honour of Professor Gustav Roth)* (Delhi, 1992), 332; Also available in *Collected Papers* 5 (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1994), 109. The commentary (Dhp-a 4, 1946-9 and Pj 2, 46915-18 ad Sn 638) also takes *moham* in the sense of “delusion,” but also includes a reference to the “four floods,” evidently preserving both traditions: *tass’ attho: yo bhikkhu imam rāgapalipathāna ṭeva kilesaduggāna ca saṁsāravattaṇa ca catunnaṁ saccānaṁ appatīvijhanamohaṇa ca aitī, cattāro oghe tiṇno hutvā pāram anuppatto... “The meaning of this (gāthā) is whichever monk has overcome the difficult path of passion, the difficult road of the afflictions, and the round of *samsāra*, and has gone beyond the impenetrable delusion of (not knowing) the four truths, he has crossed over the four torrents and has reached the other side...” Another example of the transference of a *niggahīta* to the following word may be found in Dhp 74-a where *Mam’ eva kata maññantu* (“Let them think it was done just by me”), is reconstructed by Norman as *Mam’ eva kataṁ aṁnantu* (“let them know that this was done by me”). See *Word of the Doctrine*, 84. See also Dhammachai Institute, *Dīghanikāya* (Thailand: Dhammachai Foundation, 2013), 20710, (PTS *Kevaṭṭasutta* DN 1, 21317-18), where *kim maññasi* (“what do you think?”) has a variant reading *kimaññasi* (“what have you understood?”), where the first verb is the present indicative of *maññati* and the second is the aorist of *jānati* (aṁnāṣ). The P grammarians recognized the potential confusion that this transference could cause and Kaccāyana prescribed that one should separate a final consonant with no vowel from a following word starting with a vowel. See Ole Holten Pind, *Kaccāyana and Kaccāyanavutti* (Bristol: Pali Text Society, 2013), 3, sutta #10, *pubbam adhothitaṁ assaram sarena viyojaye*, translated by E. Senart, *Kaccāyana et la littérature grammaticale du pāli, I* partie. *Grammaire pāli de Kaccāyana, sūtras et commentaire* (Paris: Imprimerie nationale, 1871), 12, On sépare de la voyelle [initiale du mot suivant] la consonne finale, non accompagnée de voyelle, qui la précède (“One separates the final consonant of a preceding word which does not have a vowel, from a following word which starts with a vowel”).
The verb forms are also quite different although from the same root: 

\( \text{accagā} < \text{ati} + \text{v} \text{gam} \) and \( \text{upātyagāt} < \text{upa} + \text{ati} + \text{v} \text{gam} \). The Tib translation of this verse (33.50) has \( \text{klung} \) (“river”) for \( \text{moha/oha} \), which means they understood it in the sense of \( \text{oha} \) or \( \text{ogha} \) “stream” or “flood,” and \( \text{rab brgal} \) for the verb which is close in meaning to \( \text{ati} + \text{v} \text{gam} \) (\( \text{accagā} \)), “surpass, overcome.”

The Ch version has \( \text{斷生死河} \) (\( \text{duān shēngsǐ hé} \), “cut off the river of life and death”), where \( \text{河} \) evidently translates \( \text{ogha} \).

Generally speaking the availability of manuscripts would tend towards harmonization as copyists seek to obtain greater consistency in the transmission. This is certainly not the case in this verse. We can tentatively reconstruct the original oral transmission as

\( \text{saṃsāramo(g)hamaccagā} \) (“[whoever] passes over the flood of \( \text{saṃsāra} \)”) where the \( \text{-g-} \) in \( \text{ogham} \) may or may not have been present, as aspirated stops changed to an aspirate only as early as Vedic times and are also present in the earliest Buddhist writings; by Aśoka’s time we find several examples in the edicts. The P redactor, as noted, took the final \( \text{-m} \) of \( \text{saṃsāram} \)

75 Negi gives the verbs \( \text{vi} + \text{vā} \text{rīgh} \) (“pass over, rise beyond, overcome”), \( \text{sam} + \text{ut} + \text{v} \text{tī} \) (“cross over, pass over or beyond”), \( \text{ati} + \text{v} \text{kram} \) (“to go beyond or across”) and \( \text{vy} + \text{v} \text{ātī} \) (“to go beyond”) as the usual S counterpart for \( \text{brgal ba} \). The prefix \( \text{rab} \) is an intensifier. Negi has nothing listed for \( \text{klung} \). See J. S. Negi, Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary (Sarnath, Varanasi: Central Institute of Higher Tibetan Studies, 1993), 885, s.v. \( \text{brgal} \). For Tibetan \( \text{Udānavarga} \), see Champa Thupten Zongstse, Udānavarga, Band 3 Der Tibetische Text unter Mitarbeit von Siglinde Dietz, herausgegeben von Champa Thupten Zongtse (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1990), 428. All future references to the Tib UV are from this edition.

76 T04n0210_p0572c15.

77 Tov, Textual Criticism, 307f.

78 Bloomfield & Edgerton, Vedic Variants, 47-69; Bryan Levman, “Aśokan Phonology and the Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition,” Canadian Journal of Buddhist Studies, Number 6 (2010), 70. An example in an early Buddhist \( \text{sutta} \) is found in the \( \text{Mahāparinibbānasutta} \), DN 2, 913 where \( \text{bhava-netti} \)
as the anlaut of -oham, creating a new word moham and for good measure, nasalizing the final -a of saṃsāra > saṃsāram, obviously in his/her mind to clarify the proper reading: viz., saṃsāram moham, ("saṃsāra, the delusion") not, saṃsāromoham ("the delusion of saṃsāra"? or "the flood of saṃsāra"?), which would have been ambiguous, as we have noted. The verb accagā is a standard 3rd person aorist of ati + ṭgam, atyagamat, with the normal change of -ty- > -cc giving us the form accagamat > accagā with -mat > Ø and compensatory lengthening of -a > -ā. Why the last syllable of this verb becomes null is not clear, although the form is attested several times in the Sutta Nipāta. The UV redactor heard saṃsāromoham as the “flood of saṃsāra,” but perhaps recognizing the potential ambiguity, dropped the final -m in saṃsāra to avoid the confusion which we have just discussed, and Sanskritized oham > ogham with the addition of the missing stop -g-; with the final -a and initial o- combining in normal saṃdhi the compound became saṃsāraugham. With the removal of the -m > Ø, the pāda had one less syllable and therefore a di-syllabic prefix had to be added to the verb, if the verse was to scan.79

This little phonological exercise demonstrates both the possibilities and limitations of this so-called “middle-way” approach. Although we can not recover an “Ur-text” or anything which

samūhatā (“craving for rebirth abolished” < P samūhanati, “abolish, remove” < S ṣhan, “to kill, destroy”) has a S parallel (in Waldschmidt, Mahāparinirvānasūtra, vol. 2, page 136) bhavetri samuddhṛtā (<S ṣhr, “remove, destroy”), where the aspirate -h- has been interpreted and back-formed into an aspirated stop by the S redactor.

79 In an earlier form of this paper I had mistakenly identified upatyagāt as derived from upa + ṭyaj, the palatal ending of some a-stem verbs sometimes changing to -g (as in tyāga, tyāgin, "abandoning"). However, in this case it is clearly a Sanskritized version of MI accagā. Thanks to Dr. Oskar von Hinüber for pointing this out to me (e-mail).
might be construed as “the original words of the Buddha,” we can, with some degree of certainty re-construct an earlier transmission of *saṃsāram oham, from which the P redactor construed saṃsāram moham and the UV saṃsāraugham. The latter is ruled out as the earlier form as it would also have made perfectly good sense in P (with -au- > -o-, i.e., saṃsārogham) and therefore cannot account for what has come down to us in the P exemplar. The P phrase is also a possibility for the earlier reading, although unlikely for two reasons: crossing over the “flood” (o(g)ha) makes much more sense in the context (passing over “delusion” is less compelling) and both the Tib, Ch and BHS version use this term - the “majority rules” principle in linguistic reconstruction.\(^{80}\) Nevertheless, even if one disputes these conclusions, we have learned quite a bit about the nature of the oral transmissions of the teachings and how they have changed over time.

Next we will discuss the raw linguistic material we have to work with, P and the other Pkt dialects which have survived.

Chapter Two

Pāli and the Dialects.

Introduction - the source material

In studying the historical linguistics of the Buddhist transmission, the scope of its diachronic complexity is difficult to appreciate. We have several MI dialect witnesses that have come down to us, but only one complete corpus, P. Within the P tradition we have few critical editions and even those that might be termed such (like Norman’s edition of the Sutta Nipāta, Group of Discourses) have only consulted a very limited number of late manuscripts, mostly from the Burmese and Sinhalese schools, the Thai and Cambodian recensions not being easily available or accessible. 81 Many of the Sinhalese manuscripts in the National Archives are missing - lost or stolen - and much of the microfilming that has been done, is unreadable; many manuscripts are rotting away in remote monasteries which are sometimes not open to local or outside scholars. Moreover, there is a lack of specialists who can read the manuscripts, no funds and no political or cultural will to preserve them. 82 The earliest P manuscript discovered dates from the 9th century CE while the earliest Buddhist manuscripts in G were written perhaps

81 See Peter Skilling, “An impossible task? The classical "edition" and Thai Pāli literature,” Thai International Journal for Buddhist Studies, I (2009) (2009), 33-43. “The rich manuscript collections of the National Library, Bangkok, and of the many temples of Thailand have scarcely been tapped either within Thailand itself or abroad” (page 33). There is an online Cambodian edition of the Tipitaka in native script (http://www.tipitaka.org/khmrl, accessed May 2013), but I can not find anything in Roman script; see Margaret Cone, “caveat lector,” Journal of the Pali Text Society, vol. 29 (2007), 96; in composing her P Dictionary, the author consults the Thai, PTS, Burmese and Sinhalese editions of the canon, but she does not mention the Cambodian recension.

in the first or second century CE\textsuperscript{83} - representing an information void of at least 300-1000 years from when the works were first written down (P in first century B.C Śrī Laṅkā, according to tradition; G at the same time or earlier) and several centuries more from when they were actually composed. Aside from the Theravādin tradition preserved in P we have some works preserved in the G Pkt which are generally believed to belong to the Dharmaguptaka school; the Prakritized \emph{madhyadeśa} (language of the middle country between the Vindhya mountains and the Himalayas, i.e. the Gangetic plain) Sanskrit of the \emph{Mahāvastu}, which stems from the Lokottaravādin school; a hybridized Sanskrit of the Patna \emph{Dhammapada} originating in the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin (Mā-L) school and a fairly large collection (but nowhere near complete) of almost pure Sanskrit works belonging to the Sarvāstivādin and Mūlasarvāstivādin schools. Viewed over time, this is a highly complex linguistic fabric with many independent oral and written strands, each with their variant forms, weaving together, interacting and influencing each other, and later rationalized, ignored, harmonized and or Sanskritized to an increasingly predominant pan-Indic language. Moreover we have not even begun to account for the influence of the non-IA language groups - Munda, Dravidian and Tibeto-Burman, to name the principal ones, although there are probably others of which we know nothing - and which were an important component in the Indian linguistic culture of the Buddha’s day, certainly in number of speakers proportionately more then than today. Discussion on this group will be deferred until Chapter 11.

\textsuperscript{83} John Brough, \emph{The Gāndhārī Dharma\textit{p}a\textit{d}a} (London: Oxford University Press, 1962), 56; hereinafter GDhp. Brough believes in a “very early written transmission” for the GDhp (29), but does not specify what that means. For information on the new G manuscripts which have emerged in the last two decades, see M. Allon, “Recent Discoveries of Buddhist Manuscripts from Afghanistan and Pakistan and their Significance,” in Ken Parry, ed., \emph{Art, Architecture and Religion on the Silk Road and Across Inner-Asian History} (Turnhout: Brepols, 2008), 153-78. For more details see footnote 138.
Two examples

We are then, working with incomplete information and any conclusions we do reach will have to be considered tentative, as it is impossible to take into account the full linguistic complexity even within the IA groups, let alone to account for non-IA influence on the IA dialects. To take one well-known example from the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* (MPN), which I have explored previously: the Buddha likens his body to an old cart which goes along *vedha-missakena* (“dependent on straps”). In the P editions alone there are six different variant readings for the first member of this compound, *vedha, vekha* (Cambodian); *vekkha, vegha* (PTS); *velu* (Thai); *vettha* (Burmese); in addition, a BHS version has been preserved with the reading *dvaidhā-niśrayeṇa* (“reliant on two things”) which was in the exemplar of both the Ch and the Tib source document. It is evident from the variant forms that there was a good deal of confusion as to the transmission and meaning of the first word of this compound - although the commentarial tradition had got the meaning right (*vāha-bandhana-cakka-bandhan’ ādinā paṭisaṅkharaṇena, “by various thongs as repair work to bind carts, wheels and so forth.”), there was no understanding of the phonological variation. This shows, as Norman has pointed out, that the commentarial and *sutta* tradition were quite separate, with the former preserving the correct

explanation, even though the oral tradition and/or text had gone awry. Standard historical linguistics techniques can reconstruct the word to a Vedic proto-form veṣṭa and/or vleška (both meaning “band” or “noose”) and can also explain how veṣṭa evolved to dvaidha and the various other MI forms. In the P writings, there are lots of examples like this with multiple variant forms, and there are also less complex anomalies like P Dhammapada (Dhp) v. 335-d where we have only four variants of the P word abhivattaṃ (Burmese), abhivattāṃ (PTS), abhivaddham or abhivuttāṃ (Thai), abhivuddham (Cambodian) and the meaning is clearly between two choices (abhivattaṃ, abhivattāṃ or abhivuttāṃ < abhirśta “rained upon”) and abhivaddham, abhivuddham < abhivrddha “increased”). Though the “normal” translation is with the first meaning (sokā tassa pavaḍḍhanti abhiva(u)ṭṭ(h)am/abhiva(u)ḍḍhaṃ va bīraṇaṃ, “his sorrows increase like the bīraṇa grass when rained upon”), the second meaning is equally clear (“his sorrows increase like the bīraṇa grass when grown”). To those who object on artistic grounds to the repetition of the verb (abhivuddham), I would answer with Brough that much of the Dhp is “trivial in content and poetic worth, … mechanically constructed from familiar clichés or fragments of other verses.”

The change -d- or -dh- > -ḍ- or -ḍh- (S -vrddha > -vuddha > -vuddha) is quite common. We shall return to a detailed examination of these anomalous forms below (Chapters 6-9).

Pāli

89 Brough, GDhp, xxii.
90 Pischel §222, 223.
Although P is generally considered to be the oldest of the MI dialects next to the Aśokan inscriptions, a comparison of the dialect with G problematizes this common assumption; for the latter dialect shows fewer signs of later Sanskritization which is a common feature in P. This will be discussed in more detail below. The name “Pāli” is in fact a misnomer, for it suggests there is a place in India to which the dialect can be localized (like Māgadhī in Magadha or G in Gandhāra); in fact the term is based on a misunderstanding of the compound pāli-bhāsā (which simply means “language of the canon”) where the word was taken to mean a particular dialect, first used in this fashion by Simon de la Loubère in 17th century Siam. Buddhaghosa called this same language Māgadhī. An investigation of phonological and morphological nature of the language shows that it was composed in a mixture of eastern, western and north-western Middle Indic dialects with elements of Sanskritization introduced at a later time. P contains both nom. sing. endings in -o (western) and and in -e (eastern); nom. plurals in -āse (eastern) as well as in -ā (western); accus. plurals in -e as well as -am (which Lüders believed was related to the eastern accus. plural in -āni); abl. sing. in -ā (western) as well as -am (eastern, same as in AMg. an eastern language, per Alsdorf); use of -l- and -kkh-

---

91 Oskar von Hinüber, *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick.* (Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2001), §71. Lamotte, History, p. 572 also believes that P and all the Buddhist Pkts are at a “more evolved linguistic stage than the Aśokan edicts.”
94 Geiger, §79.4
95 Lüders §196-219.
96 Lüders §188-195. Ludwig Alsdorf, "The Vasudevahinḍī, a Specimen of Archaic Jaina-Māhārāṣṭrī," *Bulltein of the School of Oriental Studies (University of London),* 8 (1935-37), 329f, maintains that the ablative singular in -am is quite common in the Vasudevahinḍī which is writtein in archaic Jaina
(eastern forms) where one would expect -r- and -cch- (western forms; e.g., lujjati “it breaks” instead of rujjati, although both forms are used in P); the use of an eastern form sāṅkhaya in P instead of the western form sacchaya “loss” as in Girnār (Gir); the use of an eastern form attā instead of the expected western form atvā in G or atpā in Gir (S ātmā). P is based (in part) on dialects where some intervocalics were replaced by -y- (as in AMg.); or P itself replaces stops with an intervocalic glide as in khāyita < khādita, “eaten,” sāyati < svādate, “he tastes” goyāna < godāna, PN; or drops out the consonants completely as also occurs in G (sampāyati < S sampādayati “is able to explain”; Originally P, like other Buddhist PktS, had absolutives in -ttā and was later Sanskritized to -tvā to distinguish the -ttā form of nomen agentis nouns from the absolute. Other aspects of the language were also Sanskritized over time. Generally in the PktS, eastern conjuncts are resolved by the introduction of an epenthetic vowel and western forms are assimilated, but we find in P the use of both types of forms in the same word, e.g., ayya > ariya (eastern) ayya > avya (western); we also find consonant groups which

Māhārāṣṭrī. Per Pischel (§339, 75, 114, 181) and Alsdorf (p. 339) the change from devāt (the normal S abl. sing) to devaṛi is quite regular, with final consonant dropped and final vowel lengthened with anusvāra (e.g., AMg sakkhaṛi < S sākkhā).

97 Rock Edict (RE) 14 E. Capital letter like ‘E’ is a text locator designation used by E. Hultzsch, Inscriptions of Asoka (Delhi: Indological Book House, 1969). When the letter ‘S’ follows a RE or PE designation, it refers to the section in Hultzsch, not to Sanskrit.

98 RE 12 H; Mānsehrā and Shāhbāzgarhī also used the form atta, but in the GDhp (a similar dialect) the form atva or atvāna is used.


100 Lüders, §107; see section §101-115


normally resolved in two different ways according to locality used in the same P word: -kṣ- > kkh (eastern) and -kṣ- > -cch- (western) in kṣaṇa > khaṇa ("instant") kṣaṇa > chaṇa ("leisure moment, festival").

All the above goes to prove that P is a mixed language and also a scholarly language - it has been edited, probably by monks, and normalized for religious purposes. Von Hinüber calls this a "backward movement" which raised texts "originally formulated in a more colloquial way to literary standards, where, as usual, a much more conservative language prevailed." If one were to guess when and where this took place it would probably be in Aśoka’s court of Ujjain or nearby Vidiśā from which his son Mahinda was sent to Śri Lanka, bearing with him a (memorized?) copy of the Buddha’s teachings. But this would just be speculation. Various attempts have been made to localize P as a spoken dialect in parts of India. Some have suggested a western provenance under the belief that P was primarily a western dialect (which will be discussed below). Others have suggested Magadha (Buddhaghosa, Geiger), Kaliṅga (southeast, per Oldenberg & Barua), Taxila (northwest, per Grierson), Vindhya (central, per Konow), Ujjain (central-west, per Franke; Mahinda’s mother tongue was the language of Ujjain); Kauśāmbī (central-east, per de La Vallée Poussin) or Avanti (western central; Lamotte).


105 See Lamotte, History, 564-66, 585 for references.
None of these can be proven as P has features from all these different places. It is clear that P was not in fact a spoken language but a created one.

As discussed in the previous chapter, P is itself an adaptation of an earlier language, which one may call in general the language of an earlier Buddhist tradition. This “pre-canonic language” was first postulated by Sylvain Lévi who discovered a layer underlying P and the earliest Sanskritized Pkt texts which was earlier than, and the source of, the later dialects. It is generally believed to be a form of eastern Middle-Indic which was modified, either at or close to the source, the Buddha and/or his disciples speaking in different dialects according to the needs of his audiences, and/or communicating in a simplified pan-dialectic *lingua franca*. P was a transformation of this earlier transmission, perhaps motivated by Mahinda’s Śrī Laṅkān mission, or perhaps by the saṅgha’s need for a standardized copy of the teachings, as the religion spread rapidly across India and beyond. At the same time, the Mahāsaṃghīka school, which split from the Theravādins after the Second Council (approx. 300 BCE), began to translate their own version which was more Sanskritized than the P. Both were presumably taken from a common source.

What Language(s) did the Buddha speak?

Most scholars have always assumed that the Buddha spoke either Māgadhī or Ardhamāgadhī as his “native” tongue, although no one has considered the possible Munda or Dravidian (or other non-IA) connection which we will discuss below in Chapter 11. Certainly, the Buddha had close ties with the Magadha kingdom and much of his ministry was spent there. However, as
Edgerton and Roth have pointed out, neither his home town (Kapilavatthu, S Kāpilavastu) nor his death place (P Kusinārā, S Kuśinagara), nor Bārāṇasī (S Vārāṇasī), Vesālī (S Vaiśālī) nor Sāvatthi (S Śrāvastī) where he delivered many of his sermons are in Magadha. Bārāṇasī was the former capital of the Kasi kingdom (eventually assimilated by Ajātasattu, king of Magadha), and Sāvatthi was the capital of the Kosalan kingdom of which the Buddha’s Sakyān tribe were vassals. But the other locations were all tribal capitals - Kapilavatthu was the capital of the Sakyān tribe, Kusinārā, the Mallas and Vesālī, the capital of the Licchavi tribal federation. It is logical to assume therefore, that the Buddha must have also spoken a local non-IA dialect to these people. The effects of this borrowing on the language of the earliest Buddhist tradition and on P will be discussed below (Chapter 11).

Lüders has done a thorough study on the “Magadhisms” that survive from Māgadhī in P: the use of -e in the nom. sing., the vocative plural form bhikkhave, anomalous forms like seyattha (“just as”) with eastern se insetad of western taṃ; and numerous “hyperpalisms” where the scribe mistakenly over-corrected an eastern form into a (wrong) western form. Indeed it is relatively certain that the Buddha spoke some form of eastern MI dialect. Alsdorf believed that Buddha spoke Ardhamāgadhī, a dialect in use immediately to the west of the kingdom of


107 Throughout the dissertation, the first time a word appears I try to give the Pāli terms and Sanskrit equivalent, where they are different; thereafter my general preference is for the Pāli term, as the earlier one, unless the Sanskrit is more appropriate because of long-standing usage.

107 Lüders, Beobachtungen §122-32.
Magadha. It was called “half” Māgadhī, in Alsdorf’s opinion because - quoting a famous statement by the native grammarian Hemacandra - the change of western -r- to eastern -l- had (in the main) taken place, but the change of the three sibilants (palatal -ś-, retroflex -ṣ- and dental -s-) to palatal -ś- (as in Māgadhī) had not taken place. In Ardhmāgadhī, the three sibilants become dental -s-, as in the other western Pkt S. Other reasons Alsdorf gives for believing the original language was AMg, are 1) that AMg has the accus. pl. of masc. a-stems in āni (P is -e, only rarely in -āni or -ām which is a remnant on the -āni form); 2) AMg had loc.

---

108 *ardhamāgadhī bhāṣā, yasyāṃ ra-sor la-śau māgadhyām* ity ādikaṃ māgadha-bhāṣā-lakṣaṇāṃ paripūraṃ nāsti (Hemacandra 4, 288, quoted in Pischel §17 who, however, interprets this statement differently). “The Ardhamāgadhī language in which [the change of] la and śa of Māgadhī to the ra and sa, etc., the characteristic mark of the Māgadha language, is not wholly complete.” According to von Hinüber (*Das ältere Mittelindisch*, §74) the marks of true Ardhamāgadhī (quoting Alsdorf’s “Ardha-Māgadhī” article) is that “zwar r > l, nicht aber s, s > ś gilt - und dies sind die Kennzeichen echter Ardhamāgadhī.” In this article Alsdorf says “Now what is called real Ardha-Māgadhī, why is the language of the Jaina Canon designated by tradition as “Half-Māgadhī”? The former answer, given again by Pischel, which are underlain by the cited remarks of Lüders is, because the dialect has the e-nominative of Māgadhī, but not its ś and l. But going by the drama fragments and the rock edicts, there would be another answer lying closer. Its language is half-Māgadhī because from both characteristic features of Māgadhī it has only one, the l and not the second, the ś.” (page 20). Alsdorf also notes that in Ardhamāgadhī the r is not replaced by l consistently, although it has gone further in other dialects except for Māgadhī. On this point the definition cited by Pischel §17 of the classic canon commentator Abhayadeva *adhamāgadhī bhāṣā, yasyāṃ ra-sor la-śau māgadhyām* ity ādikaṃ māgadha-bhāṣā-lakṣaṇāṃ paripūraṃ nāsti is not to be understood with Pischel that Ardhamāgadhī ra and sa are retained, but still has the nominative in -e; but that the change from la and śa to ra and sa (lakṣaṇa ra-sor la-śau, Hemacandra 4, 288) is not paripūraṇa (complete, accomplished fully), insofar as only the half of it is met, the la, but not the śa.” Alsdorf then goes on to give some examples where mainly l is used for r in the Ardhamāgadhī canon, but later the l was changed back to r, presumably as Jainism spread into western areas.

109 See “Epigraphische Beiträge 3,” in Heinrich Lüders, *Philologica Indica*, (Göttingen, 1940), 288-290, for a long list of masc. a- stems with neuter plural endings. This was also the case for the eastern dialects at Dhauli and Jaugada and the northern dialect at Kālsī (Hultzsch, *Inscriptions*, page lxxiv and civ).
sing in -e-\textit{aṃsi}, and -\textit{aṃmi} which is similar to the typical eastern form in -\textit{asi} and also similar to the western forms -\textit{e}, -\textit{asmi} and -\textit{amhi} which P has adopted; 3) AMg uses relatives and correlatives with no initial \textit{y}-, i.e. \textit{ye} > \textit{e} or \textit{yathā} > \textit{athā}, while the western forms maintain the \textit{y}-prefix. This form is preserved in P as the form \textit{aduvā} = \textit{yad vā}. However, Alsdorf's argument is not conclusive as all of these forms can also be shown to be northwestern (Shāhbāzgarhī = Sh and Mānsehrā = M had masc. accus. pl. in -\textit{āni}) and/or northern (loc. sing at Kalsi is -\textit{asi}), forms including \textit{athā} in M.

It is clear, that unless new evidence turns up, we will never be able to find a single "original" language of Buddhism. The evidence for AMg is sparse and unconvincing and while the evidence for Māgadhī is more compelling, the Magadhisms in P are still only relicts that have survived in a dialect which is itself a secondary translation and a composite creation. Over the years attempts have been made to localize P in west-central India by comparing it to the language of the Aśokan Gir edict. Lamotte, for example, and many others have suggested that "there is no doubt that, of all the Aśokan dialects, that of the Gir edict is the closest to Pāli,"\textsuperscript{110} but when this statement is critically examined its conclusion does not stand unchallenged.

Since I have argued this case in great detail elsewhere,\textsuperscript{111} I will only summarize my conclusions.

\footnote{\textsuperscript{110} Lamotte, \textit{History}, 565. See also von Hinüber, \textit{Das ältere Mittelindisch}, §37 "Da Pāli der Sprache der Aśoka-Inschriften von Gînaṁī im Westen Indiens nahesteht, ..." But see also K. R. Norman, "Buddhism and Sanskritisation" in \textit{A Philological Approach to Buddhism, The Bukkyo Dendo Kyokai Lectures 1994} (Lancaster: Pali Text Society, 2006), 128, "The fact that there are no forms with \textit{pr} in P in contrast to the Gir version of the Aśokan inscriptions, where \textit{pr}- is the most common group containing -\textit{r}-, suggests that, despite all claims to the contrary, there is probably no connection between P and the Gir dialect of the Aśokan inscriptions.}

\footnote{\textsuperscript{111} See Bryan Levman, "Is Pāli closest to the Western Aśokan dialect of Gînaṁī?" \textit{Sri Lankan International Journal of Buddhist Studies (SIJBS)}. (2010).}
Taking first the similarities which Lamotte notes between P and Gir,\textsuperscript{112} we find that most of them are also present in the northwestern dialects of Sh and M, and/or the northern dialect of Kālsī (K):

1) nom. sing. in -o which also occurs in Sh and M as well.

2) ablat. of a-stems in -ā which Sh and K also have.

3) loc. of a-stems in -e, -asmiṃ and -amhi. As was mentioned above, AMg has loc. sing. in -aṃsi. Sh has loc of a-stems in -aspi which is closely related to -asmiṃ > -aspi as -m- > -v- in the northwest dialects (ātma > atva) and -v- commonly changes to -p- (svarga > sparga). So we may assume -asmiṃ > -*asvi > -aspi.

4) instr. of -an stems in -aṇṇa and gen. as -aṇṇo. Same in Sh.

5) P and Gir both change -u- to -a- in the word guru > garu, which Sh and K also have.

6) the replacement of -r- in P by -a-, -i- and -u- is common to K Sh and even the eastern dialects.

7) the retention of S -r- in P (and Gir) also occurs in Sh and M.

8) changing -bh- > -h- in instr. plural, also in K and M.

9) shortening of long nasalized vowels (as in gen. pl. e.g. S bhūtānāṃ > bhūtānam) is also common in K and Sh.

10) P and Gir have accus. plural of a-stem nouns in -e while all the other dialects use the -ani ending.

11) In Gir and P the demonstrative ayaṃ functions as nom. sing. in both masc. and fem (except for one case in Gir RE 1 A where iyaṃ occurs for feminine). Sh has ayaṃ for masc. and aya for fem. and K and M have iyaṃ for fem.

\textsuperscript{112} Lamotte, History, page 565.
12) Gir and P have the 3rd person sing. opt. in -e and -ey(y)a and the middle opt. in -tha. Sh apparently has no dedicated opt. form for the 3rd person,\textsuperscript{113} except for the verb \textit{vas} (siya and siyati corresponding to P siya). K has -eyā as 3rd person opt.

13) The change of S \textit{khalu} > \textit{kho} is noted by Lamotte as an isogloss between P and Gir but it is common to all the rock edicts.

14) The collapse of the three sibilants, ś, š and s to one (s). Both K, Sh and M retain the differentiation of the sibilants, the latter two following S, and the former indiscriminately.\textsuperscript{114} The eastern dialects also collapse the sibilants.

Considering all fourteen points of convergence outlined by Lamotte, there are only two points unique to P and Gir (masc. accus. plural in -e of -a stems and the levelling of all sibilants to the dental -s-) and even the latter form is present in the two eastern dialects of Dhauli and Jagaḍas.

As for the points of dissimilarity between P and Gir, here are some of the major differences:\textsuperscript{115}

1) Gir (and other dialects) has ā or āva for S yāvat, but P has yāva.

2) Gir has \textit{atpā} for the word "self," but P has \textit{attā}. This is the same as the eastern forms in J and Dh.

3) Gir has yārisaṃ < S yādrśa, but P has the Northwest form yādisa (yādiśa in RE 11 B Sh)

4) Gir has the western form for “futile” \textit{chuda}, but P has \textit{khuda} which is a Northwestern and eastern form (M K and Dh).

\textsuperscript{113} Although a form for the first person in -eyam corresponds to Gir and P. See RE 6 L: Gir, gaccheyam, Sh vraceyaṃ. M and K. have yeham from the root yā.

\textsuperscript{114} Hultzsch, \textit{Inscriptions}, lxvi.

\textsuperscript{115} For a more comprehensive treatment, see Levman "Is Pāli Closest," 120-123.
5) P *sankhaya* (“loss”) is similar to the northern version (*samkhay*- in K Sh and M), not to Gir (*sacchāya*).

6) Gir preserves the *-st*- conjunct (*seṣṭe*) but P does not (*seṭha*).

7) Gir preserves the *pr*- cluster (*prāṇa, priya*), but P does not (*pāṇa, piya*).

8) Gir preserves the *tr*- cluster (*putra*), but P does not (*putta*).

9) Gir preserves the *kr*- cluster (*āṭikrāta*), but P does not (*āṭikkanta*).

10) With the common word *brāhmaṇa*, P preserves the *br*- cluster (similar to the northwest Sh and M forms *bramaṇa*) while in five out of seven cases Gir does not preserve it. We know from etymologies in the Dhp that originally P had the form *bāhmaṇa*, as a brahman is described as someone who is *papa-bāhīto* (“rid of his sins”), and it was later Sanskritized to *brāhmaṇa*. When one randomly takes a typical rock edict (e.g. RE 4) and compares all the forms, P is shown to be closer to the dialects of Sh M and K (43% taken cumulatively; i.e. Sh 15%, M 9% and K 19%) than to Gir (only 19% of the forms correspond; even the eastern dialect of Dhauli shows a greater correspondence with P (20% of forms) than Gir. Although these numbers cannot be considered conclusive without examining the lexicon of all the rock edicts, they do suggest that the north, north-west influence on P’s structure is as or more significant than that of the western dialect of Gir. This may indeed be the case for two important reasons: 1) writing was first developed in the Gandhāra area utilizing the Aramaic script. Kharoṣṭhī was older than Brāhmī and quite possibly its precursor and model.116 If Buddhist teachings were first written down in this dialect - because of the rapid spread of Buddhism northwest through the existing trade routes - it is not surprising that the local orthography and pronunciation would have had a

major influence on the dialect transmission to other parts of India. 2) sociolinguistically, the north and northwestern dialects were considered superior to those of the east. Although it is a well known fact that the Vedic writings contain many dialects, it was the dialect of the northwest which predominated in terms of social status. Pāṇini was himself a north-westerner and it is of course this dialect which he established as the standard in his grammar; the dialect of the eastern tribes was considered inferior to the purer speech of the north and north west. The influence of this dialect on P is therefore an expected sociolinguistic fact.

118 See for example, statements in the Kauśītaki-Brāhmaṇa that those who want to learn the best speech go the north (west), since the best known speech is spoken here, in Arthur Berriedale Keith Keith, Rigveda Brahmanas: The Aitareya and Kauśītaki Brāhmaṇas of the Rigveda (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1971), 387. Also Hermann Oldenberg, Buddha: His Life, His Doctrine, His Order (London: Williams and Norgate, 1882), 400, note: “With the Buddhists the capital of the Gandhāras, Takkasilā, figures constantly as the place to which anyone travels, when he desires to learn something good, e.g. "Tat. Aṭṭh." ii, 2: 39 etc. and already in the Vinaya Piṭaka: “Mahāvagga,” vii, 1, 5 seq.” The latter reference is to the story of Jīvaka Komārabhacca, who trained in Taxilā and became a famous doctor who treated, inter alia, King Bimbisāra and the Buddha (Vin 1, 268-81).
119 In the Buddhist Ambaṭṭhasutta, the brahman Ambaṭṭha insults the Sakyans, the sub-Himalayan eastern tribe to which the Buddha belonged. They are “fierce, rough-spoken, touchy and violent. Being of menial origin, being menials, they do not honour, respect, esteem, revere or pay homage to Brahmins” (Walshe Long Discourses, 113). Jakob Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, Volume I Lautlehre (Göttingen: Dandenhoeck und Ruprecht, 1896; reprint by Elibron Classic Series, 2005), vol 1, §53 (c) points out how words containing -riṣ- were changed to -ṛṣ- to avoid the epenthetic vowel which was felt to be an eastern vulgarism. This explains why two different forms of the word pariṣad/parṣad survive and why in P there are different reflexes for the S word puruṣa. See Geiger, Grammar, §30.3 Per Madhav M. Deshpande, "Genesis of Rgvedic Retroflexion: A Historical and Sociolinguistic Investigation," in Madhav M. Deshpande and Peter Edwin Hook, eds., Aryan and non-Aryan in India (Ann Arbor, 1979), 254, “The non-Aryans are hated for being mūra-deva’ with dummy gods, śiśna-deva, ‘phallus worshippers’ adeva ‘godless,’ etc. and are particularly accused of being mrdhra-vācaḥ ‘with obstructed speech’. See also Hermann Oldenberg, Buddha: His Life, His Doctrine, His Order (London: Williams and Norgate, 1882), 391-411 for a still relevant discussion on the hostility between the eastern non-Brahmanical (and in part non-Aryan stocks) and the western vaidikas.
Norman expresses some doubt about the G-P connection; as he says “this would require a belief that the tradition of the Theravādin texts was taken from the Magadha area where it presumably originated, to the North-West where it was written down in Kharoṣṭhī.” Yet, as he notes the S word samāja (“assembly”) occurs in P as samaya, and it is in this very form that it occurs in the Sh Aśokan edict of the north-west (RE 1 E). We will return to this discussion below.

Gāndhārī

In the complex linguistic landscape of ancient India it is very difficult to pinpoint the exact relationship of the dialects to each other. Many believe that P is the oldest of the dialects, but it is not clear why P is older than G, since the latter dialect (as represented in the GDhp) is certainly more phonologically evolved. In the GDhp intervocalic stop weakening and disappearance is much further developed than in P (although of course we do not know how much of P intervocalic stop weakening has been restored by Sanskritization), suggesting a long evolutionary history prior to the date of its putative composition (1st century BCE) and its


121 See von Hinüber, Das ältere Mittelindisch, §71; Geiger, Pāli Literatur und Sprache (Strassburg: Verlag from Karl. J. Trübner, 1916), 4, believed that P was not pure Māgadhī but a form of lingua franca ("Verkehrssprache") whose fundamentals were based on Māgadhī and which the Buddha used himself.

writing down (2nd century CE). We know that many, if not all, of the features of the Middle Indic dialects are already present in situ nascendi in the Vedic writings themselves with one of the earliest examples of stop lenition/disappearance being the S word maireya (“intoxicating drink”; reflexes in P meraya, AMg. meraga, Pkt, maïrea), with cognate Vedic madirā (same meaning) pointing to a derivation from *madireya, with -d- > Ø. Another example is pra-uga (“forepart of the shafts of a chariot”), derived from pra-yuga. Interchange of surd and sonant mutes and loss of aspiration in aspirated stops, interchange of -m- > -n-, three other common MI phenomena especially prevalent in Gândhārī, are also found in the Vedic sources, as is assimilation of two consonants to one double consonant, both glides and stops, glides and nasals, nasals and stops, and stops with stops.

Since many of the MI dialect features go back at least to the Vedic writings - and some perhaps earlier - it seems impossible to date them relative to each other. Lamotte believed that P was linguistically more advanced than the Aśokan inscriptions of the northwest and even Gir; however the dating of dialects on linguistic grounds is a very precarious business. In the

123 See footnote 83. For more information on intervocalic stop loss in P (and replacement by the glide -ya-) see Norman, Group of Discourses, 148 (ad Sn 22-23): Sabhika > Sabhiya; Kokālika > Kokāliya, Mākandika > Māgandiya, samvāśita > samvāsiya (“co-resident”).
124 See von Hinüber, Das ältere Mittelindisch, §170.
125 See Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, §37b.
126 Bloomfield & Edgerton, Vedic Variants. For interchange of surd and sonant mutes, see Chapter 2, p. 26f; for loss/interchange of aspirated stops and non-aspirates, see Chapter 3, p. 47f. For interchange of -m- > -n- cf. Vedic -vant and -mant, both with same meaning (“consisting of”). For assimilation of consonants to one double consonant see §406-§421.
127 Wackernagel, Grammatik, xx-xxi suggests that several of the MI changes do not appear to have been present in Old-Indic (OI) at all, i.e. they are Indo-European (IE), but not Indo-Aryan features.
128 Lamotte, History, 567.
eastern Aśokan dialects, for example, all consonant groups are either assimilated or resolved, so theoretically, they would be later than both P and G where conjuncts are present. But it is not that simple, as obviously all Aśokan dialects were in use simultaneously and “we must recognise that there is not necessarily any correlation between the stages of linguistic development of kindred languages, so that two related and contemporary dialects can show vastly different stages of development, with one showing a far later stage of development than the other.”

With this caveat in mind we can study some of the major features of G, without prejudging its age or its relationship to the other Pkts.

Scholars have identified three periods in the historical development of G: early, middle and late. In this abstraction, "early G" is the language of the Aśokan edicts where intervocalic lenition has not yet reached the stage of "middle G" represented by the GDhp or the G Khaggavisānasutta (Khvs) characteristic of the first century B.C. and Saka period; "late G" occurs when the language has been Sanskritized. The following discussion, examining the

---


130 Summarized in Richard Salomon, "Gāndhārī Language" in Encyclopaedia Iranica (2008), http://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/gandhari-languagehttp://www.iranicaonline.org/articles/gandhari-language, accessed Aug. 2013. Salomon, Gāndhārī Rhinoceros Sūtra, §6.2.1.4 says that the Khvs is characteristic of the early and middle stages of G, because of the absence of any cases of the elision of original intervocalic -t- or -d-. Fussman, “Gāndhārī Écrite, Gāndhārī Parlée,” also makes the argument for correlating different linguistic stages of G. with time, but repeatedly points out that the spoken language evolved more quickly than the written which was conservative and preserved archaisms in the orthography (e.g. §18.3 18.5, 18.6, 37.3. etc.). In other words it is impossible to known how early these changes (intervocalic consonant lenition or disappearance, loss of aspirated stops, gemination of conjuncts, etc.) were actually in effect in the spoken language; they in fact may well pre-date Aśoka. For
language of the GDhp and Khvs and some of the new G discoveries (see below) are then more characteristic of "middle G"; however, as I will demonstrate below in Chapter 5, many of the phonological features of "middle G" were already present in the Aśokan edicts, and indeed, even earlier in the Vedic writings, as indicated above, and we can not be sure how much the orthography reflected the phonology. Senart believed that though the Aśokan edicts sometimes retained conjuncts and differentiation between sibilants, they in fact were pronounced as geminates and all the sibilants in Sh and M, though written as palatals, retroflexes and dentals, were pronounced as a single, homogenized dental. We have numerous cases where G conjuncts do not make metrical position at the beginning of the word, again suggesting they were pronounced as single letters. Although we know almost nothing about G and the northwestern dialect(s) before Aśoka's time, we may assume that they underwent a long and continuous history of phonological development from Vedic times and earlier (presumably, a northwestern dialect(s) was spoken by the IA immigrants), and that any attempt to fix the historical development into early and middle stages is probably arbitrary.


131 Émile Senart, "The Inscriptions of Piyadasi," The Indian Antiquary, Vol 21 (1892), 147-8. In Kālsī edicts (10-14) the writer uses retroflex and palatal -s- indiscriminately (with no reference to S). Sh generally tries to employ them in their proper place, with frequent "mistakes" (see Hultsch, Inscriptions, lxxii and lxxxvi). Fussman (see previous footnote) also notes that the orthography of G does not necessarily represent the spoken language, pointing to "une orthographe vieillie assez éloignée de la prononciation réelle." (§37.3, p. 485). See also discussion in Richard Salomon Ancient Buddhist Scrolls from Gandhāra (London: The British Library, 1999), 126.

132 See footnote 153 and Salomon, Gândhārī Rhinoceros Sūtra, §4.4.2.
Von Hinüber suggests that because of the limited material available, and the fact that it was a “living local, and not a literary language,” G “must be excluded from the considerations on the early literary language of Buddhism;” however, why this should be the case is not clear at all, since the GDhp is one of the most important - and certainly one of the earliest manuscript - of the early literary documents of Buddhism.\textsuperscript{133}

The witnesses that have survived of the G dialect are the Aśokan inscriptions from northwest India at Shābhāzgaṛhī and Mānsehrā,\textsuperscript{134} the G Dharmapada thought to be a product of the Dharmaguptaka school,\textsuperscript{135} the Rhinoceros Sūtra (Khvs, part of the British Library collection), Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions from the Kuśāṇa period,\textsuperscript{136} and the Niya documents, written on wood, leather and silk and dating from the third century CE.\textsuperscript{137} In addition to the British Library collection, several other new G sources have recently come to light, including the Schøyen

\textsuperscript{133} See von Hinüber, “Pāli and Paiśācī as Variants of Buddhist Middle Indic,” Bulletin d'Études Indiennes, (1985), 63-64. Also available in von Hinüber, Kleine Schriften, Teil 1, 508-09. One must of course keep in mind, as Fussman has pointed out (see footnotes 130 and 131 above), that the orthography of the GDhp is not as evolved as the actual phonology of the spoken language.

\textsuperscript{134} in Hultzsch, Inscriptions, lxxiv-xcix and passim.

\textsuperscript{135} Brough, op. cit.,

\textsuperscript{136} S. Konow, Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions (Calcutta: 1929).

\textsuperscript{137} A. M. Boyer, E. J. Rapson and E. Senart, Kharoṣṭhī Inscriptions discovered by Sir Aurel Stein in Chinese Turkestān (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1920). See also T. Burrow, The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents from Chinese Turkestan (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1937), viii, who calls the language of the Niya Documents “Krorainic” named after the capital of the kingdom of Shan Shan (鄯善, Shàn shàn), formerly Loulan. Shan Shan was located on the south side of the Tarim basin in NW China.
collection, the Senior collection, the Pelliot collection and the Bajaur collection. The major characteristics of the G dialect are

1) It has less Sanskritization than P and the other dialects. In terms of intervocalic lenition we see regular change of voiceless stops > voiced stops or to a glide. There are examples of this in P as well (page 44) but many of these have been Sanskritized and subject to over-correction, resulting in confusion between voiced and voiceless stops. In G (writing at least) “it would seem that in this position [intervocally] the distinction between voiced and voiceless stops was lost.” Often the stops and glides are eliminated altogether and the intervocalic consonant is lost.

2) As the most phonologically advanced of the dialects, the GDhp has numerous examples of stops replaced by glides, like alif, -y-, -k-, -h- or -v-, or softened to a

---


139 For Sanskritization, see Norman, “Four Etymologies” where virayo has been Sanskritized to virajo (“stainless”); Lüders gives a long list of over-corrections in Beobachtungen, §122-48. The interchange of voiced and voiceless consonants in the Pkts is discussed below in Chapter 10.


141 Ibid §28, 30, 32, 34, 39.
fricative, or disappearing altogether in intervocalic position. This trend is apparent in the Aśokan inscriptions, but accelerated in the GDhp.

3) Aspirated stops sometimes change to aspirates only, a development which was also starting to take place in P (e.g. lahu < S laghu; dahati < S dadhāti). In the case of -dh-, -th- these consonants changed to a voiced alveolar fricative [z] through an intermediate stage -ḍ. The disappearance of the stop in aspirated stops was an ongoing process which is found in the Aśokan edicts and in the Vedic texts, most prominently with -bh- and -h-. G is further advanced than P (e.g. G mahoru = P madhura; G suha = P sukha; G oha = P ogha, etc.), although some of the P lexicon may have been Sanskritized. In G many of the aspirate stops often lose their aspiration entirely (tathāgata > tadagada; bodhi > bodi).

142 Ibid, §31, 33
144 Levman, "Aśokan Phonology," 67. See below Chapter 5, page 144f.
145 Brough, GDhp, §43. This is also attested in the Aśokan RE 1, Sh sasumat- < S sādhumat- ("good"). -dh- > -s-. In the Senior manuscripts, an unaspirated, intervocalic dental consonant changes to -ṭ- (a modified form of -d- thought to represent a voiced dental fricative, [ð]. See Salomon, "Senior Manuscripts," 86.
147 Bloomfield & Edgerton, Variants, 65.
148 Fussman, "Gāndhārī," 483: "...la distinction entre aspirée et non-aspirée était devenue si faible en gandh. qu’une oreille non exercée ne la percevait plus. ("...the aspirate and non-aspirate distinction had become so weak in G. that a non-trained ear did not perceive it any longer"). A list of examples is given on page 482.
4) G shows an alternation of -m- »-v- which is not common in P. Per Brough -m- has originated as an allophone of -v- in nasalized contexts (e.g. G. bhamaṇa = P bhāvanā, "meditation"; G atva < S ātma, P atta).\textsuperscript{149} This is also common in the Vedic texts.\textsuperscript{150} P has mayam ("we") for S vayam.

5) Like P, most consonant groups are assimilated. A dental nasal + voiced stop usually assimilates to a nasal only (nandati > nanadi, "he rejoices" or pīṇḍa > pīṇa, "lump of food") while a nasal + voiceless stop usually changes to a voiced stop, without the nasal notated (śānti > śadī, "tranquility"); saṃstava > sadhava, "praise"; saṅkalpa > sagapa, "thought"), except for the velars which behave differently.\textsuperscript{151} P generally retains the conjuncts (e.g. nandati, pīṇḍa, santi, santhava, sankappa). A labial nasal + voiced stop also assimilates to a nasal (gambhīra > gammira), while P does not (P gambhīra).

Conjuncts with -y as a second member usually assimilate (RE 5 B, Sh, M: kalyāṇa > kalaṇa; RE 4 B, Sh, M: divyāṇi > divani), while in P they are often retained (divya, kalyāṇa, but dibba in prose).

6) Some consonant clusters with -r- remain, sometimes with metathesis, a feature of the Dardic languages which first appears in the Aśoka Sh and M inscriptions (e.g. dhrama), and also in the GDhp: e.g. S durga > drugha, "difficult way"; durgati > drugadi, "distress"; durbala > drubala, "weak"; however much of the -r- displacement is simply mechanical

\textsuperscript{149} Brough, GDhp, §36.
\textsuperscript{150} See footnote 126. For an example in P see Dhp 339-c where the PTS, Thai and Sinhalese have vāhā ("currents") and the Burmese has māhā ("great ones").
\textsuperscript{151} Ibid, §46. sāṅga > sağa where -ṅ- is believed to have the value of [γ]
-r- insertion, not metathesis at all.\textsuperscript{152} P does not maintain this conjunct, i.e. \textit{dugga}, \textit{duggati}, \textit{dubbala}. Consonants + -r- clusters sometimes remain in G and sometimes in P e.g. \textit{pra\text{"a}}, “wisdom” (P \textit{pa\text{"a}\text{"a}}); \textit{prasada}, “palace” (P \textit{p\text{"a}s\text{"a}da}), but they are often assimilated, e.g. G \textit{pa\text{"a}}, “living being” (P \textit{p\text{"a}na}), G \textit{pay\text{"es}\text{"i}d\text{"i}}, “he will gather” < S \textit{pra+\text{"a}ci} (P \textit{p\text{"a}cess\text{"a}t\text{"i}}), \textit{pay\text{"i}n\text{"a}du}, “gathering” (P \textit{pac\text{"i}n\text{"a}n\text{"a}ta\text{"n}}), \textit{kod\text{"a}}, “anger” (< S \textit{krod\text{"a}}, P \textit{kod\text{"a}}), or resolved, as in Sh \textit{garah\text{"a}ti}, “he scolds” < S \textit{gar\text{"a}\text{"a}ti}, with \textit{\textemptyset} > -a-.

Sometimes, although the C+-r- conjunct is preserved in the orthography, the cluster does not make position (make a preceding short vowel long), indicating that it was not pronounced.\textsuperscript{153} Conjuncts beginning with \textit{br}-, e.g. \textit{brama\text{"a}}, “brahma\text{"a}n” (P \textit{br\text{"a}hma\text{"a}na}) and \textit{brom\text{"i}}, “I call” (P \textit{br\text{"u}mi}), are retained, in P because of Sanskritization; the \textit{br}-conjunct in \textit{brama\text{"a}na} (P \textit{br\text{"a}hma\text{"a}na}) does also not make position, so it was probably pronounced as \textit{b}- indicating its etymology from \textit{b\text{"a}\text{"e}t\text{"i}} (“he wards off [sin]”). Consonant + -v- usually remains e.g. G. \textit{d\text{"a}\text{"a}ra}, “door” as it does in P (\textit{dv\text{"a}\text{"a}ra}), or G. \textit{dv\text{"a}\text{"a}\text{"u}}, “both,” P \textit{dve ca}.

---

\textsuperscript{152} K. R. Norman, “G\text{"a}ndh\text{"a}r\text{"i},” in eds. Li Zheng et al, eds., \textit{Papers in Honour of Prof. Dr. Ji Xianlin on the Occasion of his 80th Birthday} (Peking, 1991), page 137f, §15. Also available in \textit{Collected Papers} 5 (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1994), 65. e.g. S \textit{dus\text{"k\text{"r\text{"a}}}} > G. \textit{druk\text{"\text{"i}}\text{"a}} is not a true metathesis as there is no such form in the exemplar as *\textit{dur\text{"k\text{"\text{"a}}}}*.

\textsuperscript{153} See, for example, GDhp verse 127 where the -r- in \textit{prata\text{"a}} (P \textit{patt\text{"i}y\text{"a}}, “for the accomplishment”), does not make position, nor in verse 130 the -r- in \textit{pram\text{"u}ni} (P \textit{p\text{"a}pu\text{"e}}), “he may accomplish”); see also page 447 for another example re: \textit{mr\text{"a}\text{"s\text{"o}}}, (“disparagement”).
7) The three sibilants are retained in G, usually, but not always according to their Sanskritic usage: e.g. saya < śayyā, “bed” in GDhp 259, 270; suyi < śuci, “pur e” in GDhp 112, 255, 303, 322, 327; nisedhe < niṣedha, “prevention” in GDhp 15.154

8) Four OI nasals ŋ, ñ, n and m are also retained, at least in the written form (not necessarily when spoken).155 Intervocalic -n- and -ŋ- both become -ŋ-.

9) Inflections. Although Sh has a nom. sing. masc. in -o (3rd century BCE) by the time of the GDhp and Niya Document (2nd century CE), a wide flexibility has been established with nom. sing. masc. in -o -e -u and -a.156 Accus. sing. masc. and neut. forms occur in -u and -a predominantly, but also occasionally in -o which effectively means that the difference between nom. and accus. cases has been neutralized. In the Niya documents, the neuter has been abandoned and all feminines are in -ī.157 As is well known, P still retains a full nominal paradigm system. Where P has two endings for the 3rd sing. opt. -eyya and -etha, G. has only one (-eya, -e’a), dropping the middle voice. This simplifying trend is also evident in the absolutive forms. P still retains several, in -ttā (Sanskritized to -tvā), -tvana, -tu, -tūna, -ya, -yāna and -akam, while G. only has two principal forms in -tva (Sh -tu) and -ti, with two occurrences of a form in -itha.158

154 See also Norman, “Gāndhārī,” §5.3 for forms like aṣaṇ and aṣaṇ < S saṇa. There are also lots of examples where the sibilants correspond to S usage.

155 Fussman, “Gāndhārī,” 441.

156 Brough, Dharmapada, §75, 76. Fussman, “Gāndhārī,” 460-61, commenting on “la faiblesse des voyelles finales in the Apraca inscriptions (6-20 CE) says “on ne les distinguait plus assez à l’audition pour qu’elles puissent encore jouer un rôle morpho-syntaxique” (“In the hearing one was not distinguishing them enough that they might still play a morpho-syntactic role”).

157 von Hinüber, Das ältere Mittelindisch, §97

158 Brough, Dharmapada, §80 and Geiger §208-215. Sh also has a form in –ya, per Hultzsch, Inscriptions, xcixii, which Bloch, Les Inscriptions, calls “douteux” (page 78).
10) There is some degree of archaisms that have been preserved in G (e.g. points # 7, 8 above), but exactly how much is difficult to determine because of the disparity between written and spoken G. Many of the inscriptions show conservative writing, with intervocalic consonants represented that were almost certainly not spoken.\(^{159}\)

Although we cannot establish an absolute timeline, the data shows that G is the most rapidly evolving of the dialects, the most phonologically advanced and the one least Sanskritized. Because of its widespread intervocalic lenition and/or hiatus, simplification of aspirated stops and assimilation of conjunct consonants including the very common nasal + stop group (in the GDhp but not in the Aśokan REs), and simplification of verbal and nominal paradigms, it is also the most flexible, and – except for the (written) preservation of the sibilant and (partial) nasal distinction - the most homogenous of the dialects. In fact, many of the linguistic features of G accord well with the postulated *lingua franca*, northern pan-Indic dialect, or "koine Gangétique" which scholars believe underlay the Prakritic witnesses that have survived.\(^{160}\) Between P and G it is impossible to tell which preserves the older tradition, as both are translations of an earlier underlying MI transmission, now lost.\(^{161}\) There is one instance in the *Dhammapada* (Dhp 41,

---

\(^{159}\) Fussman, "Gāndhārī," 457.

\(^{160}\) Geiger, *Pāli Literatur*, 3-4 was the first to make this suggestion. The *lingua franca* would contain elements of all dialects but free of the most conspicuous linguistic differences. G qualifies in most respects except for the -ś- -ṣ- -s- differentiation. It (the *lingua franca*) was called a "koine Gangétique by Helmer Smith, "Le futur moyen indien," 178. Bechert, "Allgemeine Bemerkungen," 34, wondered whether a "poetic language existed in Middle-Indic which was possibly supra-regional in use but in certain places may have been subjected to a process of assimilation with local languages, as Helmer Smith conjectured." English translation in *Buddhist Studies Review*, 8, 1-2 (1991), 19. See discussion above on pages 27 to 31.

\(^{161}\) See footnote 58.
GDhp 153) where the GDhp gāthā is substantially different than the Dhp verse, but the commentary on the latter preserves the differences in a gloss. This can only be explained by assuming that the P and G versions go back to a common source, and may well indicate that the G version is older, with the P commentary preserving the correct version.162

Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (Patna Dharmapada and Mahāvastu)

Edgerton identifies three layers of BHS based on the degree of Middle Indicisms and later Sanskritizations in the texts in question. Based on this principle that “Middle Indic or non-Sanskrit words and forms, in whatever recension they occur, are invariably older than corresponding Sanskritizations in other versions,”163 Edgerton identified the Mahāvastu (Mvu) as the earliest of BHS texts since all parts of it, verse and prose, preserve many Middle Indic forms and the Sanskritization is “relatively slight.”164 He terms this a “Group 1” text; Group 2 texts have a more Sanskritized prose while still retaining Middle Indic forms in the more

162 K. R. Norman, "The role of Pāli in early Sinhalese Buddhism," in Heinz Bechert, ed., Buddhism in Ceylon and Studies on Religious Syncretism (Göttingen, 1978), 35. Also available in Collected Papers 2 (Oxford, Pali Text Society, 1991), 37. Norman says that the common source must be in North India. Brough discusses these verses in GDhp 225-26, and points out that one cannot tell which is older, although there are lots of examples in the P canon where the commentary has preserved older traditions lost in the suttas: e.g. K. R. Norman, “Four Etymologies,” 178 (Also in Collected Papers 2, 155); see also K. R. Norman, “Buddhism and the Commentarial Tradition,” 207-210.

163 F. Edgerton, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1953, 1998), §1.40. The same observation is made by Fussman, “Gāndhārī,” §18.5, “Il semblerait que plus le temps passe et plus les graphies soient conservatrices. Cela coïncide d’ailleurs avec l’apparition de mots skt. dans les inscriptions khar.” It would seem that the more time passes, the more the written form is conservative. That coincides moreover with the appearance of Sanskrit words in the Kharoṣṭhi inscriptions.

164 Ibid, BHSD, §1.36
conservative verse, and Group 3 texts have both verse and prose thoroughly Sanskritized but have a Buddhist vocabulary. Edgerton believed that the older parts of the Mvu dated from the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE. A text not known to Edgerton, the Patna \textit{Dharmapada} (PDhp) would certainly be part of his Group 1 texts, as it is mainly a Prakritic text with some Sanskrit elements. Roth dates it linguistically to the 2\textsuperscript{nd} century BCE as well.\textsuperscript{165} Von Hinüber calls it “more Sanskritized than P, but at the same time more Middle Indic than BHS.”\textsuperscript{166} Roth identifies the PDhp with the Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin school which split off from the Mahāsāṃghikas, and places it linguistically between the works of the Mā-L school and P, but closer to the P side. The \textit{Mahāvastu} is generally regarded as a work of the Mā-L school as well, but probably after they had seceded from the Mahāsāṃghikas, as the language is quite different. Both of these works - as in all MI Pkt - are dialectically mixed and cannot be localised to any one particular location, although Roth associates the Mahāsāṃghikas with Mathurā because of a similarity of language between the surviving Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin works and local inscriptions. PDhp’s association with Mā-L is apparently because it was written in Proto-Bengali characters and found together with other known Mā-L \textit{Vinaya} texts.\textsuperscript{167} However the complex tapestry of regional languages, travelling scribes, mixing of schools and languages, Sanskritizations,

\textsuperscript{165} Gustav Roth, \textit{Discussions about the Patna Dharmapada} (Patna: Patna Museum, 2000), 34.


\textsuperscript{167} See Roth, "Language," page 82, for a list. Note that Lamotte, \textit{History of Indian Buddhism}, 583, also associates “mixed Sanskrit” with the Buddhists of the Madhyadeśa.
harmonizations to other texts, etc., makes it difficult to attribute a certain text to a certain school solely by linguistic means.\textsuperscript{168}

Some of the distinguishing characteristics of the Sankritized Pkt found in the PDhp, which are different from P, are as follows:

1) retention of the Middle-Indic absolutive in -ttā which in P has been Sanskritized to -tvā, e.g. PDhp 172-a, ्नात्ता, “having known” (or nyāttā in PDhp 15) vs. P ्नत्वा (Dhp 12-a), or ्हेत्ता (PDhp 18-d, “having left behind”) vs. P ्हित्वा (Dhp 29-d).\textsuperscript{169} The OI -ty- conjunct is restored in P but retained in its MI form in PDhp, e.g. S ्चात्या > P ्चेत्या (Dhp 188-c), > PDhp ्चित्ता (216-c, “shrine”).

2) Generally, more conjuncts are kept than in P: PDhp retains (or restores) conjunct clusters in -r- + cons: e.g. PDhp 1-a, ्पुर्वा vs. P ्पुब्बा “former” (Dhp 1-a), or cons. + -r- ्पुत्रेसु, PDhp 143-d vs. P ्पुत्तेसु (Dhp 345-d), ्आप्पामात्रो, PDhp 123-a “little” vs. P ्आपमात्तो (Dhp 56-a).

3) retention or restoration of conjunct clusters in -ṣṭ(h)- (e.g. PDhp 1-c, ्प्रदुष्टेना vs. P ्प्रदुष्ठेना, “wicked” (Dhp 1-c); PDhp 1-b, ्स्रेṣ्ठा vs. P ्सेत्ठा, “best”(Dhp 1-b).


\textsuperscript{169} This is Roth’s original reading in “Language,” 99. In his later monograph, Gustav Roth, \textit{Discussions about the Patna Dharmapada}, 10, he changes his mind about the conjunct -tt- and believes it is -cc-, although Margaret Cone, "Patna Dharmapada," \textit{Journal of the Pali Text Society}, 13, (1989),108, reads it as -tt-. If an absolutive ending in -ccā, it would be similar to AMg (Pischel §587).
4) personal pronoun differences: use of *vayaṃ* for *P* *mayaṃ*, “we” (PDhp 254-b, Dhp 6-b); *tubbhehi* for *P* *tumhehi*, “by you” (PDhp 360-e, Dhp 275-a).

5) retention/restoration of the palatal ś: e.g. PDhp 7-a, *‘nupaśśīṃ* vs. *P* *anupassiṃ* (Dhp 7-a), even when there is none in *S*: *kuśīdaṃ*, “lazy,” PDhp 7-d = S *kusīda* or *kuśīda*.

6) retention/restoration of the S vocalic -ṛ-: e.g. PDhp 7-b, *asamvṛtaṃ* vs. *P* *aśamvutaṃ* (Dhp 7-b), “not restrained.”

7) retention of S voiced intervocalic where *P* devoices e.g. PDhp 7-d, *kuśīdaṃ* vs. *P* *kusītaṃ* (Dhp 7-d), “lazy” < S *kusīda/kuṣīda*.

8) retention of original -y- glide cons. where *P* changes to -ν-: PDhp 94-a, *anikkaśāyo* vs. *P* *anikkasāvo* (Dhp 9-a) < S *aniṣkaśāya*, “free from impurity.” Both *G* and *UV* retain the original -y-. Sometimes the change of *P* -ν- > PDhp -y- seems to be a hyperpalism, e.g. PDhp 277-b, *netaye*, “to lead,” *P* *netave* < S *netavai* (Dhp 180-b).

9) different future form: normal PDhp future, 3rd sing. ends in -hiti instead of standard *P* future in -ssati, e.g. *vijehiti*, PDhp 131-a, “he will vanquish” vs. *P* *vijessati* (Dhp 44-a).

This form also occurs in *P*, but more rarely, in the *gāthā* language; it is commoner in the Pkts, especially AMg.

---

170 K. R. Norman, “Notes on the Patna Dharmapada,” *Amala Prajñā: Aspects of Buddhist Studies (Professor P. V. Bapat Felicitation Volume)* (Delhi, 1989), 436. Also available in K. R. Norman, *Collected Papers* 4 (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1994), 9. The author suggests that a form like *netaye* “indicates knowledge of an eastern Pkt where -y- > -ν-.” In fact, it may just be a confusion on the sound. Both Munda and Tib lack a -ν- sound, so if the translator was MISL (Middle-Indic Second Language), then he/she might well transliterate as such, with the -ν- sound heard as an allophone of -p- or -b- (or the bilabial fricatives [ɸ] and [β]), which was weakened to -y-. See further discussion in chapter 10 below (page 490) with respect to change of -ν- > -p-.

10) treatment of S cluster -kṣ- differs from P. Usually PDhp has the eastern form (-kkh- e.g. *titikkhāti*, “he endures” PDhp 90-d) but sometimes employs the western form as in *yogacchēmaṃ* (PDhp 16-d, “release from attachments”) or *avecchāti* (PDhp 19-f, “he looks”) where P has the eastern forms (*yogakkheamaṃ* Dhp 23-d, or *avekkhāti*, Dhp 28-f).


12) PDhp sometimes retains the aspirated stops where P loses them: e.g. PDhp 345-a, *laghuno* (“quick”) vs. P *lahuno* (Dhp 35-a); however it retains *hoti* with P, whereas the *Mahāvastu* retains the *bhoti* form with the stop in place (see below).

13) There is significant variation on the treatment of the dental, palatal and retroflex nasals.

Sometimes P -n̐n̔- = PDhp -n̐y- (*viññāno* = -v̐myāno, “consciousness” in PDhp 349-c);

sometimes P -n̐n̔- = PDhp -n̐n̔-; P -n̐n̔- = PDhp -n̐n̔-; P -n̐n̔- = PDhp -n̐n̔-; P -n̐n̔- = PDhp -n̐n̔-.
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14) PDhp voices intervocalic stops in some cases where P does not: e.g. *prajēhīti*, PDhp 131, “he will gather” vs. P *pacessati* (<S pra + ć̐) or *aheḍayām*, PDhp 127-b, “not harming,” vs. P *aheṭhayām* (< Skt ṛ̐heth, Dhp 49-b).

15) PDhp has the correlative form *tārisaṃ*, PDhp 206-d, “such a one” vs. P which has the form *tādisaṃ* (Dhp 76-d). PDhp is similar to Gir RE which also has the form *yārisaṃ* and *tādrisāṃ* (page 52 above).

16) PDhp uses the form *ayīra*, “noble one” consistently instead of P *ariya*. The word *ayīra* is not used in P except in the later texts (e.g. *Jātakas*).

---

17) Like P and Gir PDhp has a loc. sing. in both -e and -amhi. Roth believes that this fact indicates that the three dialects belonged to a common speech community near Gir in western India and extending to Ujjayini, Vidiśā, Sāñchi and Bhārhut.¹⁷³

Between the PDhp and those section of it preserved in the Mahāvastu (the Sahasravarga and fragments of other vargas), there are the following differences:

1) Mvu restores the S form of ātmānam; both P and PDhp have a(ā)ttānam and G. atvaṇa.

The derivation -tm- > -tl- > -tm- suggests that Mvu is younger than the other Pkt.s.

2) In P the normal 3rd pers. optative middle ends in -etha (e.g. yajetha, “he worships”). In PDhp the intervocalic consonant has dropped out (yajeya) and in G the intervocalic glide has disappeared (ya’e’a). In the Mvu the original S has been restored (yajeta), again suggesting a later provenance for this Pkt. This is also the case in 3rd pers. opt. active (P pūjaye, “he honours; PDhp pūjaye, G puya’i; Mvu, pūjayet), but not always, e.g. Mvu vol. 3, p. 436, jīve (“he may live”) and Dhp 110-a, PDhp 390-a idem.¹⁷⁴

3) Mvu restores more of the -r- + cons. conjuncts than PDhp (supra page 67), e.g. muhūrtam, “for a moment” Mvu vol. 3, p. 435, PDhp 380-d muhuttam; Mvu

¹⁷⁴ The normal lenition of S yajeta > PDhp yajeya and G ya’e’a suggest that the latter two dialects preserve the earlier form and the P and Mvu are later Sanskritizations; the aspiration of the dental in P (-etha) is “remarkable” as Geiger points out (§129). For a discussion of the P forms of the optative which are many, see Geiger §127-129. References to the Mvu are to the edition by Emile Senart, Mahāvastu 1, 2, 3 (Paris Imprimerie Nationale, 1882, 1890, 1897). References to the Divyāvadāna are to P. L. Vaidya, Divyāvadāna (Mithila: Darbhanga Mithila Institute of Post-graduate Studies and Research in Sanskrit Learning 1959).
"varṣaśatam, “for a hundred years,” vol. 3, p. 43521, PDhp 380-a vaśaśatam. This is also applicable to cons. + -r- and other conjuncts, e.g. PDhp 381-b puṃñapekhi, “looking for merit” vs. Mvu puṇyařeṣī or dhyāyato, Mvu vol. 3, p. 4365, “for the one who meditates” vs. PDhp 390-d jhāyato and P jhāyino (Dhp 110-d) where jh- is restored to dhy-. Other conjuncts in the Mvu seem to be regularly preserved, although often with Pkt endings retained, e.g. apaśyaṃ in Mvu vol. 3, p. 4368, instead of regular S form apaśyan(n) found in UV 24.15; or vol. 3, p. 42214, brahmacaryavāṃ175 instead of Dhp 267-b which retains the eastern form with the epenthetic vowel brahmacaryavā or UV brahmacaryavān; or GDhp 68-b brāmmapiyaya which shows the contraction of -cariya- > -yariya- > -yiya- (-ari- > -i-); or kuśāgreṇa, “with the tip of a blade of grass,” vol. 3, p. 4359, with correct ending, vs. Dhp 70-a kusaggena and PDhp 388-a kuśāgreṇa; or Mvu vol. 3, p. 37611 prakṣiptā, “thrown into” instead of PDhp 233-c, prakkhitā; or Mvu vol. 3, p. 42116, sīktā “sprinkled with” instead of Dhp 369-b and PDhp 57-b sītā.

Occasionally Mvu assimilates the conjuncts, e.g. vol. 3, p. 1095, dullabho “difficult to achieve,” the same as Dhp 193-a and PDhp 79-a.

4) In the Mahāvastu the gen. sing. masc./neut. ending is restored to -asya, e.g. vol. 3, p. 4365, śīlavantasya, “of the moral one,” vs. PDhp 390-d śīlavantassa and Dhp 110-d śīlavantassa.

5) The Mvu will often restore the visarga that has been eliminated and/or assimilated, e.g.

Dhp 110-b asamāhito, “uncontrolled,” PDhp 390-b asamāhito, vs. Mvu vol. 3, p. 4364,

---

175 A consonant before an anusvāra/nigghita is automatically long, so there is no need for the -ā-, per Geiger §5. “Long nasal vowels do not occur,” (Law of Morae), so evidently this is a scribal error.
asamāhitaḥ or in the same pāda,, dussīlo, "of bad character," PDhp duśśilo, Mvu vol. 3, p. 436⁴, duḥśīlo.

6) There are many Pkt forms for the common S neuter form śreyas, "better." Dhp 110-c uses seyyo, PDhp 390-c śreyo, G ṣevha ṣehu. ṣeho and ṣebha,¹⁷⁶ and Mvu, vol. 3, p. 436³, śreyam. The Udānavarga (UV) 24.3 uses śreyah and sometimes the Mvu uses śreyo as well as śreyam in other gāthās of the Sahasravarga.

7) In some cases where P and PDhp have resolved conjuncts through the insertion of an epenthetic vowel e.g. Dhp 112-b hīnavīryo, "of little energy," PDhp 392-b idem, Mvu restores the original S form by elimination of the inserted vowel, hīnavīryavān, vol 3, p. 436⁶.

8) Mvu retains the Prakīrti spelling of prahāṇa (< S pradhāna, "most important or essential part" evolving to mean "exertion" in BHS) while Dhp 141-c has padhānāṃ and PDhp-c 195 pradhānāṃ. But Mvu vol. 3, p. 412¹⁷, UV 33.1 and Divyāvadāna, p. 210⁵ are all in agreement with prahāṇāṃ. I have discussed at length elsewhere the nature of this confusion¹⁷⁷ and noted that the Tibetans regularly treat prahāṇa as spong ba "abandonment," (although in this instance - the rendition of UV 33.1 - they translate it as 'bad pa, meaning "to strive"). The confusion results from the well-known tendency of the Pkts to delete the stop from aspirated stops (e.g. -dh- > -h-, a phenomenon, which, as we have noted above (page 60) is present in the Rg Veda and Aśokan edicts. So P and PDhp may well be a back-formation from a received pahāṇa > padhāna. In any

---

¹⁷⁶ See Brough, GDhp, §44
¹⁷⁷ Bryan Levman, "What does the Pāli phrase pahitatta mean?" Thai International Journal for Buddhist Studies (2011), 57-75. See also chapter 6 which substantially reproduces this article.
case two potential meanings of the compound in which this word occurs, *ukkulikappadhānam* “effort in squatting” and Mvu *ukkulukaprahānam* “abandonment of squatting” or (with variant reading *uktukukaprahānam*), “abandonment of amusing oneself” (*uktukuka* with a dental -t-) are now possible. I will discuss this further below in chapter 6.

9) Mvu retains the Prakrit ending for the instr./abl. pural in -ehi, e.g. vol. 3, p. 412, *sarvehi bhūtehi nivārya daṇḍam*, “warding off violence from all beings.” All the other witnesses use loc. plural in this instance, e.g. Dhp 142-c, *bhūtesu*, PDhp 196-c *prāṇesu*, GDhp 80-c *bhudeṣu*, UV 33.2 *bhūtesu* and Divy p. 210, *bhūtesu*. Mvu also retains the MI ablative sing. in -ā, Mvu vol. 3, p. 423, *duṭkha pramucyate*, “is freed from suffering,” with similar ending to Dhp 361-f and PDhp 51-f *dukkha p(r)amuccati*. Mvu vol. 3, p. 421, also retains the Pkt ending for the fem. instr. sing. *maitrāye (siktā)*, “sprinkled with love” (Pkt, *maitrāe*)

10) Sometimes the Mvu has its own Pkt form which differs from all other witnesses, e.g. vol. 3, p. 420, *paryādāpanaṃ* “purification.” Dhp 183-c has an eastern form with epenthetic -i-, *paryodapananam*, PDhp 357-c has *paryodamananam* and UV 28.1 has *panyavadanam* which seems to be closest to the S form derived from *pary-ava+śdi“, “to purify completely.” The Mvu form seems to be a causative of the S form with -ava- > -ā-, which is quite unusual in the Pkts where -ava- > -o- normally, as it did in Dhp and PDhp. Note in Mvu, vol. 3, p. 109, *puruṣājanyo*, “thoroughbred of a man” compared to Dhp 193-a *purisājañño* and PDhp 79-a *puruṣājamñño* and GDhp 173-a *puruṣayañño*.

Edgerton lists five BHS forms of this word and four P manifestations; In S the closest

---

178 Pischel, Grammar §154.
word is jātya with the same meaning, “of noble family,” “of good breed.” Evidently there was some confusion as to the root of the adjective, whether from ज्ञन “to be born” or ज्ञा, to know. Buddhaghosa and the Tibetans take it from the latter which Edgerton claims is false.179 In Mvu vol. 3, p. 4231, we also find the unique form adhyāyarato, “delighting in the lesson” which is probably a corruption for adhyātmaraṇaḥ, “with inward joy” found in UV 32.7 and also in Dhp 362-c and PDhp 52-c, aijhattarato and GDhp 53-c aijatvarado with normal G change of -m- > -v-.

Although the above list of Mvu idiosyncrasies is not exhaustive, it conclusively places the Mvu later than the PDhp, in that more Sanskritizations have taken place in the former, with the latter text less altered from the Pkt. However the Mvu has many Pkt forms in comparison to our last witness, the Udānavarga, a product of the Sarvāstivādin school, which seems to be completely Sanskritized and therefore the latest of the Dhammapada reflexes. The Pāli Dhp is generally considered to be the oldest of the witnesses, but if we use Edgerton’s correlation of Sanskritization with lateness, then we can not determine whether the Dhp or PDhp are earlier as they both have a considerable amount of Sanskritization and, on this basis, the GDhp would be the earliest witness as it is the most Prakritic of all the versions available to us, and the least Sanskritized. However, as Brough has pointed out, it is probably impossible to determine which of the versions is earliest due to the extreme complexity of the transmission process.180

179 Edgerton, BHSD, 90, s.v. ājanya.
180 Brough, GDhp, 26f.
The oldest Buddhist teaching traditions are generally believed to be preserved in the early gāthās; because of the innate conservatism of the poetic form and the exigencies of metre, their phonetic content is the least likely to have undergone substantial degradation over time; these poems are also easiest to memorize because of the regularity of their structure, and it is well attested in the early writings that the monks were expected to memorize the verses verbatim. The Soṇasutta in the Udāna (also preserved in the P and other Vinayas of the major schools), tells the story of a monk Soṇa Koṭikaṇṇa from Avanti who goes to visit the Buddha and spends the night with him in his own cell; towards dawn he is invited to recite some of the sacred texts whereupon he recites all sixteen sections of the Sutta Nipāta’s Aṭṭhakavagga, one of the oldest Buddhist texts to have come down to us, so old that the commentary on it, the Niddesa, is also part of the canon. Significantly, although Soṇa was from Avanti in western India, and presumably spoke a different dialect than the Buddha, the latter compliments him for reciting clearly and making the meaning clear; in other words, in this early poem there does not appear to be any dialect difference, or more likely, the Buddha’s dialect seems to have been memorized in its original form. There are lots of other examples of monks memorizing the

teachings - the prātimokṣa/pātimokkha, the bimonthly confessional formulary; Piṅgiya
memorizing the Pārāyanavagga (Sn v. 1131-a), the last section of the Sn, and the Sangītisutta
and Dasuttarasutta of the Dīgha Nikāya (3, 207-292) which were clearly meant for group
recitation (see above, page 24).

Although we have no direct evidence for the recitation of the Dhammapada (Dhp), the fact that
half of its verses occur in other parts of the Tipiṭaka and that we have substantial fragments of
seven different MI versions preserved, indicates both its ancient popularity and its extreme
usefulness for linguistic comparison and analysis. Fragments are even preserved in the Jaina
tradition.182 Another important source is the Sutta Nipāta. It is impossible to tell whether it is
earlier than the Dhammapada, although on metrical grounds it contains two poems in the
ancient old āryā metre examples of which are not found in the Dhp.183 It is certainly the earliest
work which is exclusively Buddhist, as the Dhp has many verses which are applicable to all the
samana traditions of north-east India. The Sn is also doctrinally very early, describing
peripatetic monks before the founding of an organized saṅgha and before the Buddhist
teachings of the Nikāyas had congealed in a set form. Unfortunately the work is only preserved
in P, but four of the suttas are preserved in other Indic dialects: the Sabhiyasutta,

182 These are listed in W. B. Bollée, Reverse Index of the Dhammapada, Suttanipata, Thera- und
Therīgāthā Padas with Parallels from the Āyāranga, Sūyagada, Uttarajjāya, Dasaveyāliya and
Isibhāsiyām. (Reinbeck: Studien zur Indologie und Iranistik. Monographie 8, 1983). Recently another
Gāndhāri version has come to light in the "Split Collection" which as preserved 88 gāthās, a sample of
which has been published in H. Falk, "The 'Split' Collection of Kharoṣṭhī Texts," Annual Report of the
International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University, vol. 14 (2014), 16-19. A
full study will be published at the end of 2014 (H. Falk, e-mail communication to the author, Jan. 2014).
183 Ludwig Alsdorf, Die Ārya-Strophen des Pali-Kanons (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag GMBH, 1967),
15-18.
Paribbajāsutta and Padhānasutta are preserved in the Mahāvastu in Sanskritized Pkt and the Khaggavisāṇasutta (‘Rhinoceros’ sutta) is preserved in a Gāndhāri manuscript interred in the first century CE - one of the oldest manuscripts we possess, perhaps even older than the GDhp, which is usually dated to the second century A.D. Portions of a BHS version of the Rhinoceros sutta are also preserved in the Mahāvastu and the Divyāvadāna.

Other sources for which we have more than one dialect preserved are the gāthās in the Upālisutta of the Majjhima Nikāya for which a BHS version has been discovered called the Varnāsatam, and some of the gāthās in the Sagāthavagga of the Samyutta Nikāya (e.g. the Brahmasamyuttā) for which parallel versions have been preserved in the Lalitavistara (LV), the Catuspariṣatsūtra (CPS) and the Sarīghahbedavastu (SBV), all however relatively late BHS works. Some of the gāthās in the Mahāparinibbānasutta are also found in the BHS Mahāparinirvānasūtra. All these Sanskrit works testify to the existence of a Sanskrit canon alongside the P canon, both translations of an underlying source. The Sanskrit versions, however, from which most of the Prakritisms have been excised, are presumably quite a bit younger. These are the principal poetic works for which we have more than one dialect witness, although there are many cases where duplicate poems are found within the P dialect

---

184 See Brough, GDhp 56. See also G. Fussman, “Gāndhārī,” 464 who dates the language to the second half of the first century BC, based on a comparison of its language with the language of other Kharoṣṭhī inscriptions. Six fragmentary gāthās from the Sn Aṭṭhakavagga have recently also come to light. See Harry Falk, “The 'Split' Collection,” 13-15.


186 Lamotte, History of Indian Buddhism, 587. “The Sanskrit canon does not give the same impression of unity and homogeneity as its rival. The reason for this is that it was elaborated later and because, compared to the early texts, it included more recent output compiled after the establishment of the sects.”
recensions (Thai, Burmese, Cambodian, Śrī Laṅkān, PTS), often with very small, but sometimes linguistically significant changes, as the discussion on Dhp 335 above shows (page 42).
Chapter Three, Methodology

In 1786, seventy-two years before Darwin outlined the principle of descent with variation, - which has since become a basic tenet of the scientific method in evolutionary biology - Sir William Jones outlined his theory that Greek, Latin and Sanskrit “sprung from some common source” that had varied over time.¹⁸⁷ This common source came to be known as Proto-Indo-European and the basic scientific method by which it was arrived at - the comparison of correlatable data and the identification of a shared source - is valid until this day. Indeed, S mātā (mātṛ), Latin mater, Greek μήτηρ, English mother, (and many other related forms) are all cognate words ultimately derived from a prototype Indo-European root mā- (“mother”). This principle of extrapolating an historic form to explain present data is applicable for much of the work which philologists engage in. Take for example this gāthā from the Sihasenāpatisutta of the Aṅguttara Nikāya (AN 3, 40¹⁵-¹⁶):

tasmā hi dānāni dadanti paṇḍitā vineyya maccheramaṅgāṃ sukhesino

   te dīgharatamā tide paṭiṭhitā devānāṃ sahavyagatā ramanti te¹⁸⁸

“Therefore learned people seeking happiness give gifts and having given up the stain of stinginess, they are firmly established for a long time in the heavenly abode; having gone to friendship with the gods, they rejoice.”

¹⁸⁸ Variants: …devānaṃ sahavyataṃ gatā ramanti te; sahabyataṃ ramanti te
A second reflex of this verse has come down to us in BHS,

\[ \text{tasmād dhi dānāni dadati paṇḍitā vinīya mātsaryamalaṁ sukhaṁśaṁ} \]

\[ \text{te dīrgarātraṁ tridaśe pratiśhitā devānāṁ svabhāvagatā ramanti (e)} \]

which is basically identical in meaning except for the phrase \text{svabhāvagatā} vs. the P \text{sahavyagatā}. The latter means “gone to friendship…” (<S \text{sāhāya}); the former, “gone to the nature/condition of the gods” (<S \text{svabhāva}). Of course these mean different things. The BHS versions actually states that the \text{paṇḍitā} become gods, which is a common trope in the \text{Nikāyas}, e.g. being reborn in the realm of the Thirty Three;\textsuperscript{190} the P simply says that the \text{paṇḍitā} become friends of the gods. Which is correct? We may deduce that the original word transmitted was the Pkt version of \text{svabhāva} which would be \text{*sahāva} (with change of initial double consonant \text{sv-} > \text{s-} and aspirated stop -\text{bh-} > -\text{h-}); the form may also have been \text{*sahāa} or \text{*sahāya} with change of intervocalic -\text{v-} > \text{Ø} or to the loosely articulated glide > -\text{y-}.\textsuperscript{191} Taking the most parsimonious explanation of \text{*sahāva}, since this word was very close to the P word \text{sahavya}

\textsuperscript{189} Waldschmidt, \textit{Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra} (MPS), 190, §12.8

\textsuperscript{190} For example, see DN 2, 208\textsuperscript{6-8} from the \textit{Janavasabhasutta}: ye te, bhante devā bhagavatī brahmacariyāṃ caritvā adhunuppannā Tāvatiṃsakāyaṃ, te añña deve atirocanti vaṇṇena ceva yasasā ca. “And those devas who, having lived the holy life under the Lord, had recently appeared in the Heaven of the Thirty-Three, outshone the other devas in brightness and glory.” (Walshe, \textit{Long Discourses}, 294).

\textsuperscript{191} In P and the Pkts most initial conjuncts simplify to a single consonant (e.g. S \text{svayam} > sayam “self”). The aspirated stops, as early as Aśoka’s time, change to aspirates only (e.g. PE 6 C S \text{vidadhāmi} > \text{vidahāmi} “I establish” and Pischel §188). Intervocalic consonants drop out (as in Gāndhāri examples above; or in Aśoka RE 4C, S \text{stavira} > \text{Gir thaira, P thera}); or change to a weakly articulated -\text{y-} (Pischel §187) or -\text{v-} (as in Aśoka PE 7 EE, S \text{scitā} > \text{socave, “purity”}) Interchange of -\text{y-} and -\text{v-} is also quite common (Pischel §254, Geiger §46).
(where the long \(-\ddot{a}\)-would have been seen as compensation for the lost \(-vy-\) conjunct which automatically made the preceding \(-a-\) long), and the sense fit the context, the P redactor interpreted the word as *sahavya, while the BHS redactor chose *svabhāva.\(^{192}\) Both interpretations were possible, but the latter is more likely. Be that as it may, the point of this exercise is to show that the comparative method points to an earlier, underlying form \(*sahāva, *sahāa or *sahāya\) which must have been present to account for the two derived forms. The only other explanation (ruling out random chance because of the close phonological correspondence) - the deliberate alteration of a received tradition - seems unlikely given the sarīgha's concern with the purity of the buddhavacana transmission, discussed in detail above.

The Comparative Method

The comparative method of linguistic reconstruction has been outlined by Campbell in chapter 5 of his *Historical Linguistics* monograph.\(^{193}\) This method consists of detailed comparison of parallel, phonologically related reflexes (potential cognates) in order to reconstruct the underlying protoform, based on the normal historical linguistic principles of directionality of language change, features held in common, majority rules and economy, while, when necessary, rationalizing overlapping sets. However there are several problems with the comparative method itself and with the nature of the data that we are working with.

\(^{192}\) Typically \(-vy-\) within a word > \(-vv-\) (Pischel §286), but in the beginning of a word or at word boundary, \(-vy-\) > \(-v-\) as in S *udayavyaya* > P *udayavaya*. Geiger §54.6.

The comparative method has four basic assumptions: 1) that the proto-language is uniform with no dialect or social variation, 2) that language splits are sudden, 3) that after the split-up of the proto language there is no subsequent contact among the related languages and 4) that sound change is regular.\textsuperscript{194} None but the last assumption (ignoring for the moment the issues of language diffusion and borrowing) can be wholly confirmed, but the usefulness of the method in linguistic reconstruction has been validated time and time again. Although the method has shortcomings - an idealized, simplified method which like many scientific models cannot account for all the possible variables - it nevertheless has been an extremely powerful tool in reconstructing the broad outlines of the world’s various language groups.

\textbf{Limitations}

Because the first assumption of the comparative method is that the proto-language was uniform, the method has no mechanism built into it which would allow it to address variation directly. This presents a problem with respect to the change of Old Indic to Middle Indic as most of the changes in MI are already present in OI. “The existence of dialects contemporary with at least later Vedic texts, that exhibited phonological features known from Middle Indo-Aryan dialects may be regarded as an uncontestable fact.”\textsuperscript{195} Thus there can be no simple

\textsuperscript{194} Ibid, P 164-66.

\textsuperscript{195} Norman, “Dialect Forms,” 373; also \textit{Collected Papers} 4, 30. See also Bloomfield & Edgerton, \textit{Vedic Variants}, 20: “The large mass of variants of this kind, clearly pointing to extensive influence of Middle-Indic phonetics in the earliest periods of the language, seems to us one of the most important results of this volume of the VEDIC VARIANTS.” Also T. Y. Elizarenkova, “About Traces of a Prakrit Dialectal Basis in the Language of the Rigveda,” in Collette. Caillat, ed., \textit{Dialectes dans les Littératures Indo-Aryennes} (Paris, 1989), 16: “… that the state of things in the RV makes one admit in its language the
diachronic OI > MI reconstruction and dialect differences and the complexities of OI >> MI mixing must be accounted for. As early as 1896 Wackernagel discussed this issue in detail in his *Altindische Grammatik*. Many of the Middle Indic changes were already present in Vedic Old Indic, for example:

1) the replacement of a dental by a cerebral when preceded by an \(-r-\) or \(-l-\) sound, e.g.

\(vika\tilde{a}\) “disgusting" (RV and P) from \(*vikrta\).\(^{196}\)

2) the loss of vocalic \(r\) in the word \(\text{s\i}thira\), “loose" (P \(sithila\), AMg \(s\i\)dhila) which occurs in the RV beside the “correct” form \(a\tilde{s}\)rthita “not loose.”\(^{197}\)

existence not only of separate lexical borrowings, possessing a MIA phonetic aspect, but that of Prakritic tendencies, which can be traced on all linguistic levels: phonetic/phonological, morphological and syntactic. That gives grounds for supposing that there might be two kinds of language in the period when the hymns were composed: a hieratic language of the religion of an OIA linguistic type, which is known as Vedic proper, and another one, a colloquial speech, used by the \(R\)ś\(i\)s in their everyday life and belonging to the MIA type (or being strongly marked by MIA tendencies)...” See also Wackernagel, *Altindische*, xvii- xviii: “Zwar in priesterlichen Kreisen wurde wohl eine Sprache gesprochen, die mit der Hymnensprache im Lautbestand völlig übereinstimmte und in Formen und Konstruktionen nur in soweit von ihr abwich, als die poetische Phrase und das Archaische, wofür jüngere Ausdrucksmittel zu Gebote standen, gemieden wurde. Daneben aber war (wenigstens in bestimmten Volksschichten) schon zu der Zeit, da die uns erhaltenen Hymnen entstanden, eine Sprache gebräuchlich, die über jene priesterliche Sprache weit hinaus entwickelt war und die Haupteigenheiten der ältesten Phase des Mittelindischen, der sogen. Pālistufe, an sich trug;” “To be sure in priestly circles a speech was probably used that fully agreed with the phonology of the language of the hymns and differed in form and construction only so far as the poetic phrase and the archaic, for which a younger expression was the rule, was avoided. Besides it was already the time (at least in the designated social classes), when the extant hymns arose, that a language was used which developed far beyond that priestly language and contained within itself the oldest phase of Middle Indic, the so-called Pāli.”

3) the replacement of -ḷ with -u- in the Vedic word *kḷp > kup.* 198

4) the replacement of *kṣ- with *ch-, Vedic *kṣura “razor,” later S *churikā “knife,” P *churikā, idem.* 199

5) loss of intervocalic stops, Vedic *pra-uga, “forepart of the shaft of a chariot” < *pra-yuga, modirā “spirituous liquor” (from Vedic *madira, “intoxicating”) < *madireya with reflexes *maireya (-d- > Ø) in Epic S, *meraya in P, *meraga in AMg (see page 55 above). 201 There are also lots of examples of intervocalic consonant lenition OI > MI as Vedic *nija, “innate” > P *niya, AMg *niya, Māhārāṣṭrī (Mr) *ni; and Vedic *śuka, “parrot” > P *suva. There are also many examples attested in the Aśokan edicts, mainly from the northwest, e.g. *rāja > rāya (RE 1 D Sh); *mama > maa (RE 5 E, N, Sh M); *priya > pria (RE 1 F, RE 13 A Sh); *kamboja > kamboya (RE 5 J Sh); but also from the east, north and west. 203

6) Use of MI -j- for -dy- in Vedic *dyut “spendour,” Vedic *jyotis “brightness” and P *joti “light, splendour, radiance.” 204

---

199 Wackernagel, §135b
200 Ibid, §371b.
201 See von Hinüber, *Das ältere Mittelindisch*, §170.
203 See Levman, ”Aśokan Phonology,” 67-68; chapter 5 below, page 149. The Pillar Edicts. for example, show very little variation and are written in the eastern dialect, the administrative language of the court (Kanzleiexistence), in Pātāliputra, which Lüders called Old-Ardhamāgadhī (*Beobachtungen*, 7). See also von Hinüber, *Ältere Mittelindisch*, §17.
204 Ibid, §149a,
7) Use of / for r which would be not so much an eastern dialect form as a younger
development of r - derived from the old Indogermanic / - already present in the RV. Like
\(\text{\=l}ab\), \(\text{\=r}ab\), “take hold of, grasp” (P labhat); laghu, raghu, “light, swift” (P lahu); śliś,
śriś, “connect, attach” (P, silitha, “connected”); miśra, miśla (P missa, “mixed”), etc. 205

8) Preservation of gen. sing. in -e < -as rather than -o in the Vedic phrase sūre duhitā
“daughter of the sun.” 206

9) Interchange of voiced and voiceless consonants. This is a common problem within OI 207
and between OI and MI and directionality has not been proven. Lüders saw these as
“Hyperpālismen,” i.e. false Pāli-izations (Pālisierungen); he believed that the eastern
language of the Ur-kanon voiced intervocalic consonants, so when it was translated into
a western (P) dialect, the redactor systematically devoiced these consonants, even
when this resulted in a incorrect form. 208 Mehendale argued that a simpler explanation
for these forms was that the eastern language devoiced intervocalics and they were
taken over in this form into the western language. 209 However, there is no consistency
to the changes and we will look at other possible explanations below in chapter 10. To

---

205 See Lüders, Beobachtungen, §30 where he argues that with the meaning “sacrifice” \(\text{\=a} + \text{\=r}ab\) (in P and Gir) preserves the older form of the word than the RV \(\text{\=a} + \text{l}ab\). Note that except for this instance (and missa, where the liquid is assimilated), P always preserves the \(l\) (younger) form. For other examples see Wackernagel, Grammatik §192.

206 Wackernagel, Grammatik 285b\^\^β. "The sound lengthening before consonants alternated initially
between \(e\) and \(o\) perhaps according to the neighbouring sound. Then -o prevailed. -e was retained only
in the fossilized Vedic sūre duhitā from sūras d- “daughter of the sun.” But it emerges in Middle Indic
again, esp. in Māgadhī, certainly a strong inheritance from the oldest OI.” (trans. author).

207 See Bloomfield & Edgerton, Vedic Variants, 26f, for interchange of surd and sonant mutes.

208 Lüders, Beobachtungen, §122f.

209 M.A. Mehendale, Some Aspects of Indo-Aryan Linguistics (Bombay: University of Bombay, 1968),
Page 56f.
take one example illustrative of the problem. S “praroga (Vedic roga, “disease”) appears in P as paloka with -g- > -k- (devoicing) and (paradoxically for a dialect which is supposed to be “western”) a change from western -r- > eastern -l-, while a similarly articulated intervocalic velar, like Vedic mūka, “dumb” is voiced in P > mūga, i.e. -k- > -g-. Another example is the confusion over the treatment of Vedic utpāta, “unusual natural phenomenon,” which is sometimes converted to P uppāda and sometimes uppāta.210

10) Loss of aspirated stops was present from Vedic times (supra, 36), especially with the consonant -bh-, but also with others. It is also present in the Aśokan edicts.211

11) Change of conjunct consonants to geminates. This is a hallmark of the OI > MI evolution, but is also present in the Vedic writings and shows that the confusion over the original derivation of such forms as bodhi-satta (whether the second word in the compound is derived from sattva, sakta, śakta, etc.) was longstanding. The Vedic form prasatto, “satisfied, pleased” for example has two variant forms: prasakto (<pra + ṣaṁj, “attached, devoted”) and prasapto, (< ?).212

Equally significant are the cases where an old sound is quite otherwise represented in Middle Indic than in Vedic and sounds which are lost to Vedic and appear to derive from Indogermanic forms (that is IE), earlier than Old Indic.213

210 See Lüders, Beobachtungen, §96. To add to the confusion, there of course is a Vedic (utpāda) and P (uppāda) word < ut + ṣpad which means “coming forth.” The AMg reflex for both words is uppāya, where the meaning must be established from the context.


212 Ibid, §139. Another example is the Vedic form khilye (var. khille, “uncultivated land”); see §38.

213 See von Hinüber, Das ältere Mittelindisch, §11.
1) P *jagghati*, “he laughs,” Vedic *jakṣat*, “laughing” or P *jhāyati* “it burns,” Vedic *vksai*, *kṣayati* where P preserves the aspiration and voicedness of the Indo-Iranian *gzh*.214

2) Pkt *tūha* (P, AMg *tittha*), “ford” is derived from Indo-Iranian *ṛ*, which is represented by *ṛ* in Vedic, *tīrtha*.215

3) P *u* instead of Vedic *a*, under the influence of a preceding nasal sonant or replacing one, as P *sammuti*, S *sammati* “common opinion”; P *brahmunā*, Vedic *brahmanā* “by Brahma”; P *evu*, Vedic *evam* “thus”;216 P *rājūnām*, Vedic *rājñām*, “of kings.”217

4) P *posa* “man” from Vedic *pūrṣa* without the usually inserted *-u* (purṣa).218

5) P *iṅjati*, vs. Vedic *iṅgati*, “to move, agitate” where the Vedic guttural is replaced by a corresponding palatal.219 P also preserves the Vedic form *iṅgati* and Vedic also has a form *abhy-r̥ñjati* “hasten towards” which may be related to the P. In the *Lalitavistarasūtra* there is the form *iṅjanā* “movement” which is presumably derived from MI. P, S and AMg (*iṃgiya*) - all preserve the noun *iṅgita*, “gesture.”

6) P preserves the word *idha*, “here” which seems to be older than the Vedic *iha* since it preserves the aspirated stop which typically changes to aspirate only over time. The

---

215 Ibid, xix.
216 P *evumāṃ = evaṃimaṃ* in *Padarūpasiddhi*, 33, giving various elisions: *mano aṅñaṃ manunṇaṃ, evaṃ imaṃ evumāṃ, paralopo, iti evaṃ ivaṃ evaṃ, ukārassa vakāro*. Per the DPPN, the *Padarūpasiddhi* is a grammar by Buddhappiya (or Dīpankara) Thera, based on Kaccāyana’s grammar.
217 Ibid, §19, footnote.
218 Ibid, §51; Geiger, §30.3.
219 Wackernagel, *Grammatik*, §121.
Aśokan edicts also preserve various related forms: RE 13 AA *hida* (K Sh), *ia* (M); RE 9 M *hida* (K M), *ia* (Sh).

7) Pkt preserves the trace of a sibilant before a consonant in the word *pa-mhusai* *pa-mhasai* (P *pa-mussati* “he forgets,” AMg *pa-muṣṭha*, “forgotten,” past part. with *mh < sm*) while it is not present in Vedic: *pra víṃś, pramamarṣa*, “he forgot.”

8) There are several Vedic words which preserve both the OI and MI form, i.e. with aspirated stops and aspirates only (and sometimes aspirates with an epenthetic vowel) e.g. *dabhra, dahra, dahara*, “small” (P *dahara*); *sadha, saha* “together with” (P *saha*); *vṛghṛbhāti* and *vṛghṛna* “to grasp” (P *gaṇhāti/gaṇhati*); *vṛudh rohati*, *vṛuh, rohati*, “grow” (P *rohati*). P uses the dialect form, which is not necessarily younger than the OI from and may well be contemporaneous; sometimes it even preserves the apparently older form with aspirated stop, e.g. *sabbadhi*, “everywhere” while OI has the younger form with aspirate only: *uttarāhi*, “northerly” or *dakṣiṇāhi*, “in the south.”

9) P preserves an apparently older form of the 1st pers. pl. middle imperative/subjunctive in *-mase* and *-mhase* compared to Vedic *-mahai* or *-mahe*. Since directionality of change is *s > h*, P appears to have preserved the older Vedic form *-*masai.

Middle Indic has a number of lost OI roots and stems that are only found in MI (although listed in the *Dhātupātha* and not fully foreign to the Hochsprache or “standard language”). They appear to derive from forms older than OI:

---

220 Ibid, xx.

221 Ibid, xx and §219a. Wackernagel derives the *-adhi* ending from the Gk. suffix *-oθi*, cf. *ποθί*, "anywhere, somewhere."

222 Ibid, xx. For directionality of change see Campbell, *Historical Linguistics*, 129.
10) Aśoka's meñati, "he thinks" RE 13 W (maṃnaṃti, K; meñati, Sh; maṇati, M), is closer to Gothic meinjan German meinen (< IE *men-, "to think"), than to RV forms with man-:

manvate (3rd pl.) or mamnāte, (3rd dual). 223

11) Pkt se (AMg “his”) related to Avestan he šē, Old Persian šaï. 224

12) P sāmaṇ, "self" is related to Avestan hāmo, "the same" and old Slovenian samū, "the same." 225

13) tārisa, “such a one” belongs with Gk. τηλικος, not Old Indic. 226

14) P nahāru/nhāru, “sinew” is closer to Avestan snāvar, than to snāyu of the Brāhmaṇas.

Although a number of OI forms were lost in MI (the dual, different infinitive and absolutive forms, the perfect, various verbal and nominal inflected forms, etc.), 227 there were also a number of forms which MI preserved that were lost in the standard speech (Hochsprache).

1) The -ā of the instrumental sing. and the -ā of the neuter nom. plural which are present in Vedic and P but lost to S. An example of the former is the frequent expression sahatṭā, "with one’s own hand"; the latter form is “not rare in the first two periods of the

223 Ibid, xx. Hultzsch, Inscriptions, lxxxiv wonders whether the change of -a- > -e- in meñati is caused by the palatal /r/, but if we follow Wackernagel, the reason is because of a different derivation, i.e. a source from which Ger. meinen also derived.

224 Ibid, xx-xxi. the form se also occurs in P as a form of the nom. acc. neut. tam - from Māgadhī, per Geiger §105, note 2.

225 Wackernagel, Grammatik, xxi

226 Ibid, xxi. See discussion in below, item 10, chapter 7, page 231.

227 See Wackernagel, Grammatik, xxivf. for a list.
language," e.g. sotā, “ears” in Sn 345, corresponding to the Vedic neut. pl. forms in -ā, e.g. yugā, “yokes.”

2) The nom. plural of masc. -a stems in -āsas and -āse. The Vedic form -āsas is reflected in the P form -āse with the -e instead of -o suggesting the influence of the eastern dialects. It is quite common in P especially in the older gāthās (e.g. upāsakāse, “lay devotees” in Sn 376).

3) The genitive plural of go, gonām, “cows,” preserved in P as gonaṃ and replaced by gavāṃ in S.

4) The preservation of endings with r in the third person plural verb forms. There are a number of Vedic forms which preserve endings in -r- in the indicative, imperative, aorist and imperfect which are lost in standard Skt (except for the “normal” -ur and -re endings of the perfect and -ran ending of the middle opt.). Some of these are preserved in P, e.g. the 3rd pers. pl. imper. middle in -ruṃ mirroring the -rām form of Vedic; or the third pers. plural aor. in -re or -ruṃ, to give two examples.

5) The 1st and 2nd pers. plural pronouns asme and yuṣme (from base asma and yuṣma) are not preserved in Vedic but we do find them in P and the Aśokan edicts, e.g. asme > *aspe > aphe in Sep. Ed. 2, I, L (J Dh) and yuṣme > *tuṣme > *tuspe > tuphe. The form

228 Geiger, Grammar, §78, note 1 and 6.
230 Ibid, §88, note 3. gonaṃ occurs in Dipavaṃsa I 76.
232 Geiger, Grammar, §126, §159.
asme is also preserved in Māgadhī and tumhe (= tusme) in Mg, AMg and Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī.233

6) The OI forms tāt, “in this way” and yāt, “since” disappear in S and are replaced by tasmāt, yasmāt; however the forms tā and yā are retained in the Pkts as old ablative forms with the same meaning.234

7) Some subjunctive forms are preserved in P and the Pkts in the gāthā language; in Vedic the infinitive forms in -tave, -tāye and -tuye (alongside -tum) are also preserved along with the instrumental plural forms in -ehiḥ < Vedic -ebhiḥ for masc. -a stems, which are not part of classical S235

From all the above it is clear that the relationship between OI and MI is far more complex than a simple diachronic variation of “old” > “middle” as the linguistic labels suggest. In fact, the linguistic fabric was quite complicated, with many MI changes being dialect forms already present in OI, some MI forms being derived from forms which pre-dated OI and other MI forms preserving archaic OI forms which were later lost to standard S. This problematizes a simple OI > MI derivational model as is usually assumed by the comparative method. The data also demonstrate that the language “split” between OI and MI was not sudden and that a continuous intermixing of forms was taking place between a formalized and ritualistic priestly language and the different vernaculars of the people in the native dialects (Wackernagel’s untern Sprachschichten, “lower speech layers”) - including non-Indo-Aryan forms, often preserved in

233 Pischel, Grammar, §419, §420.
234 Wackernagel, Grammatik, xxvi; Pischel §425.
235 Geiger, Grammar §123, §204.1, §78 note 4.
the names and places of the RV and Buddhist writings - a tension which was in part mediated by the influence of a regularizing grammar which became increasingly important under Pāṇini and his successors.236

As the MI dialect fabric continued to change diachronically and became more diverse, the need for a koine or lingua franca arose, presumably at the point where diversification led to issues of mutual intelligibility. Koine formation is more of a synchronic process, whereby language users come into face-to-face contact and attempt to accommodate to each other's language peculiarities so that a common form of speech might develop (< Greek κοινή, "common") which could be used in trade, administration, etc., When this koine arose is impossible to know, but we may assume that its need was felt when the MI dialect differences became marked enough that comprehension difficulties had arisen; socio-linguistic factors - adopting one's speech form to a socially dominant dialect - probably also played a role, as did the existence of other non IA language users (Munda, Dravidian, etc) whose phonemic and phonotactical constraints would have had some influence on the form of the interlanguage. We know virtually nothing about this chronology; the evidence shows, however, that such a common language was already in existence at the time of the Buddha and his teachings were either translated into such a

236 Wackernagel, Grammatik, xxiii. Thomas Oberlies, “Aśokan Prakrit and Pāli,” in George Cardona and Dhanesh Jain, eds., The Indo-Aryan Languages (London and New York, 2003), 164, asserts that MI languages “descend from dialects which, despite many similarities, were different from Rgvedic and in some regards even more archaic.” Richard Pischel (§6) says that “all the Prakrit languages have a series of common grammatical and lexical characteristics with the Vedic language…” von Hinüber (Das ältere Mittelindisch §12), after reviewing the evidence, concludes that “Das Mittelindisch ist also im wesentlichen aus dem Vedishen entstanden.” (“MI has, therefore, essentially arisen from Vedic”). The actual answer appears to lie in the middle, as the data above shows.
medium, or presented in such a medium right from the beginning. We are left then with a very complex tableau of diachronic forces tending towards divergence and synchronic, contact processes tending towards dialect levelling and simplification, the whole a constantly intermixing, constantly changing linguistic continuum which we can only imperfectly grasp.

Despite the limitations of the comparative method, it nevertheless has great usefulness in Buddhist philology for establishing earlier forms, because of the availability of numerous correspondence sets which can be demonstrated to be genetically related through standard linguistic techniques, i.e. because of the regularity of sound change, the first and most important of the Neo-grammian principles. This is not to deny that borrowing and linguistic diffusion do not complicate the linguistic canvas (which will be dealt with in chapter 11); however in many cases the various witnesses that have survived have a cognate relationship, sharing features that are unlikely to have arisen by chance, by nature or by borrowing; and, -

237 See Robert L. Rankin, "The Comparative Method," in Brian Joseph, Janda, Richard, eds., The Handbook of Historical Linguistics (Malden MA, 2005), 185. In discussing "Why Does the Method Work?" Rankin says, "Copious amounts of ink have been spilled in discussions of the extent to which the Neogrammarian 'hypothesis' is really 'true.' But, as most Indo-Europeanists have always known, the exceptionlessness of sound changes was not so much a hypothesis for Neogrammarians as it was a definition. Those changes that were sweeping and observed after several centuries to be essentially exceptionless qualified for the term Lautgesetz (sound law), while changes that seemed to affect only particular words or groups of words did not so qualify."

If two or more language share a feature which is unlikely to have arisen independently in each of them by nature, or arisen independently in each of them by chance, or diffused amongst or been borrowed between them
as has been demonstrated with the example of *svabhāva/sahavya* at the beginning of this chapter, - by comparing these witnesses one can infer with some degree of certainty the form of the original transmission.

With regard to the change of OI > MI, a narrow time depth is another important factor in the method’s workability. Harrison calls this “the most basic lesson in comparative linguistics,”239 the direct relationship between elapsed time and kinship proof. With the Indic languages under consideration we are dealing with a fairly narrow time window, from the finalizing of the Vedic writings in the late second millenium240 to the writing down of P in the late first millenium BCE241 and the flowering of BHS in the early first millenium A.D.,242 a time span of only 1500-2000 years. Although our oldest manuscripts date only from this latter period (GDhp), because of the abundance of surviving witnesses and their numerous correspondences we have some degree of confidence as to the essential integrity of the data. Long periods of elapsed time destroy the linguistic data and thus severely compromise the workability of the comparative method: one cannot work without good data; and although language contact and borrowing are a normal occurrence, most instances can be recognized as such and factored out.243 Luckily, although

---

242 Edgerton, BHSD, vol. 1, page xxv & 5. Edgerton dates the Mvu as the earliest BHS work from the 1st or 2nd century B.C.; the other works are later, most dating from the early centuries of the CE
much data has been lost, or languishes in various monastery ruins of Afghanistan, Pakistan or north-west China waiting to be discovered, we have a relatively rich data set to work with.

In the available data there are basically two types of linguistic forms: Middle Indic dialect forms (like G) and partially Sanskritized (as in P or the language of the PDhp) or fully Sanskritized MI forms (like the language of the *Udānavarga*). As we have seen above (page 65), Edgerton dates works according to their degree of Sanskritization in inverse proportion to age: the less the Sanskritization, the older the work. With the exception of G and P, most of our sources show a significant degree of Sanskritization; the latter, although partially Sanskritized, are still clearly Middle Indic dialects. Our correspondence sets are also of three types: where the forms are all P based, with variant readings from the different Thai, Burmese, Śrī Lanka or Cambodian recensions (like the forms *abhivaṭṭhaṃ/abhivutthaṃ/abhivaddhaṃ* from Dhp 335 discussed above on page 42); where the homologous forms are drawn from different dialects, i.e. G, P, Patna BHS, and UV BHS, sometimes supplemented with different corresponding Aśokan forms from the western (Gir), northern (K), northwestern (G) and eastern (Dh J) dialect areas; and lastly where a P and possibly other MI form is correlatable with a Tib and/or Ch translation. Most of our sets are of the latter two types where significant amount of Sanskritization has taken place in the MI versions, and, with the possible exception of G, these do not necessarily represent natural forms, but forms that have been tampered with, probably originally at the time when the oral transmission came to be written down. We know that all the witnesses that have come down to us are translations of an earlier underlying transmission (page 26 to 31), free of the most conspicuous differences between dialects, allowing each recipient to easily adjust the phonology into his/her native tongue. In this dialect the palatal, retroflex and dental sibilants would all be represented by a single dental *s*, allowing the hearer
to substitute the “correct” sound for his/her dialect; aspirated stops would have aspirates only, and intervocalic stops would be omitted or weakened to a -ṛ- or -ṝ- sound, in both cases allowing for the back-addition of the correct dialect stop;\textsuperscript{244} conjuncts at the beginning and middle of the word would be assimilated which was a regular feature of most of the dialects (except G in some cases); liquid consonants /l/ and /r/ would be interchangeable according to the eastern or western provenance of the dialect speaker and/or interlocutor; the glides /ṛ/ and /ṝ/ and /ḷ/ and /ḻ/ would also show a fair amount of interchangeability according to dialect usage,\textsuperscript{245} as would /ḍ/ and /ṇ/ and the nasal sonant /m/ and /ṁ/\textsuperscript{246} These dialect simplifications would result in a very malleable speech-form, where many of the dialect differences had been homogenized and/or removed, allowing the hearer to make what substitutions and additions he/she required for understanding. Geiger termed this language, “surely no pure dialect of the people, but a language of the higher and cultured classes (\textit{Hoch und Gebildetensprache}) which had been brought into being already in pre-Buddhistic times through the needs of inter-communication produced by social interaction (the \textit{Verkehr in Verkehrssprache}) in India. Such a \textit{lingua franca} naturally contained elements of all the dialects, but was surely free form the most obtrusive

\textsuperscript{244} For the less common glide -\textit{va}-, see for example, \textit{paccāvamissati} (Burmese, “he will go back to”) for \textit{paccāgamissati} (Thai, Cambodian) at DN 2, 119\textsuperscript{1}. In some cases P has retained or restored the original intervocalic stop, while the later BHS work preserves the glide; this would explain the strange form āvilāyati (“it feels week” in the MPS, Waldschmidt vol. 2, 264, §27.6) as against the P āgilāyati < S ā + ēglai (“feel tired, be exhausted”) at DN 3, 209\textsuperscript{18}, where P has preserved the original -\textit{g}- (with an epenthetic -\textit{i}-) which has changed to -\textit{v}- in BHS. āvilāyati is restored by Waldschmidt from a similar occurrence in MPS §30.5, p. 286.

\textsuperscript{245} Geiger, Grammar, §46.1 and 46.2 (\textit{ṛ} >\textit{ṝ}); Pischel §236 (\textit{ja} > \textit{ya} in Mg.) §252 (\textit{ya} > \textit{ja} in AMg and other Pkt).

\textsuperscript{246} Geiger, §39.6, §46.4; Pischel §251.
dialectical characteristics.” Such a *lingua franca* would have been especially important for communication with Dravidian, Munda and Tibeto-Burman speakers in the area, who presumably at this time, as the autochthonous inhabitants, outnumbered Indo-Aryans; as the former groups learned the new language of the immigrants they undoubtedly would have had trouble with phonemic distinction between voiced and voiceless intervocalic consonants (which do not exist in Dravidian and some Tib dialects, and are neutralized in certain situations in Munda languages), aspirated consonants (which do not exist in Proto Dravidian), the consonant -v- (lacking in Munda and Tib), and other phonetic structures. This will be discussed in more detail below (chapters 10 and 11).

The *lingua franca* then would have been translated into the different dialect forms, according to either locale, or, - in the case of P which combines features of many dialect areas and resists localization (what Geiger calls a *Kunstsprache* or artificial language), - according to the disposition of the learned monks who redacted it. The redaction would not be formalized or solidified until it was committed to writing which appears not to have taken place before the first century BCE, although Mahinda’s Śrī Laṅkān mission suggests that some kind of formal

---

247 Geiger, *Pāli Literatur*, 3-4. “…gewiss kein reiner Volksdialekt, sondern eine darüber stehende Hoch- und Gebildetensprache, wie schon in vorbuddhistischer Zeit die Bedürfnisse des Verkehrs in Indien sie geschaffen hatten. Eine solche *lingua franca* enthielt naturgemäß Elemente aus allen Dialekten, wird sich aber gerade von den auffallendsten mundartlichen Erscheinungen frei gehalten haben.” English translation by Ghosh in Wilhelm Geiger, *Pāli Literature and Language, translated by Batakrishna Ghosh* (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 2004, originally published in 1943), 4-5. The original *lingua franca* was a trade language in the eastern Mediterranean in the late Middle Ages, used for dealings between people who had different mother tongues, per R. L. Trask, *The Dictionary of Historical and Comparative Linguistics*, 196. I have changed Ghosh’s translation of “reiner Volksdialekt” (“no purely popular dialect”) to “pure dialect of the people” as above, which I think represents the German better.

248 Geiger *Pāli Literatur*, 4.
redaction of the canon was done in the mid-3rd century, even if oral rather than written.\textsuperscript{249} At that time, because of the increasing prestige of S and its use as a pan-Indic language,\textsuperscript{250} there was pressure to Sanskritize the transmission. This pressure seems to have been most pronounced in the Sarvāstivādin/Mūlasarvāstivādin tradition, as the works from this tradition that have survived are almost completely Sanskritic (\textit{Udānavarga}, Gilgit manuscripts, etc. but with a uniquely Buddhist vocabulary), but this may simply be an artefact of preservation: most of the writings that have survived are quite late, probably from Gupta times (fourth to sixth centuries CE), and the new, earlier works that have just been discovered in Pakistan show a significant MI influence; for example, the Bajaur Collection, which contains what may be a Sarvāstivādin text from the first or second century CE written in G.\textsuperscript{251} This influence is present in the language of the \textit{Mahāvastu}, the Patna Dhp, P and G (the latter dialect being largely Prakritic in form), which are listed in their relative age relationship (youngest to oldest) according to the criteria of Sanskritization first suggested by Edgerton.\textsuperscript{252} The pressure to Sanskritize was only in part due to the increasing prestige and influence of the burgeoning pan-

\textsuperscript{249} I use the word "canon" in the soft sense of "a collection of scriptures (oral or written), which gives a certain authority to those texts included in it," as per also K. R. Norman, "Buddhism and Canonicity" in \textit{A Philological Approach to Buddhism, The Bukkyo Dendo Kyokai Lectures 1994} (Lancaster: Pali Text Society, 2006), 171-2. The process of canon formation is a long and complex one, as Norman outlines in this article and as Richard Salomon discusses in R. Salomon, An Unwieldy Canon: Observations on Some Distinctive Features of Canon Formation in Buddhism, in M. Deeg, O. Freiberger, and C. Kleine, eds., \textit{Kanonbildung in den asiatischen Religionen und Kanonisierung in der asiatischen Religionsgeschichte} (Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, 2011), 161-208.


\textsuperscript{251} See Ingo Strauch, "The Bajaur Collection," 19-33, for fragments of a putative Sarvāstivādin version of the \textit{Dakkhiṇāvibharigasutta} (MN 142), written in G (Kharoṣṭhī script), and a fragment of a \textit{karmavācanā} and \textit{prātimokṣa} text from the \textit{Vinaya}.

\textsuperscript{252} Edgerton, BHSD, xxv. See footnote 163, this text.
Indic language; it also had the practical purpose of clarifying potential homophones (where one word could mean two or more different things), which, because of the simplification of the language, were now quite abundant. For example, a common S word like dīrgha, was probably transmitted as dīha (which is attested in AMg), with the loss of the conjunct consonant -rgh- and the change of the aspirated stop to an aspirate only. In P the stop has been restored to dīgha (or was transmitted in this way) and it also appears as dīghāvuse, “long life” in the Aśokan edict MRE 1 P and as drīgha with metathesized -r- in GĐhp 19 and 176. Given the phonetic distinctness of the word, there is no possibility of confusion, i.e. there are no such words as *dīkha, *dībha, *dītha, *dīrtha, *dīdha, etc. that it could be. This however is not always the case, as for example in the case of maggajjhāyi ("concentrated on the path") in the Cundasutta, Sn v. 85-b where a variant (Burmese) version has maggakkhāyi ("teacher of the path"), indicating an oral transmission of *maggahāyi, where each redactor back-formed the aspirate to a different aspirated stop; although both are semantically valid, evidence later in the sutta suggests that -kkhāyi is the correct reading. Another example is the word -satta in the common compound bodhisattva. In this case we can be fairly certain of what the lingua franca transmission was (i.e. -satta), but we can not be certain of what the original word actually meant; one tradition Sanskritized it as sattva, “essence, being” (most Mahāyana Indian schools) and another as satvan, “hero” (byang chub sems dpa in the Tib tradition), and the P tradition takes it as derived from the sattva, although several other derivations (<sakta, “devoted to” and

253 Norman, Group of Discourses, 175. See discussion on palīgha/palikhā below (page 283) for another example of aspirate confusion. In Kaccāyana's grammar (Pind, Kaccāyana, 8) the example sa ve muni jātibhayam adassi ("That sage truly saw the fear of birth") echoes Sn 209 sa ve munī jātikhayantadassī ("That sage truly sees the end of birth and death"), where the bhaya/khaya alteration seems to be due to the same phenomenon of earlier transmission through aspirate only.
śakta, “capable of” are also possible); however, we are not necessarily certain of what the redactors of the early canon intended by the term or in fact, whether they allowed for a polysemous, homophonic form. Another simpler example of this kind - where apparently only two meanings are possible - is the Udāna 75\(^5\) passage acchijji vattām (“he destroyed the round,” i.e. saṃsāra < Skt.  vitality “turn round, revolve, live” past participle, vṛttat), compared with Mhv 2, 416\(^6\)-7 corresponding phrase, chinnam vartman (“the path has been destroyed”), where vattām has apparently been interpreted as a simplified version of vartman (“path, road, way, course”); it also occurs as chinnavartm- in the LV (page 253\(^26\)). We will discuss many of these homophones and polyvocalities in subsequent chapters and their ramifications for doctrinal interpretation. Equally problematic is where we have two apparently conflicting forms, with, for example, different intervocalic consonants which can be traced to a common underlying form with intervocalic glide (or with no intervocalic consonant at all), the existence of which may be inferred through the comparative method. For example, in the Sabhiyasutta of the Suttanipāta we find the P word virajo, “free from passion” and in a close parallel version of the Mahāvastu, the word virato, “ceased.” We can, accordingly be fairly certain the original transmission contained the form *virayo, *vrao or *vrayo.\(^{254}\) Generally this (stop > glide, or stop > Ø) is believed to be a feature of the later Pkts, but it is present at least as early as Aśoka (3rd century BCE) and probably goes back to a much earlier time, as evidence can even be found in the Vedic writings, as noted above (page 55) and it is a common characteristic of G. Only this kind of generalized, simplified form can account for situations in which we get three different words in an otherwise identical environment - for example, in the various dialectical recensions

of the story of Brahma and Indra requesting the Buddha to teach the dharma

(Brahmāyācanasutta) that have come down to us, we have three different forms, P

pamuñcantu, “let them put forth [faith],”255 BHS pramodantu, “let them rejoice [in their faith],” and pranudantu, “let them abolish [their doubt]” - with different meanings but phonologically very close except for the intervocalic stops and nasal form.256 One must postulate a transmitted (oral) form of *panuYantu where N = nasal and Y = intervocalic glide or nul. Another example is the P form tādi/tādino which has a corresponding BHS reflex of tāyi/tāyino suggesting a derivation tāyin < tādino < S tāḍṛśa (“of such a kind”)257 or tāyin < S t(r)āyin (“protecting”) which is how the Tibetans took it (skyob pa, “to protect”). It could also come from tāpin (“splendid, majestic, powerful”) - in all these cases an intervocalic stop has dropped out or weakened to a glide, leading to ambiguity in the transmission.258 The AMg reflex of this word is not surprisingly

255 The same form with anusvāra (pramumcantu) occurs in the Mvu 3.3195 with opposite meaning “let them rid themselves [of faith that can harm]”

256 The gāthā containing pamuñcantu occurs in several locations in the P scriptures including SN I, 138 (Brahmāyācanasutta). pranudantu occurs in the Sanghabedhavastusutta; see Raniero Gnoli, The Gilgit Manuscript of the Sarighabhedavastu, being the 17th and last section of the Vinaya of the Mūlasarvāstivādin, Part I (Roma: istituto italiano per il medio ed estremo oriente, 1977),130. The word pramodantu occurs in the Catuspariṣatsūtra see Ernst Waldschmidt, "Das Catuspariṣatsūtra, Teil 2,” Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, (1956),118. For a full discussion of this word see Levman, B. 2012. "Lexical Ambiguities in the Buddhist Teachings, an Example & Methodology." International Journal for the Study of Humanistic Buddhism Issue 2: 35-54.

257 Edgerton, BHSD, s.v. tāyin, says that “the identity of the two [tāyin, tāḍṛś] can hardly be questioned.” Lüders (Beobachtungen §108) makes a similar claim: “Die Identität von tāyin und Pāli tādi scheint mir dadurch bewiesen zu werden.” The change from tāḍṛś > tādin is however not clear. Where did the -in ending come from? Lüders suggests that the nom. tādi = tāḍṛ (<tāḍṛś) was transferred to the -in stem declension, which is possible, but certainly a derivation from trāyin is more parsimonious. The Aśokan reflex of this (tāḍṛś) word (RE 4 C: tārise, tādiso or tādiše) suggest that tāyin is not derived from tāḍṛś.

258 For a complete list of forms, see Lüders, Beobachtungen, §108.
tāi, which form (or tāyi/tāyi; tāyino is found in PDhp 88–d, alongside P tādīno, Dhp 96–d) likely represents the original underlying BMI transmission.

Von Hinüber gives the example of P sadattha (an epithet of an arhat, “highest good”) which has a Saddharmapunḍarīka BHS reflex svakārtha (“own meaning”) and suggests both are understandable in terms of an early eastern form *sayattha. In Dhp 227–f there is a confusion between P anindito (“unblamed”), and GDhp anini’a (“not to be blamed” GDhp 237–f) which may be explained by a protoform *anindiyo where the intervocalic -y- could stand for either itself or a weakened intervocalic stop, -t-, as the P redactor interpreted it. There are lots of examples along this line, and we will explore more of them below where apparently cognate words differ only in a single intervocalic stop, which can be traced to an original form where the stop has disappeared or been replaced by a glide. We can also be fairly certain - again because of confusion in re-translation - that the underlying language substituted -h- for all or most aspirated stops which leads to the confusion discussed above with reference to Dhp 414–b: samsāram moham vs. UV33.41–b samsāraugham (page 36). Another example is the confusion present in Dhp 398–c ukkhitta-paligham, “cross-bar lifted up” and UV 33.58–c utkṣipta-parikhaṃ “moat (obstacles) removed,” pointing to an original transmission *par(i)jha, where each translator acted according to his/her understanding. The Gāndhāri version of this

---


260 Norman, “Dialect Forms,” 36. Brough, GDhp, also interprets this form as anindita (§66), probably because of the occurrence of ninido (<S nindita) in GDhp 240.

261 Edgerton, BHSD, s.v. parikha.
gāthā has uksitaphali’a (GDhp 42-c) where the alif (represented by an apostrophe) is simply a syllable divider pointing to a form parigha or parikhā.\(^{262}\) An alternate explanation is that this represents a confusion over voicing of the aspirate stop; this and other examples will be discussed in more detail below in chapters 7, 8 and 9.

It is a commonplace that one can derive an MI word from OI, but one can not do the opposite.\(^{263}\) OI lexemes are much more differentiated than MI, which almost always evolve in the direction of simplification - i.e. loss or weakening of intervocalics, assimilation of conjuncts, change of aspirated stops to a plain aspirate, assimilation of sibilants, etc. The result is that many of the MI forms are homophonous - they can mean several different things when “back-translated” into OI. This does not present any problem in any oral tradition for two reasons: one can go by context, and interpret the meaning of the word according to what fits, and if one is still puzzled, one can simply ask the interlocutor what he/she meant. It is not necessarily a problem when an oral tradition is committed into writing either, if the Pkt is preserved as is, with its polyvalencies of meaning intact. Again, the reader would decide which meanings suit based on context and if more than one meaning was possible, he/she would choose one or the other or take it as a paranomasia, as seemed appropriate; indeed, the latter may be what the author meant, since we must assume he/she, as a native speaker, was well aware of the ambiguities in the language. The problem arises when the Pkt is committed to writing, it is not thoroughly understood and an attempt is made to re-Sanskritize, i.e. to translate or back-translate the Pkt

\(^{262}\) Brough, GDhp, §39. On page 188, he suggests the form is parigha, pointing to ‘eine falsche Pälsierung’ (quoting Lüders, Beobachtungen §130) in the Pali word palikha (= paligha, “cross-bar”) which appears in Jātaka 6, 276\(^{3}\). See below, item #21 in chapter 8.

\(^{263}\) For example, see Walshe, Long Discourses, 17-18.
into S in order to “clarify” the meaning. Then decisions are made and meanings assigned which were not necessarily intended by the original speaker. We know, for example that *satta* with geminate stop is an authentic Pkt word; what we don’t know is which Vedic word(s) with conjunct stop it was derived from, and whether it had only one or more sources. Similarly, when we see two corresponding words in identical context like *virajo* and *virato*, we know that a word like *vira jó*, *vira jó* or *vira o* must have existed to account for the pair; they are after all, authentic Pkt, evolved according to the uniform rules of regular sound change. But we don’t know whether the speaker, with the word *vira jó*, etc. was referring to *virato*, *virajo*, or any other possible word, like *virago*, *virado*, etc. Of course, context should make this clear, but what happens if two or more meanings are both suitable in the context?

We usually encounter two kinds of situations in the parallel Buddhist writings that have come down to us. Often, a Prakrit word is preserved (like *satta*) along with one or more (partial or complete) Sanskritizations of it. Although often the interpreted Sanskritized meaning is the only one possible, this is not always the case, as we have noted. In other cases we have two or more translations (either into Pkt, Prakritized S or S) from an underlying Pkt preserved, which can tell us definitively what this base form must have been, but not necessarily its meaning. An example of this type is the the word *vira jó* or *sahāva*, *sahāa* *sahāya* discussed on page 81, leading to two different meanings > *svabhāva* and *sahavya*; again we cannot be sure what the speaker meant, as both words fit the context.

It is a well-known fact that in the earliest Buddhist tradition as handed down in the *suttas*, the Buddha is shown to not put a lot of stock in words, which he felt were arbitrary; being stuck to fixed meanings led to suffering, like the popular understanding of the word *atta* or “self” as a
fixed, permanent, unchanging individuality. Therefore he advocated flexibility with language, not being fixated in meanings, realizing they were arbitrary, learning them but transcending them. This became a feature of his teaching style, with long repetitive lists of adjectives “dancing” around the meaning of a concept with several nouns and adjectives in an attempt to examine it from all sides. Nevertheless, the tradition was well aware that it was very important to understand words, otherwise how could anyone learn the teachings of the Path? In the Addhāsutta of the Itivuttaka, the Buddha is quoted as saying: “Beings perceive what can be expressed, they take their stand on what can be expressed; not understanding what can be expressed, they come under the bondage of death.” What do beings perceive that can be expressed (akkheya) and which they do not understand (apariññāya)? It is the five khandhas and the notions of “I,” “mine,” “god,” “man,” “woman,” “person,” etc.

The word attā is the quintessential misunderstood word; the whole philosophy of Buddhism is based on clearing up this misunderstanding. Yet we have lots of other key words in the canon which, if not misunderstood (and sometimes they are), are at least ambiguous and whose

---

264 See footnote 6, for an example.

265 Itivuttaka, 534-542: Akkheyyasaññīno sattā, akkheyyasmiṃ patiṭṭhitā; Akkheyyaṃ apariññāya, yogam-āyanti maccuno.

266 It-a (Paramatthadīpanī), 2, 32-8: evam vuttena Nirutta-patha-suttaṃ pi ettho attho dipetabbo. Evam kathāvatthubhāvena akkheyya-saṁkhāte khandhapañcakake ahan-ti ca maman-ti ca devo-ti ca manusso-ti ca itthī-ti ca puriso-ti cādinā pavatta-saññā-vasena akkheyya-saññīno. Pañcasu upādānakkhandhesu satta-puggalādi-saññīno-ti attho. Although thus spoken in the Nirutta-pathasutta [the author has just quoted SN 3, 719-23, where the Buddha explains the three “Pathways of language,” past, present and future and how they are not to be mixed], here the meaning is to be clarified. Thus, with the subject being discussed, because of their perception of the circle of existence, they are aware of what can be expressed (akkheyasaññīno), the five aggregates, the so-called expressibles - “I,” “mine,” “god,” “human being,” “woman,” “man,” etc. - the meaning is "Awareness of beings, people, etc, with reference to the five clinging aggregates."
semantic range have been narrowed by Sanskritic superimposition: from common words like P bodhisatta (Sanskritized as bodhisattva, but also subsuming several other possible meanings as discussed above); to P sammāpadhāna (usu. trans. “right effort,” Sanskritized from a proto-transmission *sammapahāṇa, and interpreted by some traditions as derived from pra + dhā and in others (like the Tib and BHS) as from pa+hā or pra + hi, meaning “to abandon” i.e. right abandoning” or both;267 to forms like P nekkhama, gerund meaning “having left home,” Sanskritized as naiṣkramya, “departure from the world” in the UV, but also capable of derivation from naiṣkāmya, “without desire” or naiṣkarmya, “without action, tranquil” (see discussion below item #19, chapter 8); or appamatta which is usually taken to mean “diligent” from S apramāda, but can also mean alpa-mātra “little measure” or even appa-mātra, “merely an ego,” based on Ardhamāgadhī form appa < Stk. ātman (item #29, chapter 8). 268 P āsavāni (“outflows”) corresponding to Mvu āsayāni (“intentions”), where the original transmission was probably āsayāni which contained both meanings (item #36, chapter 8);269 P dīpa (P, “light”) correspdoning to BHS dvīpa ( “island,” “continent”) in the phrase attadīpā viharattha (DN 2, 100) which could either mean “Be a light unto yourself” or “Be an island unto your self” or both (item #36, chapter 8). These ambiguities - where the source transmission can be determined, but the Sanskritization is questionable, needlessly limiting, or both - will be fully explicated in Chapter 6-9.

267 R. M. L. Gethin, The Buddhist Path to Awakening a Study of the Bodhi-Pakkhiyā Dhammā (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1992), 72. See also chapter 6 for a full discussion.

268 In Sn 445-a, appamatta is clearly a pun: te appamattā pahitattā, mama sāsanakārakā. “They with selves abandoned [or “with selves intent” per Norman, Group of Discourses, 51], with the self a mere trifle [or “vigilant” per Norman; it could also mean “contented with little” per the PED, s.v. appā], followers of my teaching…”

269 From the Sn Sabhiyasutta, verse 535 and parallel Mvu passage.
The comparative process also well illustrates the oral transmission process and the phonological confusion and garbling, metathesis, word substitution, word order change, etc. that is inherent in the process. Phonological confusion is constant, as in the *Nālakasutta* of the Sn v. 714-b: here P has *na pāram diguṇaṃ yanti* ("They do not go to the far shore twice") with *pāraṃ* taken in the accusative. In a parallel passage the Mvu has *na pāraṃ dviguṇāyati*, meaning "The other shore does not have a quality of two," with *pāraṃ* taken in the nominative which seems to make more sense (see below, item #37, chapter 8). There are lots of examples like this, which, while not resolvable, at least increase our understanding of the transmission process and the perils of the *bhāṇaka* transmission. Examples like the last, argue against a simple diachronic stratification as is sometimes evident (proto-language > surviving witnesses), and suggest a more fluid, constantly changing transmission process where the different translation nodes are not discernible and the relationship between witnesses not always clear.

---

270 Translated by Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 88.
In Chapter One I discussed the issue of a single vs. multiple transmission of the buddhadhamma and noted that I would try to steer a middle course between two extremes: that the language of the Buddhist canon can be traced to a single source, an Urtext, i.e. the speech of the historical Buddha is one extreme; that the source is hopelessly multifarious and nothing further can be said or known about the history of its transmission, is the other (page 32). The truth is actually some place in the middle. Though it is clear that in the early saṅgha the received teachings of the Buddha were expected to be memorized exactly, the rapid spread of the sāsana across India resulted in their translation into different Pkts and even different languages altogether, soon after his death; thus to a certain extent, what was wanted, was a moot point. Nevertheless it is important to appreciate how the early Saṅgha understood their responsibilities for the correct and accurate transmission of the teachings. All the evidence points to a commitment to memorizing and passing on the word and letter of the buddhadharma in exactly the way it was received. We will discuss some aspects of this in the following.

In the Aranavibhanga Sutta (MN 139), for example, the Buddha tells the monks that “one should not insist on local terms (nirutti), and one should not override normal names (samaññaṃ).” When there are multiple ways of referring to a bowl, for example, - according to

---

271 For a partial list of references see footnote 48.
different dialects - one should not follow the local practice and not override the usual
designations.\textsuperscript{272}

The \textit{sāṅgha} was well aware of the possibilities of miscommunicating the teachings. In the
\textit{Vinaya}, for example, Buddhaghosa gives a list of errors which would invalidate a \textit{kammavācā},
an official act of the \textit{sāṅgha}:

Where instead of an unaspirate an aspirate sound, instead of an aspirate an unaspirate
one, instead of an oral one a nasalised one, instead of a nasalised on an oral one is
produced, these four [kinds of] sounds in the formula pronounced in legal procedures
damage the proceedings. For anyone speaking in this way, and pronouncing a sound
different from the one required, is said to have a bad pronunciation.\textsuperscript{273}

One may also not change, the commentary goes on to state, a voiced consonant into an
voiceless or vice-versa ($d > t$; $t > d$; $c > j$; $j > c$; $y > k$; $k > y$), which is allowed in the \textit{sutta-piṭaka},
but, however, does “not apply to formulas in legal proceedings.”\textsuperscript{274} How did these rules come

\textsuperscript{272} The relevant section is found in MN 3, 234\textsuperscript{30}-235\textsuperscript{17}: The first sentence reads \textit{janapadaniruttīṃ nābhiniveseyya}, \textit{samaññāṃ nātidhāveyyāti} — \textit{iti kho pan’ etāṃ vuttām} Lamotte, \textit{History of Indian Buddhism}, 553 interprets this passage in an opposite sense ("One should not insist on any single term,
under the pretext that it is the only right one, but adopt the term in use in the region one is in"). However, the P and commentary seem clear that the Buddha is saying not to use local language and not override
normal usage or designation (\textit{samaññā}).


\textsuperscript{274} Ibid, von Hinüber,108/208. \textit{taṃ kammavācaṃ patvā na vaṭṭati}.}
about? The rules reveal the fact that some of the monks were not expert in P, or the Pkt on which P was based. We know for example that aspirates are not characteristic of Dravidian languages and voiced consonants in Proto-Dravidian (and many of the modern Dravidian languages like Tamil) are allophones of voiceless consonants. In Munda languages the contrast between voiced and voiceless consonants is also neutralized in certain situations and aspirates are not part of the native sub-system, but borrowed from IA/MIA. In Tib the distinction between voiced and voiceless stops (like -t- and -d-) is less phonemically distinctive than the difference in high and low pitch between the two consonants. We often forget - because of the artefact of preservation, i.e. no works having survived in the indigenous languages from this time - that MIA was only one of several languages present in ancient India; many of the sarigha members would not have been native speakers of MIA. Adopting IA/MIA as a second language had various ramifications for the pronunciation and phonology of the second language; many scholars agree, for example, that well before the Buddha’s time, retroflexes were introduced into Vedic by Dravidian speakers adopting Aryan speech to their native phonology. In the Vinaya Vibhanga there is a reference to the invalidation of a monk’s

---

276 Arun Ghosh, “Santali,” in Gregory D. S. Anderson, ed., The Munda Languages (New York: Routledge Taylor & Francis Group, 2008), 26. For Santali, but this observation applies to all the Munda languages, as far as I know. Of course we have no knowledge of ancient Munda phonology or phonetics, so this observation must be noted with the appropriate caveat.
277 See footnote 1207 & 1208.
278 Madhav M. Deshpande, “Genesis of R̄gvedic Retroflexion: A Historical and Sociolinguistic Investigation,” in Madhav M. Deshpande and Peter Edwin Hook, eds., Aryan and non-Aryan in India (Ann Arbor, 1979), 292f. For further references see discussion below in Chapter 11.
resignation if it is declared in Aryan to a non-Aryan who does not understand. The commentary explains that foreign (milakkhaka) languages include Andha, Damiḻa and others. Andha (Telugu) and Damiḻa (i.e. Tamil) are both Dravidian languages.

There is also another important statement in the Vinaya about language which has been the subject of much controversy since Buddhaghosa’s time. This is the Buddha’s statement in the Vinaya Cullavagga 5, 33 anujānāmi bhikkhave sakāya niruttiyā buddhavacanāṃ pariyyāpunituṁ ti, “I prescribe, monks, the buddhavacana to be learned thoroughly within sakāya niruttiyā.”


281 Vin 2 139-16. The whole passage is:

tenā kho pana samayena Yameḻutekulā nāma bhikkhū dve bhātikā honti brāhmaṇajātikā kalyāṇavācā kalyāṇavākkaraṇā. te yena bhagavā ten’ upasāṅkamiṁsu, upasāṅkamitvā bhagavantaṁ abhiśāvetvā ekamantaṁ nisīṁsu, ekamantaṁ nisinnā kho te bhikkhū bhagavantaṁ etadavocum: etarahi bhante bhikkhū nānānāmā nānāgottā nānājaccā nānākulā pabbajitā, te sakāya niruttiyā buddhavacanāṁ dūsenī. handa mayam bhante buddhavacanāṁ chandaso āropemā ‘ti. vigaraḥi buddho bhagavā. kathañ hi nāma tumhe moghapurisā evaṁ vakkhattha: handa mayam bhante buddhavacanāṁ chandaso āropemā ‘ti. n’etaṁ moghapurisā appasannānaṁ vā pasādāya pasannānaṁ vā bhīyyobhāvāya. atha khaṁ etat bhikkhave appasānānaṁ ceva appasādāya pasannānaṁ ca ekaccānaṁ anāthathāyā ‘ti. vigaraḥtvā dhammim katham katvā bhikkhū āmantesi: na bhikkhave buddhavacanāṁ chandaso āropetabbaṁ. yo āropetāyā āpatti dukkaṭassā. anujānāmi bhikkhave sakāya niruttiyā buddhavacanāḥ pariyyāpunituṁ ti."

At one time there were two brothers named Yameḻutekulā of Brahman birth who had nice voices and recited clearly. They approached the Buddha, etc. and said, “Nowadays, sir there are many monks, of various names, various kinds of descent, from various nations and various clans who have gone forth. They are spoiling the Buddha’s word with their own niruttī. Let us entrust (āropema) the buddhavacana to the chando.” The Buddha scolded them, “How can you say this, stupid people, ‘Let us entrust the buddhavacana to the chando? This does not, stupid people, lead to faith amongst the unbelievers or to the increase of the virtuous, and moreover leads to displeasure among both believers and non-believers and causes erroneous supposition in a few.” Having scolded them and delivered a religious discourse he said to the monks, “The Buddha’s word is not to be entrusted to the chando. For whoever does so, there
Some scholars have interpreted this statement to mean that the Buddha authorized his teachings to be translated into local dialects; others have argued that he directed his teachings to be transmitted and memorized only in his own language. The first position would argue for a multiple source virtually *ab initio*; it would render any attempt to establish a common source for the various witnesses that have come down to us as logically untenable. The second position would at least allow for the possibility that at one time - during the Buddha’s lifetime and perhaps shortly thereafter - there was a single source which was expected to be memorized and transmitted as taught. The following section argues for the single source interpretation of the *Vinaya* passage. It assumes that the injunction to memorize the teachings *sakāya niruttiyā* goes back to the historical Buddha, or at least the earliest Buddhist tradition, and adduces a significant body of other evidence from the *suttas* to support this hypothesis. The historicity of the statement is of course impossible to prove, as the *Vinaya* was not formalized until several centuries after the historical Buddha, and it may well be a construction of the later tradition "due to an attempt of maintaining a certain accessibility to the Buddha's original teaching;" nevertheless, the interpretation of the injunction is important in order to understand how the Buddhist tradition viewed the preservation of the purity of the lineage.

The meaning of *sakāya*

First, what do the words mean? *Saka* is an adjective meaning “one’s own” in P from *S* *svaka* and related to *S* *svayam*, an indeclinable with the same meaning (adjectival form *sva*; P *sa*). All

---

282 This section is adapted from Levman, *Sakāya niruttiyā*, 33-51.

283 I thank Prof. Dr. Max Deeg for this suggestion (e-mail communication, Jan. 2014).
are in agreement on this point. Sakāya is an instrumental or locative form of saka, agreeing with the same form of nirutti. A much discussed point is who sakāya refers to, for it occurs twice in the passage: Te sakāya niruttiyā buddhavacanam dūsenti…. Anujānāmi bhikkhave sakāya niruttiyā buddhavacanam pariyāpuṇitunti. It has been argued by, Brough and Norman that sakāya niruttiyā must refer to the same person(s) coming as they do so close to each other. Therefore, if the monks are ruining buddhavacana with their own nirutti, then the Buddha’s final statement, enjoining learning buddhavacana must also refer to their own nirutti. However, this is not necessarily the case as Geiger pointed out in his answer to Weller. He maintained that the meaning of saka must be determined by the grammatical or logical subject and gave as an example: “Wenn ein Deutscher zu einem Franzosen sagt: Reden Sie in der eigenen Sprache, ich will in der eigenen Sprache antworten,” “eigenen Sprache” (“own language”) must mean French in the first clause and German in the second. So, the grammatical subject of the first sentence is “the monks,” therefore, “own language” must be their own language; in the second sentence the grammatical subject is “I” (i.e. anujānāmi, I enjoin) so “own language” must refer to the Buddha, as Buddhaghosa interpreted it. Alternatively, one might say (since the second

---


286 Sakāya niruttiyā ti ettha sakā nirutti nāma sammāsambuddhena vuttappakāro māgadhiko vohāro,
sentence is made up of two clauses) that the subject of the second clause is *buddhavacana*, and therefore *sakāya* should be read as “its.” In either case, one arrives at the same meaning: “I authorize the *buddhavacana* to be learned in its (my) own *nirutti*.” It is clear that there is no necessity for *sakāya niruttiyā* to maintain the same referent in both the above sentences. In fact the Buddha may well have been gently mocking the Yameḷutekulā brothers when he used their exact words in a different context and with a different meaning. So we now have four possibilities: 1) The monks ruining *buddhavacana* with/in their own *nirutti*. 2) The monks ruining *buddhavacana* with/in the Buddha’s own *nirutti*. 3) The Buddha enjoining *buddhavacana* to be learned in their (the monks’) own *nirutti* and 4) The Buddha enjoining *buddhavacana* to be learned in his own *nirutti*. Almost all scholars have taken version 1 over version 2. The preponderance of scholars have taken version 3 over version 4.

---

287 Another example from the Raghuvamśa:

```
matparaṃ durlabham matvā nānum āvarjitaṁ mayā /
payaḥ pūrvaiḥ svānīśvāsaṁ kavoṣnam upabhujyate Ragh.-1.67 //
```

“Verily the libation of water, offered by me, is drunk, rendered lukewarm with their sighs, by my forefathers, thinking that it would be difficult to be obtained after my death” trans. by M. R. Kale, *The Raghuvamśa of Kālidāsa* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2005), 7. Here *sva* agrees with “ancestors,” which is the logical and grammatical subject of *upabhujyate*.

288 Except K. R. Norman, “Pāli Lexicogrhalical Studies 9,” *Journal of the Pali Text Society* 16, (1992), 78. Also available in *Collected Papers* 5 (Oxford: The Pali Text Society), 77. He believes that the first *sakāya niruttiyā* must also refer to *buddhavacana* (its own *nirutti*). “The monks are ruining *buddhavacana* in/with its own *nirutti*.”

The meaning of nirutti

Most scholars have taken nirutti to mean “dialect” or “language.” There is a smaller group who have taken it to mean “intonation” or “chant,” the suprasegmental prosodic features of language - in effect “recitation.” This will be discussed again below with the word chandaso. Nobody, however, has taken up a systematic study of the use of the word nirutti in the P canon. This would indeed be a daunting task as there are 131 Suttas in which nirutti is mentioned, 9


passages in the *Vinaya* and 68 in the *Abhidhamma*. What becomes immediately obvious from studying the usage of the term in the first two *Pīṭakas* is that it almost never means “dialect.” The PED gives its definition as “explanation of words, grammatical analysis, etymological interpretation; pronunciation, dialect, way of speaking, expression.” But in its usage *nirutti* seems to be a synonym for “name” or “designation,” both of which meanings are consistent with its etymology from *nir vac*, “to express clearly, interpret, explain” p.p. *nirukta; niruki* is formed by the addition of the *taddhita* suffix -i to *nirukta* and in S has the specific meaning of “Deutung eines Wortes, etymologische Worterklärung” (B&R), but BHSD just gives it as “explanation, not necessarily etymological, of the meaning of a word or text” (s. v. *niruki*). One of course usually explains a word by defining it with synonyms, so the two meanings are very closely related.

There are several instances in the canon which seem to corroborate this meaning of *nirutti*. In the *Poṭṭhāpadasutta* the Buddha talks about the different kinds of selves: “But, Citta, these are merely names, expressions *[nirutti],* turns of speech, designations in common use in the world, which the *Tathāgata* uses without misapprehending them.” On the face of it there does not seem to be a significant difference between *nirutti, vohāra* or *paññatti* Buddaghosa’s

291 The program I am using, Digital Pāli Reader, counts one time per *sutta* / passage (no matter how many times the word occurs in a *sutta*), so actual word count is higher.

292 Ole Holten Pind, email 2009.


294 PED *vohāra:* “current appellation, common use (of language), popular logic, common way of defining, usage, designation, term, cognomen.”
commentary (Sv 382) make this even more explicit; with analogy to the different kinds of selves, he talks about the products of a cow milk, curd, butter, ghee, saying, “it is called, designated [niruttī], named, defined.”

In the Mahānidānasutta, we encounter the following, “This is the extent to which there is birth, aging, death, passing away, and re-arising. This is the extent to which there are means of designation, expression [niruttī], and delineation. This is the extent to which the sphere of discernment extends, the extent to which the cycle revolves for the manifesting (discernibility) of this world — i.e., name-and-form together with consciousness.”

Now two other words - adhivacana and viññatti - have been introduced, but all three seem to have a similar meaning of designation, description, explanation. In the commentary Buddhaghosa makes a differentiation between the three terms (Sv 503):

296 PED paññatti: “making known, manifestation, description, designation, name, idea, notion, concept.”
296 saṅkhāma niruttīm nāmaṃ vohāram gacchati.
298 Both Walsh, Long Discourses, 226) and Thanissaro leave out aṇñamaṇīṇa paccayatāya pavattati (a variant reading) of their translation. I would emend to “…name-and-form together with consciousness [which] are mutually interdependent.”
299 CPD: “name, designation; metaphorical expression; near-synonym.”
300 PED: “intimation, giving to understand, information; begging or asking by intimation or hinting,” with variant paññatti, as above
“Means of designation’: It is a means of worldly designation regarding the mere word only, not having understood the meaning of the words *sirivaddhako* ('augmenting glory') and *dhanavaaddhako* ('augmenting wealth'), etc.”

“Means of explanation’: It is a means of worldly designation with reference to the cause of words like ‘he remembers, [therefore he is] mindful; he knows, [therefore he is] attentive,’ etc.”

“Means of description’: It is a means of worldly designation by making known in their variety words like ‘wise, experienced, intelligent, subtle, practiced in disputing with others’, etc.”

From Buddhaghosa’s examples it looks like he is saying that *adhivacana* relates to defining without understanding the underlying meaning, *nirutti* to defining the *kāraṇa* or etymology of words (e.g. *sato* < *sarati* < S *śmiṛtī*) and *paññatti* to designation by synonym.

The *Niruttipathasutta* (SN 3, 7113-737) also seems to use *nirutti*, *adhivacana* and *paññatti* as synonyms or near synonyms: “There are three pathways of naming, pathways of designation, pathways of description that are unmixed, that were never mixed, that are not being mixed, that will not be mixed, that are not rejected by wise ascetics and brahmins.”

301 *Adhivacanapatho ti: siri-vaddhako dhana-vaddhako ti adikassa attham adisvā vacanamattam eva adhikicca pavattassa vohārassa patho.*

302 *Niruttipatho ti: Saratī ti sato, sampajānīti ti sampajāno ti, ādikassa kāraṇāpadesa-vasena pavattassa vohārassa patho.*

303 *Paññattipatho ti: Pañḍito nipuṇo vyatto medhāvi kata-para-ppavādo ti, ādikassa nānappakārato ṅā pana-vasena pavattassa vohārassa patho.*


305 Translated by Bodhi, *Connected Discourses*, 905, SN 3, 7115-18: *Tayo me bhikkhave niruttipathā adhivacanapathā paññattipathā asamkīṇṇā asamkīṇṇapubbā na samkīyanti, na samkīyissanti*
All the references in the first three books of the *Sutta-Pitaka* then use *nirutti* as more or less a synonym for designation, name, description or explanation. In the *Aṅguttara Nikāya*, the word has taken on a more technical meaning. It is mentioned in four *suttas*,³⁰⁶ third in a group of terms. In the *Sāriputta paṭisambhedāsutta* and *Paṭisambhidāsutta* we find “One gains discriminating insight into meaning, conditions, definitions [*nirutti*] and intellect.”³⁰⁷ The *Kathavatthu* defines these as “the four branches of logical analysis” (*catupāṭisambhidā*), explained in the PED (s.v. *paṭisambhidā*) as *attha* analysis of meanings "in extension"; *dhamma* of reasons, conditions, or causal relations; *nirutti* of [meanings "in intension" as given in] definitions; *paṭibhāna* or intellect to which things knowable by the foregoing processes are presented. Buddhaghosa (Mp 3, 27⁴⁵⁻⁶, commenting on the *Paṭisambhidāsutta*) defines someone who has achieved *niruttipāṭisambhidā* as “one who has achieved the analytical wisdom with respect to the explication of the dharma.”³⁰⁸ So here *nirutti* is more than just explanation; the term now suggests a deeper hermeneutical insight into the meaning of the words. In the *Akuppasutta* and *Khippanisantisutta* *nirutti* is third in a group of five terms: “Skilled in the meaning, in the dharma, in the explanation [*nirutti*], in the letter and what comes before and after.”³⁰⁹

---

³⁰⁷AN113¹⁶⁻¹⁸: *Atthapāṭisambhidā, dhammapāṭisambhidā, niruttipāṭisambhidā* and *paṭibhānapāṭisambhidā*.
³⁰⁸ *Niruttipāṭisambhidāppatto ti dhammaniruttīsu pabhedagata-ṇāṇaṁ patto*.
³⁰⁹ AN 2¹⁰²⁻²⁵: *bhikkhu atthakusalo ca hoti dhammakusalo ca niruttikusalo ca vaṇjanakusalo ca pubbāparakusalo ca*. 
In the *Khuddaka Nikāya niruttī* is mentioned in 117 passages: once in the *Dhammapada*, once in the *Theragāthā*, 19 times in the *Apadāna* (mostly in the phrase *attadhhammaniruttisu, paṭibhāne*... as above); 13 times in the *Mahā- and CullaNiddesa* (usually in a long list of synonyms, viz., “*purisa* is a definition, a designation, a name, a term, a name, etc, “310 similar in meaning, or associated with the *catupaṭisambhidā* above); 74 times in the *Paṭisambhidā-magga*; 3 times in the *Milindapañha*; 7 times in the *Nettipakaraṇa*; and 7 times in the *Petavatthu*. Space does not permit me to delve into all the uses of *niruttī* in these (rather late) contexts, but at a glance most seem to relate to explication of the meaning of the dharma often in association with the other branches of “logical analysis.” Even the Dhp reference (v. 352-b), which could be quite old, seems to refer to dharma interpretation:

“Without craving, not talking, skilled in words and their interpretation [*niruttipadakovido*], he would know the combination of letters and which go before and which after, he indeed, with his last body, having great knowledge, is called ‘great man.’” 311 Bhuddhghosa glosses *niruttipadakovido* as “skilled in word endings and interpretation and skilled in the four branches of logical analysis.” 312

310 *Puriso ti saṁkhā samaṇṇa paññatti lokavohāro nāmaṃ nāmakammaṃ nāmadheyyaṃ niruttī byaṭjanāṃ abhilāpo Nidd 1, 12419-21.


*Vītataṇho anādāno niruttipadakovido*

*Akkharāṇaṃ sannipātaṃ jaññā pubbparāṇi ca*

*Sa ve antimasāriro mahāpaṇño mahāpuriso ‘ti vuccati.***

The *Theragāthā* ref. is the same: *niruttipadakovido*. Th, 92.

312 Dhp-a 4, 7019-20: *Niruttiyaṇa ca sesapadesu cā ti catūsu pi paṭisambhidāsu cheko ti attho.*
There are also nine places in the Vinaya where nirutti is used. The incident we are discussing in the Cullavagga, four in the Parivāra and four in the Bhikkhuṭhīṭhaṅgā. In the Vibhaṅga passage (Vin 3, 57\textsuperscript{16-23}) an honest monk takes another’s robe (cīvaram) that had been left out in the open, presumably thinking it was abandoned. The monk to whom the robe belonged then asked who had taken his robe and the honest monk answered “I stole it” (mayā avahaṭa).

Seized by the other monk, he was remorseful and spoke to the Buddha who asks him, “What were you thinking of?” (Kiñcit tvam bhikkhu?) to which he responds, “[Saying] ‘I’ was just an expression.” (Niruttipatho ahaṃ bhagavā ‘ti.) The Buddha says, “There is no fault in this case.” (Anāpatti bhikkhu niruttipathe ‘ti). Here nirutti seems to have the simple meaning of “expression” or “manner of speaking.”\textsuperscript{313} There are two other similar incidents related, where a bhikkhu leaves his robe on a chair, and another where a bhikkunī leaves her robe on a fence. In the Vinītavatthu-uddānagāthā summary (Vin 3, 55\textsuperscript{27}), just before these episodes we read “With explanation there are five without fault” (Niruttiyā paṅca akkhātā) where nirutti has the same meaning.

In the Parivāra, Atthavasakaraṇaṃ (Vin 5, 143\textsuperscript{27}) nirutti appears in its familiar location along with attha and dhamma (“One hundred meanings, a hundred phenomena and two hundred names”\textsuperscript{314}) and also in a discussion on knowledge of the kathinaṃ, the wooden frame used by bhikkhus to sow their robes. Here we find nirutti in a string of nouns, all having the similar meaning of “naming”: (“The Kathinaṃ is to be known’: the gathering of the parts, the

\textsuperscript{313} See Horner, Discipline, vol. 4, 95-96.

\textsuperscript{314} Trans. by Horner, Discipline, vol. 6, 232 as hundred meanings, a hundred clauses and two hundred expressions,...” atthasatam dhammasatam, dve ca niruttisatāni.
combination, the name, the naming, the designation, the explanation, the characteristic, the expression - all this is the kaṭhināṃ.

There are also 68 passages in the Abhidhamma which I have only passed over cursorily; their usage of nirutti seems to be consistent with the above, almost always appearing after attha- and dhamma-paṭisambhidā.

We have reached a fairly definite conclusion: nirutti, in its use in the canon does not mean “dialect,” nor does it mean “language.” How is it possible then that so many scholars have used the word incorrectly? Probably because of Buddhaghosa and his notorious gloss: Sakāya niruttiyā ‘ti ettha sakā nirutti nāma sammāsambuddhena vuttappakāro Māgadhikovohāro (Sp 6, 121418-19), which because of Māgadhiko has always been translated as “Here sakā nirutti is indeed the Māgadhan language/dialect in the manner spoken by the Completely Enlightened


316 Except Norman, “Dialects,” 61f. Norman correctly defines nirutti as “synonym (or gloss)” (p. 62), but his explication of the incident is still confusing. “People were spoiling the Buddha’s words by reciting them with explanatory glosses replacing some of the original words. The Buddha did not think this was important enough to merit translating chandaso. Even though his words were being spoiled, he gave permission for the practice to continue. What the people recited and remembered, therefore, and what doubtless became the basis of the various traditions, were the Buddha’s own words, not translated, but sometimes changed a little, by the Buddha himself, to meet local requirements” (63). The confusion in this explication stems from Norman’s belief that both the first and the second sakāya must refer to the Buddha (see page 114 above), so the “explanatory glosses” which were spoiling buddhavacana were the Buddha’s own glosses. In my reading of this incident, the Buddha did not give “permission for the practice to continue,” nor was he sanctioning his words to be “changed a little, by the Buddha himself, to meet local requirements.” He simply said, “Memorize it as I have said it, with my own terms, glosses, explanations, etc., not with theirs.”
One.” I would modify this to “Here, sakā nirutti means indeed the Māgadhan name/designation in the manner spoken by the Completely Enlightened One.” We have seen above that vohāra is used as a synonym for nirutti, meaning “name, designation, definition, explanation,” etc. So the relevant passage may now be translated as follows: Te sakāya niruttiyā buddhavacanaṃ dūsentī. “They are ruining the Buddha’s words with their own names.” Anujānāmi bhikkhave sakāya niruttiyā buddhavacanaṃ pariyāpunītun ti. “Monks, I enjoin the Buddha’s words be learned with its (my) own names/terms/designations.”

The Buddha had developed a specialized vocabulary to communicate his new philosophy. Words like dukkha, anicca, anatta, ariyasacca, tanhā, aṭṭhangikamagga, paṭiccasamuppāda, satipatthāna, nekkhamma, nibbāna, etc., while previously existent, had all been adapted to specific connotations in keeping with the Buddha’s views (or better, his lack of such). As his teachings spread and monks of different backgrounds joined, they would explain to each other and themselves, what it is that the Buddha meant; in their own words, with their own names, definitions and explanations. Someone might equate nibbāna with mokṣa or anatta with Brahman (tat tvam asī), etc. Surely this would be ruining the buddhavacana with their own names and descriptions (sakāya niruttiyā); Buddha’s views were a radical departure from the brahmanical beliefs of the day, not an extension of them. True, some monks may have also spoken a different dialect than Māgadhī as well, further complicating issues. But - if this incident goes back to the time of the historical Buddha - it is highly unlikely that this is primarily a dialectal issue under discussion, as the changes amongst the dialects would have been minor. For the Buddha lived and taught in a very confined area - in the kingdoms of Magadhā, Kosala and Kāsī, and amongst the Vajjī, Malla, and Sakya clans, all within a few hundred kilometres of
each other - and the languages spoken in these areas would have been Māgadhī or Ardhamāgadhī (and likely one or more indigenous non-IA languages). Even if there were already monks from western India who had joined the sarīgha and spoke a different dialect, they would have been able to understand the speech, as the changes were not significant enough to cause much confusion once the basic rules were known: e.g. eastern (E), nom. sing - e > western (W) -o; E, ś, s > W, s; E, kkh- > W, cch-; E, j- > W, y-; E, -l- > W, -r-; etc. We know that as time progressed the language continued to evolve phonologically and by the time the words were written down, traditionally dated to the first century BCE, they had reached a stage more phonologically advanced (i.e. simplified) than the Aśokan edicts;\(^{317}\) but we do not know when these changes took place - presumably not in the lifetime of the Buddha, although it is possible, as has been argued, that a lingua franca arose quite early, in an attempt to make the teachings available to as wide an audience as possible.\(^{318}\) However the evidence - particularly the requirement of memorization and recitation of buddhavacana to be discussed below - suggests that the language was fairly uniform while the Buddha was alive. Another (albeit negative) proof that niruttī does not mean “dialect” is this very point; if the buddhavacana was to be memorized and recited, how could that be, if there were no “standard” buddhavacana to memorize? The Vinaya story of Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa (page 26) makes it very clear that the only latitude that monks had with buddhavacana was their vocal style of recitation, not the words.

\(^{317}\) Lamotte, *History*, 567. Many of these “advances” however are simply Sanskritizations. It is clear, for example, that many intervocalic stops > a glide in the dialect or koine on which P was based; some of these are preserved in P and others are Sanskritized (i.e. the stops are restored). See Chapter Two above.

\(^{318}\) Geiger, *Pāli Literatur*, 3; Bechert, “Bemerkungen, 34.
The meaning of chandaso

It has long been appreciated that Buddhist monks were expected to memorize and recite buddhavacana as an integral part of their practice. Yet the fact that this contradicts the conventional understanding of Cullavagga 5, 33 - that each monk was to learn, and presumably recite the dharma in his own dialect - has not been noted. For if everyone were reciting something different, then there is no root text to memorize. In fact, it is exactly this situation that Buddha is addressing. Monks are to learn his words, with his own terms, not theirs. In this context Norman’s suggestion that there was “no single language or dialect used by Buddha” does not make sense, at least in terms of the earliest Buddhist practice, i.e. when the Founder lived. The Yamelutekulā brothers had a different solution to the problem of linguistic uniformity. Why not render the Buddha’s words chandaso and standardize them that way, they suggested? Some scholars have taken this to mean “render into S or Veda” and others as “render into recitatory verse, like the Veda.” Buddhaghosa quite clearly states the latter (Sp 121416-17):

chandaso āropemā ‘ti vedaṃ viya sakkatabhāsāya vācanāmaggaṃ āropema. “Chandaso āropemā’ means let us render [buddhavacana] into the way of recitation of honoured speech like the Veda,” but was not always so understood, starting with Rhys-Davids & Oldenberg in 1885. This misunderstanding led to the counterposing of “local dialect” with S and

319 See footnote 48.
contaminated the whole exegesis of the incident. The Yamelutekulā brothers wanted to put the *buddhavacana* into metrical chant along the lines of the Veda. This was a fixed system of sacred hymns and prayers (*sāman, rc, chandas*, *yajus*), with melody (*svara*), accent (*udātta, anudāta, svarita*), and dynamics (*mandra, madhyama, uttara*) by which the Vedas were memorized and recited, preventing the alteration of the words by the complex dovetailing of all the parts. Consistent with the Buddha’s opposition to and reinterpretation of all things Vedic, he refuses. After a short diatribe about why this would not be conducive to the spread of the dharma, he returns to the main point - learn the *buddhavacana* with the Buddha’s own names and terms, not with locally invented ones.

---


---

322 *chandas* is in fact one of the metrical Vedic forms and *chandaso* is used in the *Vinaya* incident as a synecdoche.- the part standing for the whole.
The Chinese Evidence

But this is not where the story ends. For as time passed by and the religion spread, afterwards the Vinaya was translated into Ch and we have five different versions of it which are worth discussing for two reasons: these passages have often been used to “prove” the “each in his own dialect” theory discussed above, and whatever they do prove, they certainly illustrate the vagaries and complexities of the transmission and translation processes.

1) Mahiśāsaka Vinaya. There were two brahman brothers who chanted the Veda and left their households to become monks. They heard various monks reciting passages “lacking integrity” and scolded them for not knowing masculine and feminine, singular or plural, present, past or future tense, long or short stress. They complained to the Buddha (but made no suggestions) and he allowed “reading and recitation in the sound of the country” as long as the meaning of the Buddha is not violated. Now this is usually interpreted as “Je permets qu’on récite comme on parle dans chaque royaume” or “suivant les phonèmes des pays (kouo-yīn, la phonologie dialectale?),” or “in keeping with dialectal pronunciation.” But these translations seem to be conflating two related language aspects - phonology and suprasegmentals. It is not dialect that Buddha is talking about, but the manner in which the verses are chanted (i.e. dù sòng, which he allows to be done according to the local custom). In

---

323 T22n1421_p0174b15_f.
324 不正 bùzhèng.
325 國音讀誦 guóyīn dù sòng
326 Lévi, “La récitation,” 442;
328 Lamotte, History, 554.
his study “Sur la récitation primitive des textes bouddhiques” Lévi makes it clear that certain recitation styles were allowed and some weren’t (502f). In the P version of the Soṇa Kuṭikaṇṇa story329 Buddha praises the monk for his recitation (arabhañña, Vin 19637) of the verses in the Āṭṭhakavagga: “Excellent, monk! These Āṭṭhakavagga verses have been well grasped by you, joyfully cultivated, well reflected on. You are endowed with a beautiful voice [the words] distinct and clearly enunciated, articulate, making the meaning clear.”330 In the various Ch parallel versions, the Buddha praises him for his local dialect (“Vous savez déclamer avec la prononciation du pays d’Avanti”).331 It is clear that the monks had an accepted way of declaiming (termed sarabhañña which Lévi defines as “en mélopée”); what was not allowed was a Vedic form of intonation, āyataka gītassarena “with drawn-out singing.”333. Lévi has a full discussion on the various Ch texts on chanting, concluding that sarabhañña was a form of chant which avoided the faults of the Vedic āyataka (435). What concerns us here is that chanting, intoning, recitation, etc. were allowed, even encouraged334, as long as it was not done in a Vedic fashion.

329 Mahāvagga 5, 13; Vin 19418-19810.
330 Vin 1, 19638-1973 sādhu sādhu bhikkhu, suggahītāni kho te bhikkhu āṭṭhakavaggikāni sumanakasitāni sūpadhāritāni kalyāṇiyāpi ’si vācāya samannāgato vissaṭṭhāya anelagalāya atthassa viññāpaniyā.
331 Lévi, “La récitation,” 407 from the Sarvāstivādin Vinaya, translated from the Ch.
332 English melopoeia “the art or theory of inventing melody” from Greek μελοποιεῖν, to write a lyric poem or set to music.
333 Cullavagga 5, 3; Vin 2, 1085-6.
334 see Lévi, “La récitation,” 430 for a discussion of the five advantages of chanting.
2) Dharmaguptaka Vinaya.\textsuperscript{335} There was a brahman called Yǒngměng (勇猛) who had left home and become a monk. He complains to the Buddha about monks of different background ruining the buddhavacana and implores the Buddha to fix the situation “according to the elegant language treatises of the world.”\textsuperscript{336} After criticizing this suggestion, the Buddha allows them to "recite and study the sutras of the Buddha according to the interpretation of the language of the common people."\textsuperscript{337} The “elegant language treatises” are clearly S and perhaps also Vedic chant. However “the common language of the country” does appear to mean “dialect." This passage seems to conflate intonation/recitation with dialect - which is not all that surprising considering it is being rendered into Ch and the translator may have seen this as a justification for his/her work. Brough suggests that the source word was janapada-nirutti (from the Araṇavibhasasutta, MN 3, 234\textsuperscript{30}, where it could mean “language of the country” or just “local terms”),\textsuperscript{338} but this seems extremely unlikely; it is probably just the translator’s misinterpretation, which was, as we have seen, not the first.

3) Vināyamātrka.\textsuperscript{339} There were two brahman monks named Wūjiēhē (鳥嘗呵) and Sànmótuó (散摩陀) who complained to the Buddha as above and ask him to allow them, “According to the treatises of the chandas (chǎntuó), to arrange the order of the padas of the Buddha’s sutras, so that the sounds become clear and their meaning evident.”\textsuperscript{340} The Buddha replied: "In my

\begin{itemize}
\item[335] T22n1428_p0955a17.
\item[336] 以世間好言論 yǐ shìjiān hǎo yánlùn.
\item[337] 國俗言音所解説佛經 guó sú yán yīn suǒ jiě shuō fó jīng.
\item[338] Brough, ”Sakāya niruttiyā,” 40.
\item[339] T24n1463_p0822a15.
\item[340] 依闡陀至持論撰集佛經次比文句, 使言音辯,了義亦得顯 Yī chǎntuó zhì chílùn zhuàn jì fójīng cíbì, shì yán yīn biàn, liǎo yì yì dé xiǎn.
buddhadharma there is no concern for fine language as long as the meaning is not lost, this is my intention. You must expound it in a way that corresponds to the sounds of living beings so that they attain insight. Therefore, one should act according to the country.\textsuperscript{341} Although this incident is ambiguous, it does not appear to be a question of dialect but of the clarity of the chant. The Buddha’s response - to use whatever sounds you needs so that people understand and gain awakening - could refer to either the local dialect or the recitation practice or both.

Brough believes the passage is corrupt.\textsuperscript{342}

4) and 5) The Sarvāstivādin\textsuperscript{343} and Mūlasarvāstivādin\textsuperscript{344} Vinaya passages are both unambiguously about chant. In the first, two brahmans Qúpó (瞿婆) and Yèpó (夜婆) had recited the four Vedic books\textsuperscript{345} from memory; when they became monks they did the same with the Buddha’s teachings. When one died, the other forgot the chants and unsuccessfully sought another companion to instruct him. He was unhappy and this fact was reported to the Buddha who prohibited “using the chant of the heretics.”\textsuperscript{346} In the latter (Mūlasarvāstivādin) passage, there are two brahmans, who are now brothers. One of them dies and the forgetful survivor goes to various of the Buddha’s disciples to ask for instruction but when he is accommodated, in every case he is dissatisfied with their chanting, which was so unlike the one he remembered.

\textsuperscript{341}吾佛法中不與美言為是。但使義理不失。是吾意也。隨諸眾生應與何音而得受悟應為說之。是故名為隨
國家應作Wú Fófǎ zhōng bù yǔ měiyán wèishì. Dànshǐ yìlǐ bùshī. Shì wú yì yě. Suí zhū zhòngshēng yīng yǔ
hé yīn ér dé shòu wù yīng wéi shuō zhī. Shiguò míngwéi suí guó yīng zuò.
\textsuperscript{342}Brough, “Sakāya niruttīyā,” 39.
\textsuperscript{343}T23n1435_p0274a20.
\textsuperscript{344}T24n1451_p0232b17.
\textsuperscript{345}四圍陀 Sì wéituó.
\textsuperscript{346}以外書音聲誦 Yúwài shū yīn shēng sòng.
When the matter was brought to the attention of the Buddha he said that “making songs in long-drawn out musical sounds” was a fault and ordered the practice stopped. Only if the “regional pronunciation” requires this practice is it allowed. This whole passage is clearly a reference to the sarabhaṅña āyatakena gītassarena Buddhist-Vedic recitation technique distinction referred to above and has nothing to do with dialect issues. Brough sees the absence of request for a S rendition of the buddhavacana as a political ploy - since both of these schools had adopted a form of Prakritized S for their canon - but even if that were the case, it is clear that the Ch recensions offer only marginal evidence in support of the “each to his own dialect theory,” despite assumptions to the contrary. In fact, only one of the five versions is unambiguously about dialect and even that one (the Dharmaguptaka) is not only about dialect, but about intonation as well.

All the Ch versions must also be viewed through a different historical lens than the P. We may assume that the P goes back to the historical Buddha, if not in precise language, at least in concept. We know that the Ch was translated many centuries later from a now lost Prakritized S by Buddhist monks who were anxious to have their new religion accepted in a new country; so it is natural that in some cases (i.e. Dharmaguptaka) they would interpret their source text as allowing or even encouraging the rendition of buddhavacana in a local dialect.

The Pāli

---

347 長牽音韻作歌詠聲 Chang qian yin yun zuoge yong sheng.
348 方國言音 Fanguo yan yin; following Lamotte, Indian Buddhism, 554. Equivalent to svaragupti (“depth of voice”) per DDB.
Having reviewed all the direct evidence available, we may now revisit the original P and offer the following explanation. Monks of different backgrounds were spoiling the integrity of the buddhavacana with their own names, expressions and explanations of Buddha’s terms. They were describing the dharma in their own terms, with their own names and synonyms drawn from their own backgrounds. Two brahman brothers complained of this fact to the Buddha suggesting that in order to preserve his exact words, they be put into formal Vedic chant, with all its accents, tones and rules. Buddha rejected the solution and ordered his teachings to be learned in the original terms in which he had taught them.

In fact, that is exactly what did happen during the Buddha’s lifetime. The monks memorized and recited his words, as the story of Soṇa and other sutras in the canon illustrate. Local intonation variance was accepted, even applauded, but we have no indication in the canon that any laxity was allowed with the words themselves, as Wynne has argued, inter alia, contra Cousins’ assertion that the Mahāparinibbānasutta mahāpadesas (DN 2, 123\textsuperscript{30}-126\textsuperscript{5}) sanctioned lower standards of authenticity for non-Vinaya teachings, Buddha’s words were to be memorized verbatim.\textsuperscript{350} This is not to say that buddhavacana did not change. As time went on, and Buddhism spread into different linguistic areas, it certainly did. But in theory anyways, these changes are recoverable by standard methods of comparative linguistics, and as Wynne opines “philological, conceptual, and narrative oddities in the early Buddhist texts are likely to

be significant - not produced by the random variation of an oral tradition, but by causes that in theory can be discovered.  

The Buddha and the Language(s) he spoke

That the Buddha was master of many, if not all, languages was a common conceit of later Buddhism. Lamotte describes a famous incident in the Vībhāṣā (3rd to 4th century CE) where the Buddha converts four kings, first by speaking in S, then, when the second two do not understand, in Drāvidian and then in Mleccha.352 Buddhaghosa, in his gloss to DN #1 evam me sutam says (Sv 2724-25) that the buddhavacana is with one form sabba-sattānam saka-saka-bhā sānurūpato "adapted to the individual dialects of all beings." This sentiment was expressed also in the 5th century CE Mahāyāna Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra 353 "...with words which explained the meaning in a final form in the dialect of each and every one of all sentient beings..."354 Probably the earliest occurrence of this sentiment is the Daśabhūmikasūtra which dates from the first century CE Here the bodhisattva of the ninth level (termed sādhumati or "good mind"), has the following skill: "If here, all beings belonging to the three thousand, great thousand world systems, came in an instant, in a single moment of time and one by one to him and were to ask an infinitude of different kinds of questions - that which each being asked, a second being would not ask - the bodhisattva would answer it in words, letters and sounds [understandable]

351 Ibid, 124.
352 Lamotte, History, 550.
353 Not the Mūlasarvāstivādin version of Waldschmidt, 1950, 1951, which is based on the same source as the P version DN #16.
354 In Weller, "Buddhaghosas Erklärung," 348: sems can thams cad shi rang rang gi yul gi skad du shin tu zur phyin par don brda spyod pa’i tshig mams kyis /
to all beings, and having answered them with a single utterance it would satisfy the minds of all beings. " These quotes highlight the disparity in time between the Vinaya incident and later development of the language question in the Mahāyāna sūtras, where the notion of the Buddha's simultaneous polyvocality ability was first presented, likely in response to the growing polyglot nature of the saṅgha. In the Vinaya, on the other hand, we appear to be at the very beginning of the saṅgha in a very circumscribed geographical locale, where,

1) The Pkt the Buddha spoke, whether an eastern dialect like Māgadhī, Ardha-Māgadhī or "old Māgadhī" or a lingua franca discussed above (or both), would have been understandable to most of the populace who lived in the areas where the Buddha taught. Monks from other regions of India would also have understood it, once they had learned the appropriate changes. This is not to deny that on occasion, the Buddha may have made these alterations himself depending on his audience.

2) Although during his lifetime there was no "canon" as we know it, there was such a thing buddhavacana, as the Vinaya incident illustrates. The early existence of such a body of teaching to which monks could refer is also implicit in i) the standards of authenticity criteria (mahāpadesas) taught in the Mahāparinibbānasutta (DN 2, 123\textsuperscript{30}-126\textsuperscript{5}); ii) the pātimokkhas which were to be recited every fortnight; iii) the Kintisutta (MN 2, 238\textsuperscript{8}-243\textsuperscript{15}) where the Buddha

\textsuperscript{355} P. L. Vaidya, Daśabhūmikasūtram (Darbhanga: The Mithila Institute, 1967), 53\textsuperscript{4-7}. translated by author.

saceṭṭaṁ trisāhasramahāsāhasralokadhātuparyāpannaḥ sarvasattvā upasamkramya
ekakṣaṇalavamuhūrtena praśnān pariprccheyuḥ, ekaikaśca teṣāmapramaññarutavimātratayā pariprcchet,
yāṃ caikaḥ sattvāḥ pariprccchen na tāṃ dvītiyaḥ, tāṃ bodhisattvāḥ
sarvasattvarutapadavyaṇjanamudgrhiṇiyāt. udgrhya caikarutābhivyāhāreṇa teṣāṁ sarvasattvānāṁ
cittāśayān paritoṣayet.
is concerned about disagreements over the meaning (atthato) and the letter (byañjanato) of his teachings and provides means for resolving them; iv) the DN recitation suttas, DN #33 Sanglitisutta and DN #34 Dasuttara Sutta; v) the Dutiya Vinayadharasutta (AN 4, 14019-1415) where the monk is expected to know the teachings “chapter by chapter, down to the letter” (suttaso anubyañjanaso); not to mention numerous other references cited by Wynne and elsewhere.356

3) The Buddha’s words were expected to be memorized and recited. This, as shown above, and as is generally accepted, was an integral part of early (and present) Buddhist practice.

4) The Buddha’s teachings were unique i.e. completely different from the prevalent brahmānic beliefs and endowed with their own specialized vocabulary devised by the Buddhists to present their insights effectively.

Given these conditions, how likely would it have been for the Buddha to authorize the substitution of his followers’ terms, explanations, names or expressions for his own, or to allow his words to be formalized in Vedic chant? The early tradents of buddhavacana wanted his

356 See Wynne, “Oral Transmission,” 108f. Also see, for example, the Sugatavinayasutta AN 2, 14823-25; te bhikkhū bahussutā āgalāgamā dhammadharā vinayadharā mālikādharā te sakkaccam suttantaṃ param vācenti, (“Those monks who are of wide knowledge, versed in the doctrines, who know Dhamma by heart, who know Vinaya by heart, who know the summaries by heart, - these dutifully hand on a text to another”). trans. E.M. Hare, The Book of the Gradual Sayings (Aṅguttara-Nikāya), (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2006), vol 2, 152; or the Sotānudhatasutta, AN 2, 1858-9: bhikkhu dhammaṃ pariyāpunāti suttaṃ geyyaṃ veyyākaraṇaṃ gāthā, “A monk memorizes the dharma: suttas, geyya and exposition…”
very words, as were transmitted to them, understood to be in the Buddha's own vocabulary and designations, memorized, repeated and recited. This is the gist of the Cullavagga incident, and the significance of the phrase sakāya niruttiyā. Nevertheless, we can not prove that this policy goes back to the historical Buddha, and it may well be an attempt on the part of the later tradition to maintain a living connection with the source teachings; however one interprets the chronology, it does highlight the importance that the Buddhist tradition ascribed to their Founder's words.

Postscript

One of the arguments advanced for the spread of Buddhism was the liberality of its language policy and this was certainly the case after the Buddha’s parinibbāna. It is well known that the early Buddhist saṅgha had a completely different view of language and words than was prevalent in the brahmanical culture of the time. For Buddhists words were not eternal and unchangeable as the Veda was for the brahmans; words were simply social conventions. The Buddha’s teachings reflects this view, using a “decentered” approach to language with synonymic and near-synonymic word repetition being a constant feature of his style. Ultimately words could not communicate the liberative insights which the Buddha realized - they were atakkāvacaro (“beyond the realm of reasoning”) - that is why, in Buddhist legend, he chose not to teach after his awakening, as he felt no one would understand him; it took a visit from

357 See footnote 283.
358 Mair, “Buddhism,” 722f. In footnote 4, at the bottom of page 722 Mair mistakenly derives P sakāya from Sanskrit satkāya (meaning "personality"). It seems that Mair is unfamiliar with the case endings in P. The stem word is saka and the S root is svaka. sakāya is instrumental fem. sing. (sometimes read as locative which has the identical case ending).
Brahma to persuade him to turn the wheel of dharma. In one *sutta* important to the later Chan tradition (*Atthatasutta* SN 4, 400-401),\(^{359}\) he renounces the use of words altogether, for they only create misunderstandings. Why then was he concerned that his words be learned to the letter? The answer I think is found in the *Nāmasutta* (SN 1, 39-40), where a divine being asks the Buddha,

\[
\text{kiṃsu sabbaṃ addhabhavī kismā bhiyyo na vijjati}
\]

\[
kissassa ekadhammassa sabbe va vasam anvagū ti.
\]

“What is overpowering all, what is unsurpassed? All are under the power of what one thing?”

The Buddha replies,

\[
nāmam sabbaṃ addhabhavi nāma bhiyyo na vijjati
\]

\[
nāmassa ekadhammassa sabbe va vasam anvagū ti.
\]

“Name overpowers all. Nothing surpasses name. All are under the power of this one thing, name.”

*Nāma-rūpa* is the fourth link in the chain of dependent origination. Once consciousness has arisen, depending on it, name and form arises. Once we name things, “reality” begins to take shape and conditions the origin of the six sense fields leading to contact, feeling, craving, etc. and the suffering of *saṃsāra*. So though names are arbitrary, conditioned and non-absolutive, they do have a lot to do with the way we perceive reality, for they “create” the world by superimposition on form which reifies based on our understanding of the nominal concept.

---

\(^{359}\) Chinese equivalent at T02n0099_p0245b09 and T02n0100_p0444c01.

\(^{360}\) *addhabhavi* from the Burmese; *anvabhavi* (“participates in”) from the Śrī Lankan.
Liberation may be achieved only by a clear understanding of the words the Buddha spoke, for only then can we be freed of their afflictive power.
Beginning in his own lifetime and certainly accelerating after he died, the Buddha’s teachings rapidly spread across India and were translated into several different dialects. The transmission process is mirrored in Aśoka’s edicts, where the royal message was modified according to the dialect peculiarities of the areas in which they were erected. Most of the Rock Edicts (RE) have three surviving dialect forms, from the east (Dhauli and Jaugāḍa) and north (Kālsī), northwest (Shābāzgarhī and Mānsehrā) and west (Gīrnar). We have even more witnesses of The Minor Rock Edicts (MRE; 17 for MRE 1 and 7 for MRE 2), although the phonological variation is more limited, because of a more restricted geographical distribution and (perhaps) an attempt to maintain some linguistic uniformity. This was certainly the case with the seven Pillar Edicts (PE) where, although we have as many as seven witnesses extant, they are virtually identical in content, representing the so-called Kanzleisprache or administrative language of Aśoka’s empire.

The Aśokan edicts are the earliest “hard” linguistic evidence we have for the Indian subcontinent, datable with certainty to Aśoka’s reign (c. 272-231) in the middle of the 3rd century BCE just 150 years or so after the Buddha’s parinibbāna. For comparative linguistic purposes they are invaluable for providing an accurate snapshot of the state of the Pkts at that time. In chapters 1 and 2 we argued that the extant scriptures in P, BHS and G are translation remnants from a lost oral transmission dialect called Buddhist Middle Indic (BMI). BMI was a kind of Buddhist lingua franca, a phonologically simplified portmanteau language, free of the most conspicuous differences between the different dialects spoken at that time, and
characterized by loss of conjunct consonants, disappearance or lenition of intervocalic consonants, including replacement of stops by glides, change of aspirate stops to aspirates only, and other features facilitating cross-dialect communication. Because of these phonological simplifications, many homonyms resulted which caused potential confusion when the teachings were later written down. We are able to reconstruct some parts of the BMI lexicon through standard comparative linguistics techniques and are able to establish, with some degree of confidence, what the this underlying stratum must have looked like to give rise to the witnesses that have survived as translations of it. All the Pkt$s show BMI influence, but P, and even more so BHS have been obscured by subsequent later Sanskritizations, while G appears to be the least Sanskritized.

All of the phonological features of BMI are also present to one degree or another in the Aśokan edicts, viz.,

1. weakening (change of voiceless stop > voiced stop, or change of stop > -\text{y}- ) or loss (disappearance of stop or change of -\text{y} -> \emptyset) of intervocalic stops.

2. loss of intervocalic aspirated stops, leaving only the aspiration (\text{bh}, \text{dh}, \text{ph}, etc. > \text{h})

3. loss of most conjunct consonants (consonant clusters), changed to geminates (e.g. -\text{kt} -> -\text{tt}) internally or to single consonants at the beginning of a word (e.g. \text{pr} -> \text{p}).

4. change of various glides ( -\text{y} -> -\text{v} and -\text{v} -> -\text{y}), liquids (-\text{l} -> -\text{r} and -\text{r} -> -\text{l}), labials (-\text{m} -> -\text{v}) and sibilants (\text{s}, \text{s} , \text{s} > \text{s}).

attesting to the advanced phonological state of the Indic languages by the third century BCE. That these changes had already taken place in the Buddha’s lifetime is also highly probable, given the preliminary evidence for the above that we find in the Vedic writings (page 55f), and the propensity for royal rock edicts to be more conservative than the actual state of the Pkt they
are representing. Senart, for example, believed the orthography of the edicts did not always reflect the pronunciation. Conjunct consonants may have been written in that form (in deference to S tatsamas) but were pronounced as geminates, as was the case for the sibilants, which, though sometimes written as retroflex and palatal s- (ś and ś in the northwestern dialects for example), were nevertheless pronounced as a single dental s-. Edgerton has made a similar point with regard to initial conjuncts which were always pronounced as single consonants and therefore did not make position metrically.

The Aśokan edicts are therefore a useful baseline proxy for the phonological state of BMI in the third century BCE, with the caveat that the actual “on the ground” vernacular was probably even more linguistically advanced. The following will present some of the principal evidence, without claiming to be exhaustive, especially from the northwest. In what follows I leave out the “normal” changes of conjunct consonants to geminates, change of sibilants, interchange of -ν- and -γ-, eastern -l- for western -r-, etc., which may all be found in Hultzsch or Mehendale. Instead, I am concentrating on examples which show the advanced phonological state of the Aśokan edicts (e.g. lenition and vanishing of stops, glides, syllables) and other unusual phenomena.

361 Lüders, Beobachtungen, 9, introduction by Waldschmidt, “Nach Lüders’ Ansicht war die Umgangsprache der Aśoka-Zeit schon weiter entwickelt als die Kanzleisprache, in die dann gelegentlich volkstümlichere Formen eingedrungen wären.”

362 See above footnote 131.


364 Hultzsch, Inscriptions; M.A. Mehendale, Historical Grammar of Inscriptional Prakrits (Poona: Deccan College Postgraduate and Research Insitute, 1997).
A. Dropping of intervocalic stops or glides.  

1) Rock Edict (RE) 1 A\textsuperscript{366} 13 A (Shāhbāzgarhī =Sh): -\textit{y-} > \emptyset: (S) \textit{devānāmpriyasya} > (Sh) \textit{devanapriasa}; RE 1 E,F (Sh): \textit{devanapia, devanapria} ("beloved of the gods").

2) RE 1F, 13A: (S) \textit{priyadarśinah} > (Sh) \textit{priadraśisa, priadraśisa} ("au regard amical,"\textsuperscript{367} Proper name).

3) RE 13 AA: S \textit{ihalaukika} > (Kālsī=K Sh) \textit{hidalokika} > (Mānsehrā=M) \textit{ialokika} ("in this world").\textsuperscript{368} See also RE 9 M: (S) \textit{iha} > (Kālsī = K M) \textit{hida} > (Sh) \textit{ia} ("here"). Mehendale suggests that the correct derivation is \textit{*idha} > \textit{*hidha} > \textit{hida}.\textsuperscript{369}

4) RE 4 C: (S) \textit{sthavira} > (Gir) \textit{thaira} (P \textit{thera}). This word only occurs in Gir. The other REs use the word \textit{vudha} or \textit{mahālaka} for "elder."

\textsuperscript{365} Adapted (with some modification) from Levman, "Aśokan Phonology," 65f.
\textsuperscript{366} See footnote 97. Capital letters (A etc.) refer to location of the text with the rock inscription as per the Hultzsch system of notation, found in his \textit{Inscriptions of Aśoka} monograph (1969).
\textsuperscript{367} Bloch \textit{Inscriptions}, 90-1.
\textsuperscript{368} This would also require a change from -\textit{h-} > -\textit{d-} which would be unusual. Bloch (§10) attributes the \textit{h}- before initial vowel as due to "l'expressivité." Alfred C. Woolner, \textit{Asoka Text and Glossary, Part 1. Introduction, Text. Part 2. Glossary} (Lahore: Oxford University Press (Printed at the Baptist Mission Press), 1924), 149, also derives \textit{hida} < (S) \textit{iha}.
\textsuperscript{369} M.A. Mehendale, \textit{Aśokan Inscriptions in India} (Bombay: University of Bombay, 1948), 12. Johansson connects \textit{hida} with Vedic \textit{idā} (in Mehendale, ibid).
5) Pillar Edict (PE) 5 B: (S) kādamba > kāamba (“goose with dark grey wings.”) In Ardha-Māgadhī (AMg.) the word is kayambaga or kayambaya or kālamba; kāamba in Māhārāṣṭrī.

6) RE 1 E: (S) *ekatya > *ekatiya > (K Jauḍā=J) ekatiyā, > (M) ekatiya, > (Gir) ekacā, > (Sh) ekatia (“some”).

7) RE 13 B: Skt: dvyardha > (K M Erīgudī=Erī) diyadha, > (Sh) diadhha (“one and a half”).

8) RE 13 X: (S) vijayitavya > (Sh) vijetavia. Derivation: vijayitavya > (K) vijayitaviya > (Sh) vijetavia (“to be conquered”).

9) RE 5 E, RE 5 N: (S) mama > (Sh M) maa (“mine”). Bühler reads mafiḥaj for Sh. See also RE 3 C for Sh maa.

10) Nig A: (S) caturdaśa > *caurdaśa > *caudasa > codasa (“fourteen”).

---


371 Per Pischel §244.

372 M. A. Mehendale, "North-Western (and Western) Influence on the Mysore Edicts of Aśoka," *Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bombay*, Sārdha-Śatābdī Special Volume, Vols. 31 & 32 (1956/57), 164 changes his mind on this compound and later decides it is just a simple compound of di + aḍha. Lüders, *Beobachtungen*, 78, footnote 2, believes it is derived from S dv Yadha.

373 In Hultzsch, *Inscriptions*, 56, footnote 13. [ ] indicate reconstruction.
Of the examples above, the loss of the glide -y- (examples 1, 2, 6, 7, and 8) may be more orthographic in nature than phonological, as the phonetic difference between -iya and ia is unclear.

B. Lenition of intervocalic voiceless to voiced stop

1) Bhabhra edict (north of Jaipur) E: (S) adhikṛtya > adhigicya (“regarding”).

2) Separate Edict (Sep. Ed.) 2 H: (S) ihalokam > (Dhauli=Dh) hidalokam > (J) hidalogam (“in this world”). (S) paralokam > (Dh) palalokam > (J) palalogam (“in the other world”). Lüders believes that the lenition -k- > -g- has to do with how the word was pronounced (as loga, not loka) and the underlying etymology of loka derived from lujyate = rujyate = P lujjati (“it falls apart,” SN 4, 528).\(^{374}\)

3) Separate Edict 2 K (S) acala > (Dh) ajalā > (J) acala (“unshakeable”).

4) Pillar Edict (PE) 7 SS: (S) dharmalipi > dhammalipi > dhammālibi (“religious edict”), also > RE 1 A, et al. (Sh M) dhramadipi, with an unusual l- > d- change which Woolner says is Iranian in origin.\(^{375}\) For change -l- > d-, see also PE 5 B where (S)

\(^{374}\) Lüders, *Beobachtungen*, §87. SN 4, 528: lujjati kho bhikkhu tasmā loko ti vuccati, “It falls apart, monk, therefore it is called ‘world,’.”

\(\text{ḍuli} > \text{(Delhi-Toprā = Top.) dalī, but > (Allāhābād-Kosam=All.) duḍī (“turtle”). PE 5 C also has another example of change -ḍ- > -ḷ-, i.e.(S) \(\text{ḍakā} > \text{(Top.) elakā (“ram”).}
\)
Also RE 2 A: (S) \(\text{keralā} > \text{(Sh) keraḍa (PN)}\) \text{and RE 9 C: (S) mahilā > (Gir) mahiḍā (“woman”).}

5) Rummindei (Rum = Lumbinī) Pillar B: (S) \(\text{vikṛta} > \text{vigaḍa (“decorated”).}\)

6) Nigālī Sāgar (west of Lumbinī) A: (S) \(\text{stūpe} > \text{thube (“relic-shrine”).}

7) Queen’s Edict (Allahabad, east India) B, PE 7 R: \(\text{ambāvṛtikā} > \text{ambāvaḍikā (“mango grove”).} \text{vaḍikā} < *\text{vartikā} < \text{(S) vṛtikā (vṛti + ka).}

8) Separate Edict 1 X, also PE 4 H: (S \(\text{śakṣyatha, śakṣyanti,) > caghatha, caghaṃti (“You/they will be able”). -ṣy- would normally go to -kh-, -ch- or -jh- but not to gh.\)
\text{The sequence must have been śakṣyati > cakhati > caghati.}

9) PE 7 S: (S) \(\text{aṣṭan} > \text{aḍha. (“eight”). Wells were dug every eight \text{kos which represents approx. 9 miles or a day’s march for an army.\) Some have argued for a meaning ardha (“half”).}

\text{\textsuperscript{376} For different suggestions on the meaning of this word, see M. Deeg, \textit{The Places Where Siddhārtha Trod: Lumbinī and Kapilavastu.} (Lumbini: Lumbini International Research Institute, 2003), 18-21.\textsuperscript{377} Pischel §317-22, §326.\textsuperscript{378} Hultzsch, \textit{Inscriptions}, 135. The first 'S' refers to the section marking in Hultzsch, the second to Sanskrit. For a discussion the meaning of \text{aḍha} (whether "eight" or "half") see Woolner, \textit{Asoka Glossary}, 56.}
10) PE 5 B: (S) sāṃkuci > samkuja ("an aquatic animal").

11) RE 5 F: (S) hāpayasyati > (Sh) hapeśadi ("he will omit").

12) RE 5 J: (S) hitasukha > (K Sh M) hidasukha ("welfare and happiness"). Only Dh and Erṛ preserve the voiceless -t-.

Although the voicing of unvoiced stops is more common than the devoicing (which follows below in Section C.), there is no uniformity on this issue (see page 85 for a discussion of Lüders’ and Mehendale’s views), which may well be an MIA as a second language problem; as I mentioned above (page 111), voicing/devoicing is not a meaningful contrast in some of the indigenous Indian languages. I will discuss this in greater detail in chapter 10 below.

C. Devoicing of intervocalic voiced to voiceless stops (fortition).

1) RE 6 D: (S) vṛaja > (Gir K Dh Erṛ) vaca, > (Sh M) vṛaca ("cow-pen").

2) RE 5 J: (S) kaṃboja > (Dh) kaṃboca (Name of a people).

3) RE 8 E: (Gir Dh) tatopayā, (K Erṛ) tatopayā, (Sh) tatopayāṃ, (M) tatopaya ("suitable").

What this word is derived from is a mystery. If it is derived from tād-upa-ka as per PED (s. v. Ta˚: P = tadūpiya, “agreeable,” “pleasant”), then K Sh and M are an example of devoicing -d- > -t-. The S prototype is probably tādā + upaga >
tadopaga > tadopaya ("suitable for that occasion"), which is a further example of lenition, -g- > -y-. 379

4) Sep. Ed. 1 C, M: (S) pratipadayeyam > (J) patipātayeham ("I may produce"). Dh has the voiced -d-. At section M, Jaugada has patipātayema ("you should practice"), with Dh -d-. Sep. Ed. 2 C also has patipātayeham. An interesting example of devoicing in two eastern locations corroborating Mehendale’s position that devoicing, not voicing is an eastern characteristic. 380

5) RE 13 Q: (S) Magā > (K Sh M Erṛ) Makā (PN). Only Gir preserves the voiced -g-. In the same section we also find Antiyoge (K M) for Antiochus (Ἀντίoχoς) with devoicing in Sh and Erṛ (Aṃtiyoko/Aṃtiyoke) and in RE 2 A, in Gir (Aṃtiyako).

6) MRE 1381: (S) ārogyam > (Erṛ) ārokaṁ ("health").

D. Change of intervocalic stop to a glide.

1) RE 13 C: dhāṃmavāyo (Gir), dhāṃmavāye (K), dhramavaye (M), dhāṃmāvāye (Erṛ). vāyo is obscure; per Sheth382 it refers to, inter alia, vāda ("discourse"), vāka ("speaking"), vāta ("wind"), all of which are appropriate in the context. It is unlikely to

379 Bloch, Inscriptions, 94, footnote 8
380 Mehendale, Some Aspects of Indo-Aryan Linguistics, 63.
381 Bloch, Inscriptions, 151, line 20.
be originally *vāya* in the sense of “leader” or “weaver,” the normal meaning of *vāya*. Bloch calls it “obscure.”

2) RE 13 M (S) āṭavika > (Gir) ataviyo (“forest inhabitant”).

3) RE 5 J: (S) kaṃboja > (Sh) kaṃboya (Proper Name).

4) RE 1 D: (S) rājā > (Sh) raya (“king”).

5) RE 1 C: (S) samāje > (Sh) samayapi (“in the assembly”; loc. ending -asmin > -aspin > -aspi; see below, G.4 “various other unusual changes”)

6) PE 1 E: (S) *gevaka > gevayā (“the low ones”). *√gev, √khev, √kev, √sev are all related and mean “to serve.” The kṛt-aka ending has been added to the root and changed to -aya. Norman suggests that *gevayā* is a mistake for *sevayā*, but there is no need to postulate a mistake as *√gev* is a valid root.

7) RE 5 G: (S) supradāraka (su+ pra + √dṛ) > (K Dh Eṭṭ) supadālaye, > (M) supadarave ([sins are] “easy to be dispersed”). Gir and Sh have sukaraṇī (“easy to commit”).

The original S word could also be viewed as a gerundive (*supradārya*), with an


epenthetic vowel added. Interchange of -y- and -ν- is common in the Pkts including P.385

8) PE 7 EE: (S) śucitā > socave, > PE 2 C (Delhi-Mīrāṭh= Top, Mīr., All.) socaye, (Lauṛiyā-Ararāj =Ar., Lauṛiyā-Nandangarh =Nand., Rāmpūrvā =Rām.) soceye (“purity”). P form is soceyya. The change -i- > -e- and -u- > -o- is explainable as a guṇa form; -i- > -a- is unusual but possible under the influence of the back vowel -o-.

9) PE 4 D: (S) atapatike > atapatiye (“discretion”).386

10) Sep. Ed. 1 N: (S) anāvṛttika/anāyuktika387 > (Dh J) anāvuttiya (“lack of practice”388 or “obstinacy”389).

E. Change of intervocalic aspirated stops > -h-

1) PE 6 C: (S) vidadhāmi > vidahāmi (“I establish”).

2) PE 7 KK: (S) laghu > lahu (“light,” “little”).

385 Pischel, §254; Geiger, Pāli Grammar, §46.
386 Hultzsch, Inscriptions, 124 footnote 3; Lüders, Philologica, 277.
387 The second suggestion is per Mehendale, Aśokan Inscriptions, 11, but it is quite a complex derivation, involving a change of -ν- > -y-.
388 Hultzsch, Inscriptions, 14.
3) RE 4 H: (S Gir) bhavati > (Sh) bhoti > (K Dh M Eṛṛ) > hoti.

4) PE 7 R: (S) nyagrodha > nigoha (“Banyan tree”).

5) Sep. Ed. 2 H: (S) labheyuḥ > (Dh) lahevu > (J) laheyū (“they may obtain”)

6) RE 4 C: (S) bahubhiḥ > (Gir Dh) bahūhi, > (K Sh M) bahuhi.

F. Simplification of two syllables into one:

1) Separate Kalinga Edict B: (S) nagaravyāvahārika (from vi-ā-ava+ḥṛ) > (Dh J) > nagalaviyohālakā (“business of the city,” “administration of justice in the city”).

vyāva- > viyāva- > viyo (-āva- > -o-).

2) RE 5 E: (S) kariṣya(n)ti > (Gir) kāsati, (Sh) kaśaṃti, (M) kaṣati, > (K Dh Eṛṛ) kachaṃti (“he/they will do”). Here we have -ari- > -a- and -ṣy- > -s- or -ṣy- > -ch-. Normal change of -ṣy- is to -ss- or -h- as in gamihii< <gamiṣyat (“he will go”) or P kāhāmi <kariṣyāmi (“I will do”).

390 Notated by Hultzsch -chh- (Inscriptions, 87) and by Bloch -cch- (Inscriptions, 102) but in Brāhmī only -ch- as far as I can tell from Hultzsch’s plate (page 88, RE 5, line 2, middle and end).

391 In Ardhamāgadhī per Pischel §523.
3) PE 5 E: (S) kṣapayitavya > jhāpetaviye (“to be burnt”)

4) RE 4 E: (S) vardhayisyati > (Gir Dh) vaddhayisati, (K) vaddhiyisati, (M) vadhrayiśati, > (Sh) vadhīṣati (“will cause to grow”).

5) RE 5 F: (S) hāpayisyati > (K Dh) hāpayisati, > (Gir) hāpesati > (M) hapesati > (Sh) hapeśadi (“he will omit”). Note the double change in Sh -aya- > -e- and lenition of -ati > -adi.

6) RE 4 B: (S) darśayati > (M) draśeti (“he displays”). All the other versions have an absolutive (dassayitpā in Gir and dassayitu in the others).

7) RE 13 O: (S) samacarya > (Gir) samacairam (“spiritual calm”; Sh has samacariyam and K ʂamacaliyam). Derivation of Gir is samacarya > samacariya > samacaira.

8) RE 13 X: (S) vijayitavya > (Gir) vijetavyaṃ, > (Sh) vijetavia. K maintains syllables (vijayataviya), while Erṛ has vijetaviyaṃ (“to be conquered”).

9) RE 6 F: (S) ājñapayāmi > (M) anapemi (“I order”). Other REs maintain the 5 syllabic structure (e.g. Sh anapayam).
10) RE 5 J: (S) vyāṛta > (Gir) vyāpatā, > (K Dh) viyāpatā, > (Sh) vapata, > (M) vapaṭa

(“busy,” “engaged”). It is not clear whether vyāṛta was pronounced as three syllables or four; certainly in the east it was four.\textsuperscript{392}

G. Various other unusual changes:

1) Change of -ṣy- > -ss- (normal) and -h- (rarer). Separate Edict 2 M: (S) eṣyatha > (Dh) eḥatha > (J) essatha (“you will discharge”). See section F 2) above.

2) Change of t- > c- (\[+anterior\] > \[-anterior\]) at the beginning of a word. RE 5, 7, 9, 12, 13:

(S) tu- > (K Dh M Sh Er) cu. Bloch suggests that cu is a combination of tu and ca, “que la prose brahmanique ancienne emploie avec sens adversatif.” \textsuperscript{393} It does not appear in the \textit{Ṛg Veda}. Another example is in RE 4 F: (S) tiṣṭhantaḥ > (Gir) tiṣṭāmto, (Sh) tiṭhiti, > (K Dh M Er) ciṭhitu (“abiding”). It appears that the high front vowel tends to reduce affrication.

\textsuperscript{392} See, for example, Whitney, \textit{Grammar}, §129 (c) where vi+arīga is pronounced viyaṛīga, rather than vyaṛīga. The change of four syllables into three is a form of lenition.

\textsuperscript{393} Bloch, Inscriptions, §50. Words appearing between square brackets are phonetic features, representing a natural group of sounds like consonants, nasals, anterior sounds, etc. \ [+anterior\] sounds are articulated in the front of the alveopalatal region, \ [-anterior\] at the back. For a brief description see William O’Grady and Michael Dobrovolsky, \textit{Contemporary Linguistic Analysis} (Toronto: Copp Clark Pitman Ltd. 1987), 45-50.
3) RE 12 D (S) garhaṇa or garhā > (Gir) garahā, (K Eṛṛ) galahā, (Sh) garana, (M) garaha ("blame"). Gir K and M may be viewed as Ø > -a-, insertion of an epenthetic vowel in garhā; Sh garana is either -aha- > -ana- or -h- > Ø from (S) garhaṇa.

4) RE 12 H: (S) ātman > (Gir) ātpa > (K Sh M Eṛṛ) ata ("self"). The appa-form of ātman (P atta-) is well attested in Ardhamāgadhī and Māgadhī.394 The Brāhmī script shows a conjunct consonant with a pa-on top of a ta-, which is normally read ātpa. Pischel says that it should be read āpta-by way of transposition of stops ātma- > *atva- > *ātpa- > āpta- >atta (P.), based on the rule of consonant assimilation that between equals (-p- and -t- being equals) the second prevails.395 If the reading were ātpa as Hultzsch has interpreted it in RE 12 Gir, then the normal derivation is appa, which is only found in AMg. - most reflexes (P and the other REs) are atta- or atva in M (and in the GDhp) and ātpa in Gir, see below. The change of -m- > -v- is fairly common in MIA396 but the change -v- > -p- is uncommon, it usually being the other way around, as a form of intervocalic lenition.397 Munda characteristically has an interchange of -m- and -p-.398 We find a similar change with aspiration, in RE 13 B (K) tasmāt > taspāt > taphāt > tapphā ("therefore") and in Separate Edict 2, I, L: (S) asma > asme > *aspe > (J D.) appe ("we," written as aphe) and (S) yuṣma > yuṣme >

394 Pischel §277.
395 Woolner, Introduction to Prakrit, §33; Pischel §270
396 Pischel §251
397 Pischel §199
*tuṣme > *tuṣpe > tupphe ("you" pl., written as tuphe). The -v- > -p- phenomenon seems to be most prevalent in the west and northwest. See, for example, RE 4 B:

(Gir) dassyātipā < (S) dāsyātvā; RE 9 H also attests to this change in Sh and M where (S) svāmika > (Sh M) spamika ("master") and RE 6 L shows the same change in (S) svarga > (Sh M) spagra, > (Gir K Dh) svagga ("heaven"). RE 10 A has (Gir) tadātpano < (S) *tadātvanam > (K Dh) tadatvāye, and > (Sh M) tadatvaye ("present time"). In RE 12 F passim, the Mānsehrā edict shows several versions of atva-, while Gir has ālpa-, K Sh and Eṛṛ ata ("self"). In the minor rock edicts MRE 1 H, several locations (Br. Eṛṛ Pān. Rāj Ude) have mahātpa for (S) mahātmā ("great soul") which Mehendale sees as a northwest influence on these southern rock edicts; in the same section there is also a (common) -p- > -v- change: (S) prāptum > (Sah.) pāvatave with other versions showing pāpotave ("to achieve").

5) RE 5 B: (S) kalyāṇa > (Gir) kalāṇam, > (Sh) kalanām > (K Dh Eṛṛ) kāyāne, > (M)

kalyāṇam ("beneficial"). -ly- usually goes to -l- in AMg., i.e. it is an eastern form; however Dhauli has kāyāne which normally results from -ry- > -yy-. This would change the meaning of this phrase from "it is difficult to perform virtuous deeds" to "it is difficult to do that which has to be done" assuming the form kārya can take the suffix -ana- (*kāryaṇa, which is not attested). The normal -r- > -l- change for eastern

---

399 See Hultzsch, Inscriptions, cvi, "Pronouns of the second person."
401 Pischel §367a
402 Pischel §287, in Māgadhī.
forms would also add to the potential confusion as to what the correct underlying
form was; i.e. assuming that the exemplar originated from an eastern locale (i.e.,
Pātaliputra, where Aśoka’s court was located) *kāryana would have been
pronounced/written as kālyana or kalyana which could easily have been
interpreted as being derived from kalyaṇa, with a completely different meaning.

6) RE 13 U: (Gir) ladhā, (Sh Erṛ) ladha, (K) gadhā < (S) labdha = “obtained,” or gadhā <
(S) gādha, “firm” or related to P gāhati, “to stand firm” or < (S) *grbdhā, p.p. of
√grah/grbh, “to grasp”).

7) Sep. Ed. 1 Z: (Dh): sakhinālambhe, usually interpreted as derived from S ślakṣṇa,
“gentle” + ārambha, “undertaking,” viz., “whose undertaking is soft,” counterposed
against Jaugāḍa version’s aphalusāṃ (“kind”). Since the compound is proceeded by
acanḍe (< S acanda, “soft”) which means the same thing, and ārambha is
superfluous in this context, it is more likely derived from sākṣiṇa + ārambha
(“undertaking it with his own eyes,” i.e. “seeing it for himself”) with sākṣina probably
nom. sing. rather than sākṣinā, instr. singular. sākṣin > sakhin, seems a much
simpler derivation than ślakṣṇa > saksṇa > saksīṇa > sakhina.

403 The -ā- shortened to -ă- because of the following double consonant per Geiger, Pāli Grammar, §5.
405 Pischel §406.
406 Pischel §317.
8) PE 4 D: **atapatiye** usually taken as derived from **ātma + patya** (“depending on one’s self”);\(^{407}\) but more likely **patiye** is derived from (S) **pratyaya** > (AMg.) **patteya** \(^{408}\) > (P.) **pattiya > patiya** (“believing, trusting, relying”).

9) RE 9 I: S **saṃśayita > (K) saṃsayikye** and (Sh) **saśayike** (M) **saśayike** (“doubtful,” “questionable”). Change of -t- > -k- is very unusual. cf **Kaccāyanabyākaraṇām Sandhikappo, Dutiyakaṇḍo, Sutta 20.27** which gives an example in P **niyato > niyako** (both meaning “restrained,” “bound”).\(^{409}\)

10) RE 9 B: (K) **pajopadāye**, (Dh Ṛṛṛ) **pajupadāye**, (M) **prajopadaye** (“birth of children”), (Sh) **pajupadane** (“obtaining of children”). Norman thinks that the -ane in Sh is just a mistake and that -aye is the correct locative ending;\(^{410}\) from the fem. stem **utpad** ;\(^{411}\) Sh could well come from S **paj-upādāna** (“appropriating children to oneself) which has the same meaning as **putra- lābhesu** in Gir (“acquisition of children”). There is a similar change of -y- > -p- in the Dhp vs. 33-b where P has **dunnivārayaṅm** (“hard to guard,” “hard to check”) and the **Udānavarga** (31.8-b) has **durnivāraṇam**. P shows both forms with the same meaning. The oldest is probably **nivāraṇa** which evolved

---


\(^{408}\) Lakshmi Narayan Tiwari, ed., **Kaccāyanavyākaraṇāṃ of Kaccāyana Mahāthera with the Commentary by Mahāvijitāvī Thera** (Varanasi: Dr. Harish Chandra Mani Tripathi, Publication Officer, Sampurnanand Sanskrit University, 1992), 47.


\(^{410}\) Hultzsch, *Inscriptions*, 38, footnote 22.
to nivāraya and was later re-Sanskritized in the UV. Change of -y- > -n/ṇ- is rare in Pkt, but the interchange of the two sounds is fairly common in Munda, at least at the beginning of a word.412

11) RE 4 C: (S) yāḍṛśā > (K) ādisā, > (Dh) ādisē, > (M) adiśe, > (Sh) yadiśaṃ > (Gir) yārise (“such as”). Loss of -d- in (Gir) and retention of -r- is unusual. This also applies to correlative (S) tāḍṛśa > (Gir) tārisē in the same RE.

12) PE 5 H: (S) caturdaśa > cāvudasa (“fourteen”). Change of -t- > -v-.

13) RE 1 G: (S) mayūra > (K J) majūlā > (Sh M) majura > (Gir) morā (“peacock”). Note change of -ayū- > -o- in Gir Change of -y- to -j- was common in at least one of the Pkts.413

14) RE 2 A: (S) kerala > (Gir) ketala (PN). Unusual change of -r- > -t-. M preserves original and K has kelala. Omitted in Err

15) RE 3 B: (S) dvādaśa > (Gir) dbādasa, (K) duvāḍasa, > (Dh) duvādasa, > (M) duvaḍaśa, > (Sh) badaya (“twelve”). dv- usually goes to d-,414 but can also go to b-

412 Kuiper, Aryans, 37.
413 Norman “Buddhism and Regional Dialects 88-89.
414 Pischel §298.
as is evident here and in numerous other examples, where the -v- > -b- and the d- > Ø. Thus when a translator (who is perhaps familiar with Northwestern dialects) encounters a form like *vedha* (*Mahāparinibbānasutta* DN 2, 100), it can be legitimately interpreted as *dvaidha* (in the *Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra*) as is attested.

16) RE 13 Q: (S) *catvāraḥ*, > (Gir) *catpāro*, > (K Ṛṛṛ) *catāli*, > (Sh) *cature* (“four”). Change of -v- > -p- in Gir (see #4 above) and -v- > Ø in the others.

17) RE 2 B: (S) *upta* > (Sh) *vuta* (“sown”) from √vap). Could also be derived from √vṛdh, p.p. *vṛddha* (“grown”) but this usually takes the form of *vudha* in Sh as for example in RE 4 C.

18) RE 9 G: (S) *gurūnām* > (Sh) *garuna*. The other forms maintain the -u- in the first syllable. However in RE 13 G, Sh has *guruna* and K has *galu*. In MRE 1 N, Br. and Ṛṛṛ both have *garu*.

19) RE 5 K: a strange situation with Gir and Sh using the word *aparigodha* (“no attachment,” see BHSD, s. v. *paligodha*) and K Dh and M *apalibodha* (“no obstruction”), from a different root. See discussion in Woolner. *godha* is derived from √gṛdh (“to covet, desire”) and *palibodha* perhaps from *pari + vṛdha* (“to

---

415 Pischel §300
obstruct") by dissimilation (PED s. v. \textit{palibuddhati}: \textit{pariruddhati} > *\textit{paribuddhati} > \textit{palibuddhati}).

Although the rationale for many of the above changes is not immediately clear, the list nevertheless well illustrates the range of textual variants which occurs in the PktS. One of the more interesting is the four different forms of the word \textit{ātman}, where we find \textit{appa} (AMg), \textit{atva} (M and GDhp), \textit{ātpa} (Gir and MRE1) and \textit{at(t)a} (K Sh Eṛṛ P). As Mehendale has suggested, the changes do seem to have a north-western origin where -\textit{m-} > -\textit{v-} and -\textit{v-} > -\textit{p-} are often found (\textit{ātman} > \textit{atva} > \textit{atpa} > \textit{appa}; or, with stops transposed, a common case of metathesis, \textit{apta} > \textit{atta}).

\textbf{Discussion and Conclusions}

The most phonologically malleable of the dialects - and therefore closest to the postulated BMI \textit{lingua franca} - is Shābhāzgarhī, an early form of G written in Kharoṣṭhī script. Here we find several examples of intervocalic stops and glides dropping out, a phenomenon which is even more prevalent in the G \textit{Dharmapada}.\textsuperscript{419} Mānsehrā is also a G dialect, but not as phonologically advanced as Sh. Lenition of intervocalic voiceless stops > voiced stops occurs not just in Sh, but also occasionally in the Pillar and Separate Edicts, including Rum, Nig and Qu, but not invariably so. Mānsehrā usually preserves the voiced stops, while change of intervocalic stops to a glide is present in Sh M Gir and the PEs. Most cases of consonantal disappearance between vowels are found in Sh and many cases of syllable simplification. The

\textsuperscript{419} Brough, GDhp, §32-34.
influence of the north-western dialects on the other Pkts is also evident in other ways, as in the different forms of ātman, described above where changes -m- > -v- and -v- > -p- appear to originate in this region; earlier (page 50f) I have discussed the influence of the northern and north-western dialects on the formation of P, which I concluded was more significant than the influence of the western dialects.

The Gir dialect has several anomalies: it preserves the initial t- in words like tu and tistamito, whereas most of the other dialects change to cu and cititlu, except for Sh and M which show both the tu and cu forms; M has cititlu and Sh tititi. Gir is also the only dialect to preserve the form yārīsa < yādṛśa, with the other dialects keeping the -d- and losing the -r-. Gir also preserves the unusual forms ātpa or āpta (< S ātman, suggesting a derivation from the north-west via M and GDhp atva, i.e. ātman > atva > ātpa), and dassayitpā (< S darśayitvā) and catpāro (< S catvāraḥ). These changes are also phonologically similar to the eastern (J Dh) words aphe (< asma) and tuphe (< yuṣma) and the north-western (Sh M) words spamika (< Ssvāmika) and -aspi (loc. sing. S < -asmin, e.g. vracaspi, "in the cow-pen," RE 6 D and passim). The Buddha lived and taught in the north-east. Why then would BMI be most similar to G in the north-west, as the facts seem to suggest here?

1) This may be just a coincidence, as we do not know the exact time-line of BMI and G evolution and how and whether they interfaced. Early transmitters of the buddhavacana may have deliberately simplified the phonology of the Buddha’s teachings to make them more
accessible to those of the *sarīgha* who spoke other dialects\(^4^{20}\) or to those for whom MIA was a second language. Omission or lenition of intervocalic consonants, assimilation of sibilants, dropping of aspirated consonants, etc., would remove many of the characteristic differences between dialects and provide a “common denominator” which allowed for easier comprehension.\(^4^{21}\)

2) On the other hand the change of OI > MI was a natural and ongoing, diachronic process of simplification, the seeds of which were present in the Vedic writings themselves.\(^4^{22}\) Since the Aryan immigration came from the north-west and by the Buddha’s time had been in progress for over a millennium, it is not surprising that the north-western Pkt which evolved from OI would be the most phonologically advanced and simplified of all the vernaculars and a natural medium for a *lingua franca* or *Verkehrssprache*, a homogenized, supra-regional language for all of northern India. In which case, the Buddha - or more likely his followers - would have simply adopted what was already in place. This will be discussed in more detail in chapter 13.\(^4^{23}\)

3) and 4) The sociolinguistic influence of the prestigious north-western dialect, and the importance of the Karoṣṭhi script, are two other potentially important factors, already discussed above (page 53).

\(^{4^{20}}\) Norman, “The Dialects in which the Buddha Preached,” 75 (1980), 144 (1991) suggests that “the Buddha varied the dialect of his preaching to meet local requirements.”

\(^{4^{21}}\) See discussion above page 97.

\(^{4^{22}}\) See footnote 195.

\(^{4^{23}}\) Several scholars have taken this position with respect of G; for references see footnote 1546.
Part Two

In the following four chapters (Six to Nine) I discuss approximately sixty-four cases of ambiguities in the transmission of the Buddha’s teachings - cases where we are not exactly certain what was said, or where we are fairly certain what was said but not certain what was meant. Most of these ambiguities result from the oral nature of the transmission process and the language medium in which they were transmitted: the north Indian *lingua franca* which we have been describing in earlier chapters, which, as a simplified and malleable form of communication was often open to homonymic interpretation. Part Two therefore presents the evidence for the following types of transmissional ambiguities (hereinafter marked A + number);

1) ambiguities (open to more than one interpretation) due to the elision or lenition of intervocalic stops in the underlying transmission

2) ambiguities due the change of aspirated stops to aspirate only in the underlying transmission.

3) ambiguities due to the assimilation of conjunct consonants.

4) ambiguities due to the interchange of glides, sibilants, nasals or other vowels/consonants.

5) ambiguities due to oral transmission issues - garbling, metathesis, word or letter deletion, epenthetic vowel insertion, consonant and vowel change, phonological confusion, hyperforms (misunderstood translations) and others.

6) ambiguities due to grammatical misunderstanding, or etymology.

7) ambiguities which are phonologically related but unexplainable.

8) ambiguities which are not phonologically related.
As the reader will discover, although we can often identify - with some degree of confidence - the phonological content of the underlying transmission, we can not always be certain what meaning(s) was/were intended by it. Nevertheless the study gives us a much better understanding of the practice and process of the buddhavacana transmission and the uncertainties that lie therein.

In the entries that follow, each ambiguity will be identified by a capital “A” (for ambiguity) followed by one of the numbers above (e.g. A1), for ease of classification.
Chapter Six, Ambiguities in the Canon - a Sample Case

As an example of how the comparative procedure works in practice, I begin by showing multivalencies in the phrase *pahitatta* and the related Pkt noun *pahāna*.

*pahitatta* A2

The compound *pahitatta* is a common expression in the P writings. Its first occurrence in the *Dīgha Nikāya* is in the *Mahāsīhanādasutta*. Here the Buddha describes true ascetic practice to the Ājīvika Kassapa. A true ascetic is not just one who practices austerities, but who has perfected his morality, his heart and wisdom. What are these perfections? Practicing the ten moralities, guarding the sense doors and attaining the four *jhānas*, gaining the superknowledges and insight into the nature of things, so he becomes free from corruption.

At the end of the *sutta*, Kassapa enters the *saṅgha* and

> alattha … eko vūpakaṭṭho appamatto ātāpi pahitatto viharanto, na cirass’ eva yass’ atthāya kula-puttā sammad eva agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajanti tad anuttaraṃ brahma-cariya-

---

424 238 occurrences in various inflected forms, using the Digital Pali Reader as a search engine. This section first appeared in Bryan Levman, "What does the Pāli phrase pahitatta mean?" *Thai International Journal for Buddhist Studies*, (2012): 57-74, and is reprinted with the journal's permission (with minor revisions).

425 DN 1, 174^{11-13}: *imāya ca kassapa, sīla-sampadāya citta-sampadāya paññā-sampadāya aṇṇā sīla-sampadā citta-sampadā paññā-sampadā uttaratarā vā pañītatarā vā n’ atthi.* "And, Kassapa, there is nothing further or more perfect than this perfection of morality, of the heart and of wisdom" (Walshe, *Long Discourses*, 155).

426 As detailed in the *Sāmaññaphalasutta*, DN 1, 63-85.
“...living alone, secluded, diligent, zealous, pahitatto, in a short time attained that unsurpassed perfection of the holy life for the purpose of which sons of good families leave home for homelessness, realizing himself in this very life the superknowledges, entering and abiding in them, knowing, ‘Birth is destroyed, the holy life has been lived, done is what had to be done, there is no further coming to being’. And the Venerable Kassapa became an Arahant."

What does pahitatto mean? it is usually translated as “of resolute will” or “master of himself,” being viewed as a complementary facet of appamatto and ātāpi, (both of which have the sense of “diligent” or “resolute”), with a reinforcing, but slightly different emphasis. The word pahita is usually taken to be a past participle of the verb padahati (“to strive, exert”) < S root pra + ṣādhā (pradhāṭi). In the change from Vedic to the Pkt, the voiced aspirates regularly change to aspirates alone, and conjuncts at the beginning of a word simplify to a single consonant.

427 DN 1, 1771-9.
428 A pun which also means “contented with little” (PED s.v. appa).
429 PED s.v. pahita/arahant
430 Voiced aspirates > -h-, per Pischel §188; this change also takes place in G as per Brough 1962, §40. Simplification of word-initial conjuncts is as per Pischel §268. Although consonant + ra was allowed word-initially, it was pronounced as a single consonant, even if preserved per Franklin Edgerton, "The Meter of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies, London, (1934), 43; Edgerton BHSD, §1.38; A. K. Warder, Pali Metre, A Contribution to the History of Indian Literature (London: Published for the Pali Text Society by Messrs. Luzac and Company, Ltd., 1967), 49,
However pahita can also be correctly derived from S pra + ṣṭhā (“to abandon,” relinquish,” past participle prahāṇa/prahīṇa) or pra + ṣṭhā (“despatch, drive away, forsake,” and equivalent to pra + ṣṭhā per MW, past participle prahita). In his commentary Buddhaghosa synonymizes pahitatto with pesitacitto in the following gloss: pahitatto ti kāye ca jīvite ca anapekkhatāya pesitacitto vissaṭṭha attabhāvo.431 “The word pahitatto means ‘a mind pesita without expectation of life or body, a vissaṭṭha person.’”432 The word pesita is the past participle of P peseti (to send forth) < S pra + ṣṭhā peseti which means “to send forth,” but also has the meaning of “dismiss” or “banish.” The word vissaṭṭha (< S vi + ṣṛj P < vissajjati) has a primary meaning of “giving up, setting free, leaving behind,” with secondary meanings “sending forth.” We therefore do not in fact know which of these meanings Buddhaghosa intended with his gloss: a mind “sent forth” (presumably meaning “focused” and a synonym for “diligent”), or a mind “sent away,” “dismissed,” like the meaning of pra+ṣṭhā/pahita which, as we have seen, also has the meaning of “abandoned.” The PED claims that Buddhaghosa was mistaken in his derivation of pahita from pahiṇati (< S pra+ṣṭhā), but as we shall see below, Buddhaghosa was aware of both meanings in pahita and intended both by his gloss. So I would tentatively translate this gloss as follows: “The word pahitatto means a mind banished without expectation of life or body, an individuality cast off.”

---

431 Sv 2, 363." pesitacitto is a variant reading in the Burmese recension. The PTS has pestita’ atto which does not change the meaning. attabhāva has various meanings: CPD: bodily form, body; existence as an individual; living being. PED: (1) person, personality, individuality, living creature; form, appearance, (2) life, rebirth, (3) character, quality of heart.

432 Either “… a mind dismissed without expectation of life or body, a person(ality) given up” or “…a mind concentrated, without expectation of life or body, a focused person,” or both.
Nominal forms

From these two roots - pra + ṭhā and pra + ṭhiḥā, - two nouns developed, pradhāna and prahāṇa which had potentially contradictory meanings: pradhāna, meaning “the most important or essential part of anything” in S, but whose meaning evolved to “exertion” in Sanskritized Pkt (SP).\textsuperscript{433} prahāṇa had the meaning of “weakness,” “disappearance,” “relinquishing,” “abandoning,” “avoiding,” in S; in SP, it meant “abandonment,” and was also used as a synonym for pradhāna, meaning “exertion,” “strenuousness.”\textsuperscript{434} In P, these words were kept separate: P has padhāna meaning “exertion,” “striving” and pahāna, meaning “giving up, abandoning.”

We know that both these words had important doctrinal implications and were in common use in the teachings. The word pahāna occurs over 1,000 times in the P writings and padhāna about 600. In SP prahāṇa is much more common than pradhāna, as the semantic field of the latter has been subsumed by the former. This is a normal development of Pkt phonological evolution, as the aspirated stops regularly change to aspirates and the change of dental -n- to retroflex -ṇ- is also very common.\textsuperscript{435} By the time of the Aśokan edicts (around 250 BCE) the change of aspirated stops to aspirates alone was already taking place in many instances, viz.,

1) Pillar Edict (PE) 6 C: (S) vidadhāmi > vidahāmi (“I establish”).

2) PE 7: (S) laghu > lahu (“light,” “little”).

\textsuperscript{433} MW s.v. pradhāna; BHSD s.v. pradhāna.

\textsuperscript{434} Bothlingk and Roth (P 1112) s.v. prahāṇa: das Weichen, Verschwinden; MW (P 700) s.v. pra-hā, BHSD, (P 389) s.v. prahāṇa.

\textsuperscript{435} See footnote 430 above; for the nasal change see Pischel §224.
3) Rock Edict (RE) 4 H: (S Gir) bhavati > (Sh) bhoti > (K Dh M Eṛṛ) > hoti.

4) PE 7 R: (S) nyagrodha > nigoha (“Banyan tree”).

5) Separate Edict (Sep. Ed.) 2 H: (S) labheyuḥ > (Dh) lahevu > (J) laheyū (“they may obtain”)

6) RE 4 C: (S) bahubhiḥ > (Gir Dh) bahūhi, > (K Sh M) bahuhi.436

Although this does not occur throughout the edicts, there is reason to believe that the Aśokan inscriptions were more conservative than the colloquial languages of the day which were more advanced phonologically.437 P is a composite, artificial, scholarly language normalized for ecclesiastical purposes,438 which was more phonologically advanced than the Aśokan edicts;439 since the change of -dh- → -h- intervocalically is not uncommon in Middle-Indic (parallel passages in SP show this change; see below) and in P itself with respect to all cases of the verb ṣdhā (e.g. S pradhāti > P padahati; vidadhāti > vidahati; dadhāti > dahati; and so with all conjugated forms of the kind prefix + ṣdhā),440 it is reasonable to assume that the change also

---

436 The Arabic numeral refers to the rock edict, the capital letter to the section within, as per Hultzsch, 1969. PE = Pillar Edict, RE = Rock Edict, Sep. Ed. = Separate Edict, Dh = Dhauli, Eṛṛ = Eṛṛaugudi, Gir = Girnār, K = Kālsī, M = Mānsehrā, Sh = Shāhbāzgarhī.

437 Lüders, Beobachtungen, 9. Senart also believed the orthography of the edicts did not always reflect the pronunciation. Conjunct consonants may have been written in that form (in deference to S tattamas) but were pronounced as geminates, as was the case for the sibilants, which, though sometimes written as retroflex and palatal s- (ś and ś in the northwestern dialects for example), were nevertheless pronounced as a single dental s-. See Emile Senart, "The Inscriptions of Piyadasi," The Indian Antiquary, vol. 21 (1892): 145-55.

438 Lüders, Beobachtungen; Norman, Pali Literature, 4; Lamotte, History, 563; von Hinüber, “Oldest Literary Language,” 180f.

439 Lüders, Beobachtungen, 9; Lamotte, History, 573.

440 Although the aspirate was kept in the gerund nidhāya, parallel passages in Ardhamāgadhī dropped it: nidhāya daṇḍam bhūtesu (Sn 629a) > nihāya daṇḍam pānehim in the Āyāramgasutta in W. B. Bollée,
happened in the nominal form, but was later Sanskritized (in P but not in SP) for purposes of disambiguation (pradhāna > pahāna > padhāna).

That is to say, when pradhāna changed to prahāṇa diachronically over time, the word took on both meanings of “diligence” and “abandoning” as a homonym. The use of p(r)adhāna was in fact a Sanskritization, an attempt by the translators of the oral tradition to clarify an ambiguity in the meaning. So, for example, in the Vimalakīrtisūtra, there is only one use of pradhāna, 441 but seven uses of prahāṇa (of which five have the meaning “abandoning” and two “exertion”); in the Mahāvastu (Mvu) there are seven uses of pradhāna and fourteen of prahāṇa; and in the Lalitavistarasūtra (LV) there are seven pradhānas and eleven prahāṇas; in both these sutras, most prahāṇas refer to “abandoning,” some to “exertion” and some are equivocal. 442 Each

---

441 Missing in the Tib but translated as “abandoning” or “eliminating” (此是永斷, cǐ shì yǒng duàn) by Xuanzang in: Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, Vimalakīrtinirdeśa, A Sanskrit Edition Based upon the Manuscript Newly Found at the Potala Palace (Tokyo: The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University, Taisho University Press, 2006), 96: 58b1 Critical edition, footnote 7; Ch: T14n0476_p0580c03). See also Lamotte’s The Treatise On The Great Virtue Of Wisdom Of Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra), with reference to the correct meaning of sammappadhāna: (quoted in French by Gethin, Buddhist Path to Awakening, 70, footnote 7: “In the Pāli sources, sammappadhāna ‘right efforts’; in the Sanskrit sources, samyakprahāṇa ‘right cessations’, translated into Tib as yaṅ dag par spoṅ ba, but glossed as samyakpradhāna in the Kośavyākhyā, P 601, l. 29. The Ch translations give a choice between tcheng cheng or tcheng k’in on the one hand, and tcheng touan on the other hand.” (927). Tib yaṅ dag par spoṅ ba = right abandonment; Ch tcheng cheng = pinyin zheng sheng (?) and tcheng k’in = pinyin zheng qin, 正“right endeavour,” tcheng touan = pinyin zheng duan “right abandoning” (正斷). Compare to P.V. Bapat, “Chinese Madhyamāgama and the Language of its Basic Text,” in B.P. Sinha (ed.), ed., Dr. Satkari Mookerji Felicitation Volume, (Varanasi, 1969), 5, who considered the translation of “abandoning” for prahāṇa a mistake on the part of the Ch translator who “did not understand the dialectical variation in written or spoken forms of Prakrit.”

442 A non-equivocal example: as in Mvu 3.137-15: evam dīrghasmim samsāre snehadveṣa duḥkhītā // snehadveṣṣąprahāṇārtham dharmaṃ caratha nirmamā //
instance must be examined as to context to understand the true meaning of the word - whether “diligence,” “abandoning” (or both).

To return to our example above from the Mahāsīhanādasutta. Does pahitatta mean “resolute self” or “abandoned self”? - both are possible and both may well have been understood by a native speaker of that time. A clue to the compound’s meaning in this context is contained within the sutta itself. In the Buddha’s description of the “perfection of the heart” (cittasampadā), he talks about mastering the four jhānas (meditation states). In the highest or fourth jhāna, we have the following:

punaca param, mahā-rāja, bhikkhu sukhassa capahānā dukkhassa ca pahānā pubb’eva
somanassadomanassānām atthaṅgamā adukkham asukham upekkhā-sati-pārisuddhiṃ
catutthajhānāṃ upasampajja viharati.443

“In this way you, who are suffering because of attachment and hate in long-lasting saṃsāra, practice the dharma for the purpose of abandoning love and hate, free from all worldly connections.”

An example from the Lalitavistara where prahāna is used in the same sentence with different meanings: catvāri samyakprahānāni dhammālokaṃkham sarvākuśaladharmaprahānāya sarvakuśaladharmaparipūrtayai saṃvartate (Vaidya 1958, 24). “The four correct efforts are a means of entrance into the light of the law for the purpose of fulfilling all proper dharmas, for the abandonment of all improper dharmas.” And another example from the Mahāvastu 2.285: iha āśraṇa aśeṣā niravaśeṣā nirudhyanti vyupaśāmyanti prahānam-astam gacchanti“Here the outflows are destroyed completely without remainder, they are quieted, they are abandoned, they vanish.”

443 DN 1, 173. This section is abbreviated in the PTS edition (as it is a repetition of an earlier text) and one must refer to DN 1, 7528–31 for the above quotation.
“And again, great King, with the giving up of pleasure and suffering, and extinguishing of former happiness and melancholy, a monk enters into the fourth meditation state which is beyond pleasure and suffering and purified by mindfulness and equanimity, and he abides there.”

Here is pahāna as a noun, with an unequivocal meaning of “relinquishing”; it can not mean “diligence” in this context. The context suggests that the compound pahitatta describing Kassapa, following closely this statement, may also have the additional connotation of “abandoned self,” along with the usual meaning of “resolute self.” Yet there is still some ambiguity here. One may object that these are separate pericopes and may not have been composed at the same time, and that the latter stock formula concerns striving, not abandonment. However, there are other cases which are perhaps more definitive. In another instance of pahitatta, in the Bhayabheravasutta of the Majjhima Nikāya we find the following where the Buddha describes his enlightenment experience:

Tassa me evaṁ jānato evaṁ passato kāmāsavāpi cittaṁ vimuccittha, bhavāsavā pi cittaṁ vimuccittha, avijjāsavāpi cittaṁ vimuccittha, vimuttaṁ viṁuttaṁ iti ūpānaṁ ahosi; khīṇā jāti, vusitaṁ brahmacariyaṁ, kataṁ karaṇīyaṁ, nāparaṁ itthattāyāti abhaṁñāsīṁ. Ayam kho me brāhmaṇa rattiyā pacchime yāme tatiyā vijjā adhigatā, avijjā vihatta vijjā uppannā, tamo vihatto āloko uppanno, yathā taṁ appamattassa ātāpino pahitatthassa viharato.

This is normally translated as follows: “When I knew and saw thus, my mind was liberated from the taint of sensual desire, from the taint of being, and from the taint of ignorance. When it was liberated there came the knowledge: ‘It is liberated.’ I directly knew: ‘Birth is destroyed, the holy
life has been lived, what had to be done has been done, there is no more coming to any state of being.' This was the third true knowledge attained by me in the last watch of the night.

Ignorance was banished and true knowledge arose, darkness was banished and light arose, as happens in one who abides diligent, ardent, and resolute. “

But the following translation of the last line is also possible and equally or perhaps more apposite: “Ignorance was banished and true knowledge arose, darkness was banished and light arose, as happens in one who abides diligent, ardent, and who has abandoned the self.” Here the context is about enlightenment, so, while striving may still be appropriate, the additional meaning of abandoning the self, which is the core of the enlightenment experience, is almost certainly present. The affliction of the self and its abandonment is one of the oldest and most fundamental of Buddhist teachings.

Another instance where the meaning of “abandoned self” for pahitatta is in the forefront occurs in the Kāyagatāsatisutta (MN 119; 3, 8929-30) where the compound occurs as part of a repeated refrain throughout the sutta: tassa evaṃ appamattassa ātāpino pahitattassa viharato ye gehasitā sarasamkappā te pahīyanti, “As he abides mindful, ardent, pahitatta, his thoughts and memories about the household life are abandoned.” Here the connection of pahitatta with

445 Cf. Sutta Nipāta vs. 800-a and –b:
Attaṃ pahāya anupādiyāno
Nāne pi so nissayām no karoti

“Having abandoned the self and not clinging, he does not make a dependency, even on knowledge.” Buddhaghosa takes attaṃ as yaṃ pubbe gahitam (Pj 2, 53017, “what was formerly grasped”) but it also is a pun on atta, the self. Cf. Sn vss. 727, 925, where the Buddhaghosa and the Niddesa commentary recognize both meanings.
abandonment is made explicit by the use of the form pahīyanti (the passive form of both pa + ṭhā and pa + ṭhi, both meaning to abandon) right after its past participle.

**Pradhānasutta**

The compound pahitatta occurs throughout the Tipiṭaka, starting with the Dīgha Nikāya; but probably one of its earliest occurrence is in the Sutta Nipāta, (Sn) Pradhānasutta. The verse sections of the Sn are generally thought to be amongst the oldest and most original of the Buddha’s teachings, with parts perhaps going back to the Buddha himself. Three Middle Indic versions of the Padhānasutta have survived, one in P, the second in SP in the Mahāvastu (Mvu) and the third in the Lalitavistara (LV). The P recension starts with the following gāthā:

Taṃ maṃ padhānapahitattam nadim Nerāṇjaramat,  
viparakkamma jhāyantam yogakkhemassa pattiyā. 425

All translators take pahita in the above compound to refer to the past participle of padhāna, resulting in clumsy or redundant translations as “I strove the striving,” “resolute in exertion” or "myself intent upon striving." But pahita in this context makes just as good sense as “abandoned”; not only is the tautology of “exertion-exerted-self” avoided, but the translation of “the self who has abandoned exertion” or “self-abandoned-through-exertion” or “the self

---

446 Norman, Pali Literature, 59, 63; Norman, “Four Etymologies from the Sabhiyasutta,” 179; also available in Collected Papers 2, 154.

447 Jones Mvu, 225; Bhikkhu Thanissaro, Handful of Leaves 4 (United States: The Sati Center for Buddhist Studies & Metta Forest Monastery, 2003), 214 and also available at http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/kn/snp/snp.3.02.than.html; (accessed May 2013), Norman, Group of Discourses, 49.
resolute in renunciation also suits the context. The Mahāvastu version makes this more explicit:

ramaṇīyāna vanagulmāṃ ca paśyīya /

uruvilvāya sāmante prahāṇaṃ prahitaṃ mayā //

parikrāmya vyāyamantaṃ uttamārthasya prāptaye /

namuci karuṇāṃ vācaṃ bhāṣamāṇa ihāgamat// Mvu 2.238

“Seeing these pleasant woods and groves in the Uruvilvā neighbourhood, I abandoned striving; having transcended striving (lit: “the end of exertion”) in order to reach the highest goal, Namuci

448 The compound can be parsed two ways: [(striving abandoned) (self)] and [(striving) (abandoned self)]. The first is a accus. tatpuruṣa within the context of an karmadhāraya and an overall bahuvrīhi modifying the pronoun maṃ (the self who has abandoned striving; yassa attā padhānāṃ pahito); here pahito is used in an active sense, as in Norman’s translation, “myself intent upon striving.” For the active use of past participles, see Kaccāyana 559 in Ole Holten Pind, “Studies in the Pāli Grammarians,” Journal of the Pali Text Society, 14 (1990),209 and Pāṇini 3.4.72 in Rama Nath Sharma, The Aṣṭādhyāyī of Pāṇini (New Delhi: Munshiram Manoharlal Publishers, 1987), vol. 3, 642, where a past participle can be used in an active sense with verbs of motion; also Whitney 2000, §952a and Speijer 1998, §360. The second is a karmadhāraya containing an instr. tatpuruṣa and overall a bahuvrīhi (i.e. a self abandoned by means of striving: attā pahito padhānena); here pahito is used in a passive sense, which is the more normal usage. It could also mean “the self who is striving for/resolute in renunciation” ([(renunciation) (striving self)], taking pradhāna = pahāna (renunciation) and pahita as p.p. of pra + dhā = “striving,” which would make it a karmadhāraya containing an accus. or loc. tatpuruṣa and overall a bahuvrīhi (yassa attā pahito padhāne/padhānāṃ). The second of these - the self abandoned through exertion- where pahita is a past passive participle, is the most logical of these possibilities. See further discussion below. The compound (padhānapahitattam) also occurs in other parts of the canon, e.g.the Ariyapariyesanāsutta (MN 1, 170 in reference to the pañcavaggiya, the group of five monks with whom the Buddha practiced asceticism); here the compound could also mean two things: “the self intent upon striving” as above or “the self abandoned through striving” which is more grammatically common, taking pahita as a past passive participle. The commentary (Papañcasūdanī = Ps 2, 186) has padhānatthāya pesitattabhāvanā which is also ambiguous.
came there and spoke these words of compassion.”\textsuperscript{449} The Buddha has abandoned striving as he has gone beyond it to awakening. The time sequence in the \textit{Pradhānasutta} is quite unclear: while Māra unsuccessfully tempts the Buddha for seven years trying to obstruct his awakening (Sn verse 446; SN 1, 122\textsuperscript{25}-124\textsuperscript{13}, \textit{Sattavassānubandhasutta}), most of the encounters with him seem to be post enlightenment, making the connotation of “abandonment” for \textit{pradhāna/pahāna} as or more contextually germane as “exertion.”\textsuperscript{450}

\textit{Lalitavistara}

In the \textit{Lalitavistara} we have both the S version and the Tib translation to consider. The S reads:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ramaṇīyāny aranyāni vanagulmāśca viṛudhāḥ /}
\textit{prācīnāmurubilvāyām yatra nairaṅjanā nadi/Lal_18.1 //}
\textit{prahāṇāyodyataṁ tatra satataṁ drṛḍhvikramam /}
\textit{parākramantaṁ viṛyeṇa yogakṣemasya prāptaye Lal_18.2 //}
\end{quote}

\\textsuperscript{449} Jones Mvu, vol. 2, 225 translates, “Seeing these pleasant woods and forest thickets near Uruvilvā, I strove the striving. When I had come to the end of my striving for the attainment of the utmost good, Namuci came along speaking words of commiseration.” He translates \textit{parikrāmya}, as “having come to the end;” ordinarily the verb means “circumambulate,” but it also has the meaning of “walk through,” “go past,” “outstrip,” and “overtake.”

\textsuperscript{450} For example the first two of the \textit{Mārasaṃyutta} (SN 1, 103-127) \textit{sutta}s start with the formula, \textit{evam me sutam: ekam samayam bhagavā uruvelāyam viharati najā neraṅjarāya tīre ajapālanigrodhamūle paṭhamābhisambuddho} (SN 1, 103\textsuperscript{4-6}). “Thus have I heard. On one occasion the Blessed One was dwelling at Uruvela on the bank of the river Neraṅjara at the foot of the Goatherd’s Banyan Tree just after he had become fully enlightened” (Bodhi, \textit{Connected Discourses}, 195). The context of most of the other \textit{sutta}s is also post-awarement.
“Where the pleasant woods, thickets and shrubs are located by the river Nairāñjanā to the east of Urubilvā, there [Namuci spoke] to the one who had undertaken renunciation, who was always of firm fortitude, who had distinguished himself with effort to accomplish awakening.”

This version seems to favour the third of the three interpretations above (“resolute in renunciation”), although prahāṇyodyatam could also mean “who had undertaken striving.” A few verses later, we find the LV reflex of pahitatta:

srotāṃsyapi nadināṃ hi vāyureṣa viśoṣayet /
kim punaḥ śoṣayetkāyaṃ śoṇitaṃ prahīṭatmanāṃ Lal_18.11

“This wind may dry up the streams of the rivers; why should it not also dry up my blood, body and abandoned/resolute self?”

with a corresponding P reflex of:

Nadīnam api sotāni ayaṃ vāto visosaye,
Kiṃ ca me pahīṭattassa lohitāṃ nūpasussaye.452

451 reading prahīṭatmanām m.c. for prahīṭātmānam. If a genitive plural, “why should it not also dry up the blood and body of resolute/abandoned selves?”

452 vs. 433. Translated by Norman, Group of Discourses, 50: “The wind would dry up even the streams of the rivers; and why should my blood not be dried up when my self is intent [upon striving]?” Verse 432 immediately preceding this one also has the compound pahīṭattā:

Atthi saddhā tathā viriyam, paññā ca mama vijjati,
evām maṃ pahīṭattam (pi) kim jīvaṃ anupucchasi.
“This wind would dry up even the streams of rivers, why would it not dry up the blood of my abandoned/resolute self?”

and Mvu:

\[nadīnām api śrotāṃsi ayāṃ vāto va śoṣayet / \]

\[kiṃ mama prahitāṃsya śoṇitaṃ nopāṣoṣaye //\]  

“This wind would dry up the streams even of rivers, why would it not dry up the blood of my abandoned/resolute self.”

In the context either “abandoned” or “resolute” self is applicable. The Tibetans, however, translate the LV only with spangs pa nyid (“abandonment”) as follows:

\[chu klung dag gi chu rgyun kyang \]

\[rlung gis nam par skem byed na, \]

\[spangs pa nyid kyi khrag tsam lta, \]

\[di yis ci phyir skam mi ’gyur\]  

which Norman (ibid) translates, “There is faith, and energy, and wisdom is found in me. Why do you ask me about life even though my self is thus intent [upon striving]?” The clumsiness in the last clause is removed if one translates, “… since my self has been abandoned?”

\[Mvu 2.239^1-2. Translated by Jones, Mvu, 226: “The wind can dry up the streams of the rivers; why may I not dry up my blood by my resolute exertion?”\]
“The streams of the rivers have been thoroughly dried up by the wind; seeing only the blood of my abandoned self, how is it not dried up by this means?” In the P and LV suttas there are two other references to padhāna, viz., kiṃ padhānena kāhasi kiṃ prahāṇe kariṣyasi (“what will you do with renunciation/striving”) and duggo maggo padhānāya/ duḥkham mārgaṃ prahāṇasya (“the difficult road of renunciation/striving”) which are translated in the Tib by spong ba yis ni ci zhig bya (“what is the use of renunciation?”) and spong ba’i lam ni sdug bsngal te, (“the path of abandonment is painful”).

Buddaghosa’s commentary

In his commentary on the Padhānasutta, Buddhaghosa explains the origin of the sutta:


454 Pechā 211B and 212A at http://asianclassics.org/reader.php?collection=kangyur&index=96. Accessed May, 2013. Reading spangs pa bdag nyid for spangs pa nyid, as per the S. Translated by Gwendolyn Bays, The Lalitavistara Sūtra The Voice of the Buddha: The Beauty of Compassion, vols 1 and 2. (Berkeley: dharma Publishing, 1983), 400, as “The wind which dries up the rivers flow can easily dry up the body and blood of renunciates,” from a French version by Edouard Foucaux, compared to the original Tib. 455 vs. 428-c and 429-a in P and 18.6/18.7 in LV. Tib pecha 211B. In addition to these two, Mvu (2.23811-12), has two additional usages of prahāna (not found in Sn or LV) which are all more suitably translated as “renunciation,” than “striving” (see also: 2.2387, mahāprahāṇam, 2.23910, prahāṇato).
“What is the source of the *Padhānasutta*? ‘I will go in order to *padhāna*; in that matter my mind rejoices.’ This was spoken by Ven. Ānanda in completing the *pabbajjāsutta*. The Blessed One, seated inside a perfumed hut, thought, ‘By wishing to perform *padhāna* for six years I have done a difficult thing; I will speak of this today to the monks.’ Then he left the perfumed hut, sat down on the Buddha seat and began to preach this *sutta* beginning with the words ‘*tam maṃ padhānapahitattam*.’”

Apparently it was Ānanda who composed the *Pabbajjāsutta* (of which *padhānāya gamissāmi*… are the last words, found in the last *gāthā* of the *sutta*, 424-c) but Buddha himself who spoke the *Padhānasutta*. What is interesting in this passage is the connection Buddhaghosa makes between *pabajiya* and *padhāna*: the latter is the direct result of the former. A *pabajiya* is one who has gone forth and left the world. He/she has renounced everything for the homeless state of the wandering mendicant. Is the *padhāna* performed by the *pabajiya* striving for enlightenment or a continuation of the renunciation process of the mendicant? Or both? In his gloss on the first compound of the *sutta*, Buddhaghosa suggests that both meanings are correct:

*padhānapahitattan ti nibbānatthāya pesitacittaṃ paricattaattabhāvaṃ vā; “padhānapahitatta*

means a mind directed towards *nibbāna* or he whose existence as an individual has been rejected.”456

456 Pj 2, 3867-17. See footnote 431 for the range of meanings of *attabhāva*. 
From this gloss it appears that Buddhaghosa is interpreting *pahita* in the first instance as a p.p. of *pa* + ध “directed” and *padhāna* as a loose synonym for *nibbāna* (with the meaning of “abandoning”); in the second alternative the compound *padhānapahita* is synonymized with *pariccatta*, which is past participle of S *pari* + य “to give up, abandon, leave behind, reject.” *attabhāva* is “the body, the personality, the individual.” On further analysis, then, there are potentially five meanings present in this compound:

1) a person whose mind is focused on enlightenment.
2) a person who has abandoned his/her self.
3) a person who has abandoned his/her self by virtue of exertion/striving/austerities.
4) a person who is focused on renunciation.
5) a person who has abandoned striving.

The last three meanings are implicit in the grammatical structure, but not drawn out by Buddhaghosa.

The *pahitatta* compound also occurs several times in the *Dvayatānupassanāsutta* of the Sn, along with its familiar adjectives *appamattasa* and *ātāpino*, describing a *bhikkhu* who rightly contemplates the pairs (misery and the origin of misery); once again the meaning “abandoned self” is equally or more germane to the context than “resolute self,” as the major point of this *sutta* is that the stopping of individual personality (*sakkāyassuparodhanaṃ*) through understanding the causes and conditions of what makes misery arise, and the attaining of the

---

457 Sn p. 140, and throughout
state of *nibbāna*, is the goal of the teaching and equated with true happiness.\(^{458}\) There is a constant refrain repeated throughout the *sutta*:

\[
evaṃ sammā-dvayatā-nupassino kho bhikkhave, bhikkhuno appamattassa ātāpino pahitattassa viharato dvinnāṃ phalānaṃ aṇṇataram phalam pāṭikāṅkham: diṭṭhe va dhamme aṇṇā, sati vā upādisese anāgāmitā” ti.\(^{459}\)
\]

“For the one who sees the pairs correctly in this way, monks, for the monk who dwells vigilant, ardent and with an abandoned/resolute self, one of two fruits is to be expected - either perfect knowledge even in the present existence, or, if there is still some fuel of life remaining, the state of a non-returner.”

The achievement of the state of *arahant* is just that abandonment of the state of the “I,” as the Buddha has stated throughout the writings.\(^{460}\)

The phrase *pahitatta* also occurs in the *Sāriputtasutta* of the *Āṭṭhakavagga* (verse 961) of which we have a Ch rendition; although the Ch version does not track the P version *pāda* for *pāda*

\(^{458}\) Sn p. 148, verse 761; Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 96 for trans.

\(^{459}\) Sn p. 140\(^{11-15}\).

\(^{460}\) *Aggivacchagottasutta* MN 1, 487, Ŋāṇamoli & Bodhi, *Middle Length Discourses*, 592: “Therefore the *Tathāgata*, I say, is liberated by not clinging, by relinquishing, abandoning, annihilating, purifying and destroying all illusions, all mental disturbances and all I-making, mine-making, and the tendency to conceit.”
and seems partially “jumbled” (in relation to the P), it appears that the Ch translate *pahitatta* as
行不捨, rendered by Bapat as “… the practices which he gives not up.”

One other anomaly in the *suttas* is explained by the dual meaning of *padhāna/pahāna*. In the *Dāmalisutta* of the *Devaputtasāmyutta* (SN I 47), the *devaputta* Dāmali says to the Buddha:

*karaṇīyam etam brāhmaṇena padhānaṁ akilāsunā.*

*kāmānaṁ vippahānena na tenāśmīsate bhavan ti.*

translated by Bhikkhu Bodhi as:

“This should be done by the brahmin:

Striving without weariness,

461 In the P we have
*Ky-assā vyappathayo assu, ky-āss’ assu idha gocarā,*
*kāni silabbatān’ āssu pahitattassa bhikkhuno.* 961

which Norman translates as ("What ways of speech should be his? What spheres of activity should be his here? What virtuous conduct and vows should there be for a *bhikkhu* with intent self?" (Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 118). In the Ch we find, 口已出善惡響, 在行處當何作? 持戒住行不捨 比丘學求安祥,


translates as, "The words, good or evil, that his mouth has uttered, and his spheres of work - how are they shaped? So also [how are shaped?] the rules of conduct which he observes and the practices which he gives not up? He, the Bhikṣu, who learns to seek ways of peace." There appear to be some differences between the P text and the one the Ch redactor had in front of him, although it looks like *pahīta* was still considered to mean “abandoned” or “giving up” (but the reason for the negative is not clear). A simpler translation than Bapat’s for *pādas* c and d is, "Keeping the rules, continuing to practice, not giving up, the monk learns and strives for happiness." In the Ch, *padas* c and d seem to answer the question in *padas* a and b; in the P, the question extends throughout the *gāthā*, as Norman has rendered it, as above.
That by his abandoning of sensual desires
He does not yearn for existence."\(^{462}\)

As Buddhaghosa points out in the commentary, the Buddha’s answer, which denies the need for striving (“For the brahmin there is no task to be done," *natthi kiccaṃ brāhmaṇaṭṭaḥ…*SN 1, 47\(^{32}\)) is unique in the *Tipiṭaka*, for nowhere else does he do so;\(^{463}\) however if the source transmission contained the word *pahānaṃ* instead of *padhāṇaṃ*, then the Buddha’s answer makes sense, as he is punning on both senses of the word *pahānaṃ* (“effort” and “abandonment”) - no effort is required as abandonment is not an act of doing anything, simply letting go (“For the brahmin has done what should be done," *katakico hi brāhmaṇo*, SN 1, 47\(^{33}\)).

*sammappadhāna*

In The *Buddhist Path of Awakening*, Rupert Gethin deals with the four *sammappadhānas*, (usually translated “right exertions”) which not surprisingly show the same ambiguity in meaning between “effort” and “abandonment” as we have seen with the compound *pahitatta*.

He summarizes his conclusions as follows:

\(^{462}\) Bodhi, *Connected Discourses*, 141.

\(^{463}\) Sāratṭhapakkāsīni’ (Spk) 1, 10512-14; *Tīsu kīrā Pīṭakesu ayaṃ gāthā asankiṇṇā. Bhagavatā hi aṇṇattha vīryassa doso nāma dassito n’ atthi*, “In the three baskets this *gāthā* is unparalleled; for not elsewhere is *vīrya* shown as a fault by the Blessed One.”
The point is that one cannot exclude the possibility that the Buddhist tradition 
deliberately capitalized on the ambiguity of a Middle Indo-Aryan form from an early date - prior to any schism between the Sarvāstivāda and the Theravāda….One cannot, then, simply characterize samyak-prahāṇa [the SP form] as an ‘incorrect’ backformation. Although samma-ppadhāṇa must, I think, take precedence over samyak-prahāṇa as reflecting the correct primary exegesis, it does seem that the Buddhist tradition as a whole preserves an explanation of the terms which focuses on the notion of abandoning.

In terms of Buddhist spiritual psychology, one of the significant aspects of samma-ppadhāṇa or samyak-prahāṇa was that it was understood as directly facilitating the abandoning of unskilful states either at the moment of attaining the transcendent path or during the prior stages [italics in the original].

In the *Visuddhimagga* (quoted by Gethin 1992, 79), we find the same connotative ambiguity:

They endeavour by means of it, so *padhānam*. Virtuous endeavour is sammappadhānam; either it is sammappadhānam because by means of it they endeavour correctly (*samma*) or it is virtuous endeavour because of abandoning the unsightly impurities and *padhāna* because of producing benefit and happiness and causing an excellent condition, bringing about the condition of being foremost (*padhāna*).

---

465 *Visuddhimagga* 22, 35: *padahanti etenā iti padhānam / sobhanaṃ padhānam sammappadhānam / sammā vā padahanti etenā ti sammappadhānam / sobhanaṃ vā taṃ kilesavirūpattavijahanato*
Here, all three meanings of *pradhāna/pahāṇa* converge - “effort,” “abandoning” and the standard S meaning of “chief” or “foremost.”

As native speakers the bhāṇakas who transmitted the Buddha’s teachings orally after his *parinibbāna* were certainly aware of the ambiguities present in the words *pahita* and *p(r)ahāṇ(n)a*. It is clear that in some cases they left it to the hearer to decide which of the meanings was appropriate and in others they meant both meanings to be understood. For *pradhāna* as “exertion” and *prahāṇa* as “abandonment” are closely related terms within the Buddhist dharma. One exerts oneself for the purpose of abandoning all one’s preconceptions, judgments, and afflictions, the absence of which is the first step to liberation. The compound *pahitatta*, then, probably had both meanings and both were intended. The ambiguity of the compound is preserved in P and in SP because the past participle did not change; however later translators (including the PED and BHSD) did not recognize it. In the case of the nominal form, *p(r)ahāṇ(n)a*, when it came to be written down in P, the translators chose to disambiguate the word by “restoring” the -dh- aspirated consonant. Unfortunately this obscured the dual meaning of the word, much like how the etymology of the word for brahma (from P bāh- “to

---

*padhānañca hitasukhanipphāda kattena seṭṭhābhāvāvahanato padhānabhāvakāraṇato căti sammappadhānaṃ*… Gethin notes that “the correct reading of this passage is difficult to determine” (page 72, footnote 39). The compound *kilesa-virūpatta-vijahanato* has a variant reading of *kilesa-virūpatta-virahato “being rid of…,” in Henry Clarke Warren, *Visuddhimagga or Buddhaghosācariya* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1950), 583, without, however, any significant change of meaning. See also PTS edition (Vism), 679^3-7, which contains yet another variant *vidahanato*, “… because of burning up the unsightly impurities,” another instance where the earlier oral transmission must have had an intervocalic glide or nothing at all (*viyajanato* or *viahanato*) and the consonant was back-formed, each time differently in three different cases.
remove” as “one who has removed sins”) was clouded (Norman 2006b, 134), when the Pkt “bāhaṇa” was Sanskritized to brāhmaṇa. The Tib translators seem to be well aware all along that p(r)ahān(n)a and pahita had the additional and often primary meaning of abandonment and renunciation. In the end one cannot agree with Gethin that “endeavour” as a translation for padhāna/prahāṇa reflects the “correct primary exegesis” - numerous examples having been adduced where both meanings of “abandonment” and “endeavour” resonate and harmonize together.

466 Closest to this form is that attested in the Aśokan rock edicts in Kālsī (north India) bābhan- (13G), in Dhauli (east India) bābhan- (4A, 4C, 5K, 8E and 9G) and Mānsehrā (north-west India), bamaṇa (4C).
Chapter Seven, Ambiguities in the Canon 2 and the Transmission Process

1) *paccekapuddha, pratyekabuddha, patteyabuddha, prace’abuddha* A3, A5

The meaning of the compound *paccekapuddha* and its SP reflex *pratyekabuddha* is a well known crux in MI studies. It is usually derived from the S *pratyeka-* (*prati-eka, “each one, every single one, individual”) and has come to mean a “private or solitary Buddha, one who remains in seclusion and does not teach the dharma to others.”\(^{467}\) This would make it a *karmadhāraya* compound, but the literal meaning of the compound (“every single Buddha”) seems to have little direct relation to this putative, expanded meaning. The phrase is shared by both Buddhism and Jainism which have traditionally defined it in a variety of different ways. In Buddhism a canonical definition is found in the *Puggalapaññatti* along with a *sammāsambuddho*, a fully enlightened Buddha: “What is a person who is a fully enlightened Buddha? Here, a certain person awakens by himself to the highest knowledge of the truths concerning the *dhammas* previously unheard; and there he achieves omniscience and mastery of the powers - this person is called ‘a fully enlightened Buddha.’ What is an individual who is a *paccekapuddha*? Here, a certain person awakens by himself to the highest knowledge of the truths concerning the *dhammas* previously unheard; and there he does not achieve omniscience nor mastery of the powers - this person is called a *paccekapuddha*.\(^{468}\) In the *Paramatthajotikā* 2, Budhaghoṣa

\(^{467}\) Keown, *Dictionary*, s.v. *pratyekabuddha*.

\(^{468}\) *Puggalapaññatti*, p. 14\(^{11-20;\, katamo ca puggalo sammāsambuddho? idh’ ekacco puggalo pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu sāmaṃ saccāni abhisambujhati tattha ca sabbāññutam pāpuṇāti balesu ca vasībhāvaṃ: ayaṃ vuccati puggalo *sammāsambuddho*. katamo ca puggalo *paccekasambuddho*? idh’ ekacco puggalo pubbe ananussutesu dhammesu sāmaṃ saccāni abhisambujhati; na ca tattha sabbāññutam pāpuṇāti, na ca balesu vasībhāvaṃ — ayaṃ vuccati puggalo *paccekasambuddho*. The
explains, “Buddhas are enlightened themselves and cause others to be enlightened; pacceka- are enlightened themselves, they do not cause others to be enlightened. They comprehend just the essence of the meaning, but not the essence of the dhamma. For, having taken on (only) the idea of the supramundane dhamma, they are not able to teach (it).”  

The pacceka fills in the space between the omniscient, teaching Buddha and disciple who learns the dhamma from him; whatever the etymology of the word pacceka-, the word has come to mean “private, solitary,” in that a pacceka achieves enlightenment by himself and does not teach what he has learned to anybody. The Jainas recognize three types of Buddhas, but define the second category differently: first are those enlightened by themselves (svayam-buddha or saha-sambuddha); secondly, those enlightened by some particular thing (pratyeka-buddha < S pratyaya, “cause, condition”); and lastly those enlightened by another Buddha (buddha-bodhita). Mahāvīra and Gotama were enlightened by themselves, while a pratyeka-buddha was enlightened by an external cause. In AMg the word takes the form of pattea, pattega and patteya, where the -ty- is assimilated to -tt- rather than palatalized to -cc- as in P. However, rather than deriving from S pratyeka, the AMg word appears to derive from S pratyaya (“cause, condition”) with the fronting of -a- > -e- in the

PTS edition reads phalesu for balesu in the Burmese recension, showing a confusion between voiced and unvoiced stops.

469 Pj 2, 51:24b-c: Buddhā sayaṇ ca bujjhanti pare ca bodhenti; pacceka-buddhā sayam bujjhanti na pare bodhenti attharasam eva paṭivijjhanti na dhammarasam, na hi te lokuttaradhammarāmā pariṇātān āropetvā desetum sakkonti


471 Mylius, Wörterbuch Ardhamāgadhī, 414.
presence of the palatal -ty- (pratyaya > *patyeya > patteya), a very common phenomenon; this would then also be the case for P pacceka, where -ty- > -cc-, and the derivation would be pratyaya > *paccaya > paceya or pratyaya > *patyeya > pacceya. The P change from paceya > pacceka would then be a hyperform, the translator interpreting the intervocalic -y- as a substitute for a missing stop. A derivation from pratyaya seems to make more sense semantically, with the compound then being interpreted as a tatpurusa: “one enlightened because of an external cause” (pratyayena buddha) or “one who awakens to the conditions,” i.e. awakened to pratītya samulpāda (pratyayān buddha, with the past participle used in an active sense). This latter sense is in fact how the compound is etymologized in the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra, where a pratyekabuddha is defined as those who “apply themselves to the Tathāgata’s teachings in order to understand causes and conditions to reach complete extinction of the self;” Kumārajīva’s Ch translation of pratyekabuddha is 緣覺, yuán jué, “condition perceiver,” or “awakened by conditions,” although translations of the compound in later works use 獨覺, dújué, “individual enlightenment” which corresponds to the


473 Norman, “Buddhism and Sanskritisation,” 135. A hyperform is defined by Norman as “…forms which are unlikely to have had a genuine existence in any dialect, but which arose as a result of bad or misunderstood translation techniques,” in “Dialect Forms,” 375. Also available in Collected Papers 4, 54. The OED defines a hyperform as “a hypercorrect spelling or pronunciation,” and “hypercorrect” as “of spelling, pronunciation, or construction: falsely modelled on an apparently analogous prestigious form.”

474 ātmaparinirvāñahetuhetupratyayānubodhāya tathāgataśāsane ‘bhiyujyante, ta ucyante pratyeka-buddhayānam ākāṁśamānāḥ… in H. Kern and Nanjio B., Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka or The Lotus of the True Law (St. Petersburg: L’Académie Impériale des Sciences, 1908-12), chapter 3, page 808-10.

usual understanding of the P compound *paccekabuddha.* The same anomaly is witnessed in the Tib translations where both meanings are preserved, sometimes using *rkyen rtogs* (“condition realizer”) and sometimes *rang rgyal* (“self-conqueror”).

The word *pratyaya* derives from the verb *pratī*(*prati +ī*) which has the meaning of “to go towards, to trust, to believe” and the nominal form *pratyaya* also has this sense (“belief, firm conviction, trust, faith,”). The noun has a reflex in P of *pattiya* with the same meaning (where again the -a- > -i- fronting is due to palatalization because of the -y- in the conjunct -ty- (*pratyaya > *pratiya > *prattiya > pattiya*). In AMg the reflex is *patteya*, as noted above, with the additional lowering of -i- > -e-. Thus another possible meaning of the *patteya-buddha* compound is a *tatpuruṣa* meaning “awakened by faith.” A homonym for *pattiya* in P is the gerundive of pāpuṇāti, meaning “to be attained” and this is another possible derivation: *prāpteyabuddha > patteyabuddha*, which von Hinüber defines as “Buddha durch einen glücklichen Zufall” (Buddha by good luck). Oberlies believes this is the correct derivation, quoting the Pkt form *patteyya* in the medieval grammar *Saddanīti*, but the literal meaning is strained (“Buddha to be attained”) and a derivation from *pratyaya* seems preferable. There is also a G form *prace’a* which has the meaning of “cause, condition” in GDhp 88-b,

---

476 Ch translators also transliterated the word as 辟支迦 (*bizhījiā*, pronounced pjiak-tcia/tci-kia in Middle Chinese), the middle character suggesting they were translating from a Pkt where the conjunct had changed to a palatal geminate. See Edwin G. Pulleyblank, *Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin* (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1991). Abbreviation PB.


corresponding to the P form *paccaya (idem)* in Sn 15-b: “in whom there are no latent tendencies [which are] cause for the return to this shore” (GDhp 88-a & 88-b: *yasa anoše’a na sadi keyi/ oru akamaṇa‘i prace’a i;* Sn 14-a & 15-b: *yassānusayā na santi keci oram āgamanāya paccayāse*).\(^479\)

Norman has argued that the concept of the *pratyeka-buddha* predates both Buddhism and Jainism and was alien to both; the attempt to assimilate it into each religion resulted in inconsistent views about just what a *pratyeka-buddha* meant.\(^480\) In the P tradition a *pacceka-buddha* is someone who achieves enlightenment but stays to himself, solitary and does not achieve full mastery of a Buddha’s powers; amongst the Jainas, a *patteya-buddha* is one who is awakened by a specific external cause or condition as opposed to a Buddha who is awakened by himself; in the BHS tradition a *pratyeka-buddha* is someone awakened by an understanding of the dependent origination teaching, but who then does not teach himself.

Philologically we can not be fully certain of the meaning, as P *pacceka* and AMg *patteya* are both derivable from S *pratyeka* and *pratyaya*, and *patteya* could also derive from *pratyaya* in

\(^479\) Translation from Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 2. For text see Brough, *GDhp*, 131. G *prace’a* could also be derived from S *pratyeka*.

\(^480\) Norman, “Pratyeka-Buddha,” 102; also in *Collected Papers 2*, 248. In R. Kloppenborg, *The Paccekabuddha, A Buddhist Ascetic*. (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1974), 1, the author defines a *paccekabuddha* as "one who is enlightened by himself, or for himself" and "an enlightened one who is single, who is on his own" and places the term *paccekabuddha* in "the Indian tradition of asceticism and individualism and the popular reverence and esteem for ascetics, wandering religious men, *munis* and sages" (page 6). Although she mentions the Mahāyāna definition of the terms as "one who has become enlightened by (understanding) the causes" (page 10), she does not draw any phonological connection between the two terms (*pratyaya and pratyeka*).
the meaning “faith” and is also the gerundive form of pāpuṇāti (“he attains”). Indeed the confusion over the exact nature of a pratyeka/pacceka-buddha is probably due to this very lack of understanding of the etymology of the word. However the preponderance of the evidence suggests that the primary derivation of all the witnesses, P pacceka-, BHS pratyeka- AMg pattea-, patteya- or pattega-, and G prace’a- is from S pratyaya, with the meaning of a Buddha awakened by a specific cause or condition, or a Buddha waking up to the truth of interdependent origination. This of course does not preclude other semantic strata including the possibilities discussed above.

2) nibbāna, nirvāṇa, nivvāṇa, nivāna A1 (-p- > -v-), A3, A4 (-m- >< -v-), A6

The word nirvāṇa is such a common term that it entered the English Language early in the nineteenth century, with a meaning of “The realization of the non-existence of self, leading to cessation of all entanglement and attachment in life; the state of being released from the effects of karma and the cycle of death and rebirth” (OED). It is a polysemous, multi-faceted word with many strata of meaning in Buddhist thought, some of which I will examine here.

Here the oldest form we possess appears to be AMg nivvāṇa, or G nivana, where -rv- > -vv- (geminates were not notated in G); the P form with -vv- > -bb- is a later change.481 The form nirvāṇa is a back-Sanskritization of nivvāṇa.

481 Pischel §287; von Hinüber, Das ältere Mittelindisch, §255; Oberlies, Pāli, §16.4.
Etymologically the word is believed to derive from the S root *nir + \(\sqrt{vā}\), meaning “to blow out.” This is an old, probably pre-Buddhist word first found in the *Ṛg Veda*, Book 10, 16.13 in its causative form with a meaning of “cool;”\(^{482}\) it is not clear, however, that the primary derivation of *nirvāṇa* goes back to this verb, as the primary metaphor is more about the extinction of a fire (not necessarily through blowing out) by depriving it of fuel, which of course are the three poisons. If one blows out a fire, there is presumably still some fuel remaining. The *locus classicus* for this trope is the *Aggivacchagottasutta* where the Buddha tries to explain to Vaccha why his question concerning the *Tathāgata*’s future existence or non-existence is unanswerable. A fire burns in dependence on its fuel of grass and sticks and “when that is used up, if it does not get any more fuel, being without fuel, it is reckoned as extinguished.”\(^{483}\) The word here for “extinguished” is *nibbuto*, which, although it seems related to *nibbāna*, is in fact derived from a different verb, \(\sqrt{vr}\), which means “to cover over” or “to restrain, suppress, exclude;” *nibbuto* is derived from S *nirvṛta* (from *nir + \(\sqrt{vṛ}\): nirvṛta > nivṛta > nivvuta > nibbuto) which means “extinguished,” as well as from S *ni + \(\sqrt{vṛ}\) (past participle *nivṛta*: nivṛta > nivuta > nivvuta > nibbuta) which means “to remove, suppress, exclude.”\(^{484}\) The participle *nivṛta* also has the additional sense of “satisfied, happy, tranquil, at ease, at rest” (MW) and the adjective

---

\(^{482}\) *yām tvām agne sumādahas tām u nir vāpayā pūnaḥ* "Cool, Agni, and again refresh the spot which thou hast scorched and burnt." Ralph T. H. Griffith, *The Rig Veda* (The Internet Sacred Text Archive DVD-ROM 9.0, 1896), file:///C:/ISTA09/hin/rigveda/rv10016.htm  

\(^{483}\) MN 1, 487-80: *Yaṁ hi so bho Gotama aggi tinakatthāpādānaṁ paṭicca ajali, tassa ca pariyaḍānā aññassa ca anupahāra añāhāro nibbuto t’ eva sarikham gacchatī ti*. Translation by Bodhi & Ñañamoli, *Middle Length Discourses*, 593.  

\(^{484}\) In the early writing, geminates were written as single consonants, so a -\(v\)- could represent itself or -\(vv\)-. See footnote 1416 and 984.
nirvara (perhaps derived from a different nir + ṛ meaning “to choose”) means “excellent.”

The meaning “at ease, at rest” in fact derives from a different verb for which vyāvaṭa (“busy, occupied with”) is one P reflex, ultimately stemming from the S root ṛpr (vi + ā + ṛṛ) meaning “to be busy” with the change of -ṛ- > -ṛ-, characteristic of the eastern Pkts. The verb nir + ṛ therefore also means “without movement” and nibbuto incorporates both meanings of “extinguished” and “without movement” neither of which carry the connotation of “blown out.”

Three examples which the PED gives, where nibbāna/nibbuto have this dual privative sense (without the fuel of the afflictions, without movement) are Sn v. 1094 (“This island, without possessions, without grasping, matchless, I call it ‘quenching,’ the complete destruction of old age and death”); the Saṅghavandanāsutta, SN 1, 236 (“…among the violent, they are quenched; among those who grasp they do not grasp”); and the Upādānasutta, SN 2, 85 (“…when the former supply of fuel is exhausted, that great bonfire, not being fed with any more fuel, lacking sustenance, would be extinguished.”)

Although in these examples, the meaning “blow out” is not necessarily absent, the primary meaning seems to be “remove, exclude,  

485 Although I am not suggesting that nirvara > nirvāṇa, the change from -ṛ- > -ṇ- is indeed attested in MI (See Geiger §43.2), with the long -ā- simply being the vṛddhi form of ṛṛ, nir + vāra (“keeping back, restraining”).

486 M. A. Mehendale, Indo-Aryan Linguistics, 38. Pischel, Grammar, §199. Note that both ṛṛ and ṛṛ are class nine verbs, therefore their stem form is ṛṛṇa- and prṛṇa-, and of course the change from -ṛ- > -a- (and sometimes other vowels) is automatic in all the Pkts (Pischel §48). So a possible derivation is: nirṛṇa > *nirvṛṇa > *nirvāna.

487 akiñcanaṃ anādānam, etam dīpaṃ anāparaṃ, nibbānam iti nāṃ brūmi, jarāmaccuparikkhayam.
Translation by Norman, Group of Discourses, 132.

488 attadāṇḍesu nibbutā, sādānesu anādānā. Translation by Bodhi, Connected Discourses, 337.

489 mahā aggikkhandho purimassa ca upādānassa pariyādānā aṇñassa ca anupahārā anāhāro nibbāyeyya. Translation by Bodhi, op. cit, p. 589.
suppress" (from ni + \( \sqrt{v} \)) the afflictions. Buddhaghosa makes this meaning explicit in his explication of nibbāna where he specifically defines it in terms of virāga or the absence of passion: “Bhikkhus, in so far as there are dhammas, whether formed or unformed, fading away (virāgo) is pronounced the best of them, that is to say, the crushing of vanity, the elimination of thirst, the abolition of reliance, the termination of the cycle of existence, the destruction of craving, fading away, cessation, nibbāna” (Quoting from the AN).490 Buddhaghosa then goes on to explain each of these points, ending with a commentary on the word nibbāna: “It is called nibbāna because it has gone away from (nikkhanto), has escaped from (nissaṭo) is dissociated from craving, which has acquired in common usage the name ‘fastening’ (vāna) because, by ensuring successive becoming, craving serves as a joining together, a binding together, a lacing together of the four kinds of generation, five destinies, seven stations of consciousness and nine abodes of beings.”491

Note the reference to the word vāna, which Bhikkhu Ēṇāṣaṇamoli translates as “fastening;” this is another attempt to etymologize the word nirvāṇa as nir-vāṇa (“unfastening”), this time, taking vāna as derived from the verb vāyati, “to sew” or “to weave” (< Vedic \( \sqrt{ve} \), vayati) echoed in P word saṁsibbana- (“sowing together”). The word vāna does not only mean “sewing,” but also

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Aggappasādasutta AN 2, 34:} & \quad \text{yāvatā bhikkhave dhammā sarīkhata vā asarīkhata vā virāgo tesam dhammānaṁ aggam akkhāyati yaddaṁ madanimmadano pipāsavino ayāyasamugghāto vattūpacchedo tanhākkhayo virāgo nirodho nibbānaṁ.} \\
\text{Translation from Bhikkhu Ënāṣamoli, The Path of Purification: Visuddhimagga (Berkeley: Random House, 1976), 285-286.}
\end{align*}\]

\[\begin{align*}
\text{Vism 293:} & \quad \text{Yasmā pan’esa catasso yoniyo, pañcacatiyo, satta-viññāṇatthitiyo, nava ca sattāvāse aparāparabhāvāya vinanato, ābandhanato, saṁsibbanato vāna ti laddhavohārāya tanhāya nikkhanto, nissatō, visamuyutto, tasmā nibbānā ti vuccatī tī.} \\
\text{Translation by Ënāṣamoli, Path of Purification, 286.}
\end{align*}\]
has come to have the meaning “desire” or “lust” because the commentators have linked it to
the root 𑀠vananati, (“to desire, love wish.”). Thus vana is a homonym meaning both “forest” (<
S, P vanam, “forest”) and “lust, desire,” and also appears in its vrddhi form as vāna with the
meaning “jungle” and as a synonym for tanhā (“craving”). The locus classicus for this derivation
is Dhp vs. 283:

vanaṃ chindatha mā rukkham,
vanato jāyatī bhayam,
chetvā vanam ca vanathaṅ ca
nibbanā hotha bhikkhavo.

“Cut the forest not the tree; from the forest fear is born. Having cut the forest and the
underbrush, you are, monks, without depravity (nibbanā, comm: nikkilesā hotha).” The gāthā is
explained in the Dhammasaṅgaṇī-āṭṭhakathā: “bhavanetti” means the cord of becoming. For by
it, like oxen bound by the neck with a rope, beings are led by their obsessively desired objects.
Whatever sense-object one desires, associates with or clings to is vanam. He desires or he
begs for is vanam. vanatho - the word has grown by a syllable. Or, like the forest, with the
meaning of causing suffering and misfortune, and with the meaning of
entanglement/obstruction, so, vanam. Because of powerful craving, that is its name. Because
of more entanglement, then there is stronger craving, thus the name \textit{vanatho}. Notice that, although there is a S word \textit{vāṇa}, meaning “sound,” no one has tried to etymologize \textit{nibbāna} as “without sound, silent.”

We have so far uncovered four semantic strata in the word \textit{nirvāṇa/nibbāna} which we might expect an educated \textit{sāvaka} (“hearer”) to intuit at some level: blowing out, extinguishing by lack of fuel, motionlessness, and the absence of mental entanglement, like a forest’s undergrowth. Are their other possibilities? I think so.

In 1999 a S manuscript of the \textit{Vimalakīrtinirdeśa sūtra} was found in the Potala Palace in Lhasa, Tibet. It is of unknown date and provenance but has preserved numerous Prakritisms. In the tenth chapter there is a long list of the attributes of the \textit{bodhisattva} recited by the Buddha which includes the following phrase: \textit{samsāra udyāna-nirmāṇa-samjñā}. Not being able to make much sense of the phrase, the critical edition changed it to \textit{samsāra udyāna-vimāṇa-samjñā}, requiring two changes -m- \textit{> -n- and -n- > -n-}.\footnote{The meaning would be something like “understanding a garden palace in \textit{samsāra.”}} A more parsimonious explanation (and one


\footnote{Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, \textit{Vimalakīrtinirdeśa} (Tokyo: Taisho University Press, 2006), page 104, footnote 10. For the \textit{udyāna-nirmāṇa-samjñā} compound see manuscript line 63b6 above.}

\footnote{the final -e of the locative changing to -a because of the following \textit{u-} of \textit{udyāna}.}
that makes better sense) is simply to change the -m- of nirmāṇa to a -v- > nirvāṇa which is in fact how the Tibetans have read it: 'khor ba la skyed mos tshal dang mya ngan las 'das pa lta bur 'du shes pa'o, which Thurman translates as "conceiving of the world as a garden of liberation." Since we know that the alternation of m/v is not uncommon in the Pkts and that -m- originates as an allophone of -v- in nasalized contexts (in the word nirvāṇa the -v- is enclosed by two nasals), this change is not that surprising; what is surprising is finding it attested in a Prakritized S document - to my knowledge this is the first ever instance of nirmāṇa being written for nirvāṇa. This also suggests the intriguing possibility that the change is not just phonological but was a deliberate play on the semantic range of nir-māṇa, which could mean “transformation” (as in nirmāṇakāya), or “free from pride,” without the retroflex -n- sound

495 Thurman’s translation may be found at http://www2.hf.uio.no/polyglotta/index.php?page=fulltext&view=fulltext&vid=37&mid=&level= (accessed June 2013), or see Robert Thurman, The Holy Teaching of Vimalakīrti (University Park and London: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1976), 88. The actual Tib seems to read “Conceiving of saṃsāra as a garden and as nirvāṇa.” Note that the Tibetans translate nirvāṇa as “gone beyond suffering,” without trying to do a literal translation. The Ch transliterate it as 涅槃 which in Middle Chinese sounded something like as net-ban, per Pulleyblank, Lexicon. The character 涅 is apparently used to represent a nir or nr sound which is not available as a final in a MC character (Pulleyblank, Lexicon, 15-16). Judging by the presence of this conjunct, it looks like the Ch translation was from Sanskrit or G (nirvāṇa/ni(r)vāṇa; G sometimes preserves the -r- and sometimes doesn’t). Of the three Ch translations that are extant, the only one that appears to have translated this section is by Kumārajīva, viz., 於生死中如園觀想, Yú shēngsī zhōng rú yuán guān xiǎng. This seems to translate the S word-for-word: “Thinking that in the middle of saṃsāra it is like a garden pavilion (觀 = nirmāṇa, "building"),” which of course does not make much sense. T14n0475_p0554b15(00). The change of -v- > -m- is also apparent in Kumaunī (nimūṇa, “to extinguish”), in Nepāli (nimāunu, idem) and Sinhalese (nimanavā, idem; nimi, "finished," nimiya, "end"). See Turner CDIAL, entry 7398.

496 Brough, GDhp, §36; Pischel §251. Brough gives several examples from G of the change -v- > -m-nāvam > nāma; viññāvaṃ > viñāmi, etc. The alternation of -m- and -v- is also common in Dravidian phonology, see Kamil V. Zvelebil, Dravidian Linguistics An Introduction (Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture, 1990), 3.
(nirmāṇa), or even - with change of -ā > -a- and -ṇ- > -m- , “selfless” (nirmama). All interpretations could be taken as metaphors for the Buddhist sumnum bonum of nirvāṇa.

I am not of course suggesting that all these nuances of meaning were present to the average MI speaker, either in the Buddha’s day or afterwards; however, it is self-evident that the word nirvāṇa had multiple levels of meaning and the very richness of its semantic fabric contributes to its suitability as a description of the Buddhist goal: nir + ṣvā, meaning to blow out the ego, with additional connotations of cessation of blowing (i.e. stillness) and coolness (in its causative form); nir + ṭ with the meaning of extinguishing the flames of desire; ni + ṭr; excluding or suppressing craving which fuels the flames; nir + ṭr in its Pkt form of nir + ṭr, without motion, busyness; nir + ṣvan, without desire; nir + ṭman, without thinking, without pride (the latter from its vrddhi form māna). In the one word nirvāṇa/nibbāna, the meanings of five different verbal roots resonate and interweave, each meaning emphasizing a different aspect of the Buddha’s teaching.

3) pamuñcantu, prumumcantu, pramodantu, pranudantu. A1, A4 (nasals)

This is a case which I have already discussed in detail elsewhere,497 so I will only provide a short summary here. After the Buddha achieves enlightenment he decides not to teach, as the dharma he has realized is too subtle for explanation. After Brahma pleads with him to turn the wheel of dharma he eventually agrees, yielding to Brahma’s argument that there will indeed be

some people who will understand the teachings. The story is preserved in the P SN and other parts of the P canon, in the Mahāvastu, the Saṅghabhedvastu, the Catuspaṇiṣatsūtra and the Lalitavistara. In the first four of these works, in a gāthā where the Buddha agrees to teach, the headword above occurs, in four different transformations, some of which are in fact opposites (like pramodantu “let them rejoice” and praṇudantu, “let them reject”). The transmissional mix-up points to the existence of an earlier BMI form “paNuyantu or “paNuantu, which accounts for the reflexes which we have and strengthens the hypothesis of a “proto-canonical” language underlying P and the other PktS which was malleable enough to be subject to diverse interpretations by later redactors.

4) atta A3

The word atta is a homonym with several different meanings. The Dictionary of P (DP) lists four different possibilities: 1) atta < S asta, “thrown” (p.p. of √as) 2) atta < S ātta (p.p. of √ā+dā), “taken, grasped” 3) atta < S āpta, (p.p. of √āp) “obtained, full complete” 4) atta (stem form; nom. sing. attā) < Skt ātman, “self.” There are also other, less common possibilities: atta < S akta, “bedaubed” (cf. P upatta, “smeared”) p.p. of √añj; atta < akta (p.p. of √aj, “driven”); atta < S ārta, “afflicted, pained” < p.p. of √ṛ (in P atta, but occurs in AMg as atta); atta < ārta (p.p. of √ār=ā+ṛ), “praised” (not attested in P). The word is a good example of the extreme semantic flexibility of Pkt where, because of the assimilation of stops and the loss of a long vowel before two consonants (“law of the two morae”), one word can have several different S derivations - in

this case approximately eight; obviously in determining the meaning(s) of the word, context is all important. A well known case where there is a possibility for two readings occurs in the Sn, vs. 787:

```
upayo hi dharmesu upeti vādaṃ, anūpayaṃ kena kathāṃ vadeyya,
attā nirattā [var. attāṃ nirattāṃ] na hi tassa atthi: adhosi so dīṭṭhi-m-iddh’ eva sabbā [var. sabban] ti.
```

This is translated by Norman as, “An involved person is indeed involved in dispute[s] in respect of doctrines, [but] how, about what, could one dispute with one who is not involved? He has taken up or laid down nothing. He has shaken off all views in this very world.”

The commentary suggests that there are two possibilities for attā nirattā, although Norman takes the words as representing past participles of ādiyati (“to take up”) and nirassati (“to throw off”) because of the occurrence of these words in an earlier verse of the sutta. The commentary is as follows: tassa hi attadiṭṭhi vā ucchedadiṭṭhi vā n’atthi, gahanamañca naṃ vā pi attanirattasaññitaṃ n’atthi.500 “For he has neither a view of the self/soul [i.e. eternalism], nor a view of nihilism; for him there is no grasping or releasing, no so-called taking up or casting off.”

The commentator seems to be suggesting that both meanings are present and this is confirmed by the Niddesa: attā ti sassaadiṭṭhi n’atthi. nirattā ti ucchedadiṭṭhi n’atthi, attā ti gahitaṃ n’atthi, nirattā ti muñcitabbaṃ n’atthi; yass’atthi gahitaṃ tass’atthi muñcitabbaṃ,

499 Norman, Group of Discourses, 100.
500 Pj 2 5239-11.
yass’atthi muñcitabbaṃ tass’atthi gahitaṃ; gahanamuñcanam samatikkanto arahā buddhiparihānīṃ vītivatto. So vuṭṭhavāso ciṇṇacaraṇo gataddho gatadiso jālimaraṇasamāsāro, natthi tassa punabbhavo ti, attā nirattā [var: attaṃ nirattaṃ] na hi tassa atthī. ⁵⁰¹ attā: he has no view of eternalism, nirattā: he has no view of nihilism. attā: there is no grasping, nirattā: there is nothing to be released. He who has something grasped, has something to be released; he who has something to be released, has something which has been grasped. He has transcended grasping and release, the noble one has overcome the loss of wisdom. He is a rain-dweller (vuṭṭhavāso), an accomplished practitioner, one who has completed the journey, who has conquered the enemy, viz., the cycle of birth and death. For him there is no more coming-into-being; for him there is no self nor absence of self (nothing taken up or put down).” Obviously both the commentator and the author of the Niddesa seems to be comfortable with the dual meaning of these terms, which is part of the Indian nirvacana ("etymology") tradition (see discussion below, page 234f).

This semantic ambiguity is repeated in three other instances of the Sn:

Na tassa puttā pasavo vā khettāṃ vatthum na vijjati,
attā vā pi nirattā vā [var: attaṃ vā pi nirattaṃ vā], na tasmiṃ upalabbhati. (858)

---

⁵⁰¹ Nidd I 82²⁵-³¹. The attā nirattā variation is from the Burmese recension.
“For him there are no sons or cattle, field[s], [or] property. For him there is nothing taken up or laid down.” An alternate translation of pādā c would be “For him there is no self or not-self.” Commentary the same as for verse 787.

ajjhattam eva upasame, naññato bhikkhu santim eseyya:

ajjhattam upasantassa, n‘atthi attā [var. attaṃ, athā] kuto nīrattā [var.: nīrattha] vā. (919)

“Only within himself would he be at peace. A bhikkhu would not seek peace from another. For one who is at peace within himself there is nothing taken up, how much less anything laid down,” with a possible alternate translation of the last pāda as “… there is no self, how much less a not-self?” Commentary repeated. There is only one other occurrence of nīrattām in the Sn, in verse 1098, but here it occurs without the corresponding attaṃ/attaṃ and appears to mean "cast away.

Kāmesu vinaya gedhāṃ, (Jatukaṇṭhi Bhagavā) nekkhammaṃ daṭṭhu khemato,

uggahītaṃ nīrattāṃ vā mā te vijjītha kiñcanaṃ. (1098)

“Dispel greed for sensual pleasures, Jatukaṇṭhi," said the Blessed One, “having seen going-forth as safety. May there be nothing taken up or laid down by you.” The commentator

502 Norman, Group of Discourses, 107.
503 Ibid, 114.
504 Ibid, 133.
glosses nirattam as “to be released or cast away” contrasting it with that which is grasped (uggahiṭṭam) "because of the view of craving."505

Doctrinally both meanings of atta/niratta are correct. One of the Buddha’s key insights was that opposites are not an accurate way of viewing reality, and that their adoption leads to extremism and with it, affliction and suffering. The locus classicus for this statement is in the Kaccānagottasutta (SN 2, 1633–1730) where the Buddha expounds the two root extremes to Kaccāna, the extreme of existence and non-existence. The Buddha teaches the path of the middle way, which is interdependent origination. The self (as a permanent, unchangeable entity) and the not-self (as a pure absence or a nothing) are also extremes and to be rejected. As the Buddha says to Kaccāna “For the most part, Kaccāna, this world is dependent on a duality, on the notion of existence or non-existence. But for one who sees the arising of the world as it really is, for one with complete wisdom, there is no notion of non-existence with respect to the world; and for one who sees the cessation of the world as it really is, one with complete wisdom, there is no notion of existence with respect to the world.”506 In the same way as existence or non-existence must be rejected, so must the self and the not-self, or any view and its opposite; these are not an accurate reflection of reality. This seems to be precisely what the Buddha is

505 Pj 2, 59816–18: uggahita ti tanṭādiṭṭhisvesa gaḥitaṃ; nirattaṃ vā ti niraṣitaḥbbaṃ vā, muñcitabban ti vuttaḥ hoti.

saying to Jatukāṇṭhi in the verse mentioned above and in the following verse, where he rejects the past, the future and even the present:

\[\text{yaṃ pubbe taṃ visosehi, pacchā te māhu kiñcanam.}\]

\[\text{majjhe ce no gahessasi, upasanto carissasi. (1099)}\]

“Dry up what is in the past, may there be nothing for you in the future; if you do not grasp the present, you will wander at peace.”\(^{507}\)

So the commentators’ interpretation of \textit{atta/niratta} as a rejection of opposites at all levels, and even of the concept of opposites (as \textit{majjhe}, the present, entails a past and future) seems to be doctrinally correct, and there is no need to choose between one or the other.\(^{508}\)

There was also a northern recension of the \textit{Sutta Nipāta} which unfortunately did not survive, except for a few suttas in the Mvu and one \textit{vagga} (the \textit{Āṭṭhakavaggo}), called in Ch the 義足經 (\textit{Yìzú jīng}) and usually translated as the \textit{Arthapada Sūtra}.\(^{509}\) Here two of the above \textit{gāthās} have

\(^{507}\) Translated by the author. Norman’s translation is “Make what [existed] previously wither away. May there be nothing for you afterwards. If you do not grasp anything in between, you will wander calmed,” op. cit, 133. The \textit{Niddesa} specifically treats this \textit{gāthā} as dealing with time, glossing \textit{pubbe} as \textit{atīte} (“past”), \textit{pacchā} as \textit{anagāte} (“future”) and \textit{majjhe} as \textit{paccuppanne} (“present”) See Nidd 1, 434, lines 1, 8 and 17.

\(^{508}\) The notion of transcending all opposites and transcending the very transcending reached its fullest flowering in the Chan tradition. See Thomas Cleary, \textit{Book of Serenity, One Hundred Zen Dialogues} (Boston and London: Shambhala, 2005), xxviii, “…going beyond absorption in the present moment, transcending all notions, even of ‘thusness’ and acting in the midst of differentiations with no sense of either relative or absolute, being or nonbeing.”

survived in a very different form from the P, which tells us a lot about the difficulties of the transmission process. One verse (Sn 787) is basically unrecognizable in the Ch translation; although it follows after Sn 786, it appears to be a translation of a different source text. The other is a version of Sn 919:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ch</th>
<th>Bapat’s translation</th>
<th>P Sn 919</th>
<th>Norman’s translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>且自守行求滅，Qiě zi shǒu xíng qiú miè</td>
<td>By just guarding himself, the quiescence he may seek;</td>
<td>Ajhattam eva upasame,</td>
<td>Only within himself would he be at peace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>學莫從彼求滅，Xué mò cóng bǐ qiú miè</td>
<td>He must learn to seek it not of others.</td>
<td>nāññato bhikkhu santim eseyya:</td>
<td>A bhikkhu would not seek peace from another.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>以內行意著滅，Yīnèi xíng yì zhù miè</td>
<td>By inner reflections, the mental attachment doth cease.</td>
<td>aijhattaṃ upasantassa</td>
<td>For one who is at peace within himself</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>亦不入從何有？Yì bù</td>
<td>He pries not into</td>
<td>n'atthi attā [var. attaṃ,</td>
<td>there is nothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

This roughly corresponds to the P for the first three *pādas*, but in the last *pāda* there is a significant divergence; the whole concept of *attā/niratta* has been lost. I will take up the subject of transmission anomalies in more detail - specifically with reference to the *dhāraṇīs* of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* - below in Chapter 13.

5) *anibbisam, anivvisam* A3

What does the word *anibbisam* mean in Dhp 153?

*anekajātisaṃsāraṃ sandhāvissam anibbisam*

*gahakārakam* [var. *gahakāram*] *gavesanto, dukkhā jāti punappunaṃ*.

Norman translates as “without respite”: “I have run through the journeying-on of numerous births, without respite, seeking the house-maker; birth again and again is painful.”⁵¹² He suggests that *anibbisam* derives from *nivisam* (< S *ni+ ṇiś, “to come to rest, settle down in a home”) with -bb- m.c. and compares it to S *anivīsamāna* “not retiring to rest, restless.”

---


However, if the derivation is from a related verb, nir+ víś (“settle in a home, become a householder,” or “to enjoy, delight”), the phonology is regular as -rv- > -vv- > -bb- normally (e.g. nirvāṇa > nivvāna > nibbāna). This would give the meaning as “not settling down in a home” or “not becoming a householder” or “not enjoying (saṃsāra)” and would contrast with “seeking the house-builder” (a metaphor for the body and tanhā) in pāda c. Interpreted in such a manner, this would be an elegant contrastive trope - seeking the house-builder (tanhā) although not settling down in a home, suggesting the frustration of seeking permanence where there is none. Alternatively it could just mean, “not enjoying.” Dhammapāla interprets the word in the former fashion in his commentary on the Therīgāthā, verse 159 where Norman translates “without expiation.” Dhammapāla glosses it: saṃsārī ham anibbisan ti saṃsārasamudde patittham avindantī alabhantī bhavādisu aparāparuppattivasena saṃsārim ahan ti “Not finding, not obtaining a resting place in the ocean of saṃsāra because of of being born again and again in various states of existence, I wandered…” This sense of frustration of rebirth over and over again is apparent in the only other extant MI version of this gāthā, in the UV (31.6-b) which has punaḥ punaḥ (“again and again”) in the place of anibbisam. The Tib translation also has yang yang (“again and again”) and skye ba’ī ‘khor ba du ma (“many-birth-cyclings”) and loosely


514 Thī-a 13713-15.
corresponds with the UV. The Ch version also has omitted anibbisā, translating instead 無端, (wúduān) “without end.”

Norman derives his translation of “without expiation” from S nirveśa (< S nir + viś, as above, “wages, reward, atonement, expiation”). Buddhaghosa consistently glosses it taṃ ṇānaṃ avindanto alabhanto (“not finding, not obtaining wisdom”), which, as Norman points out is not one of the meanings of nir + viś or ni + viś. Perhaps Buddhaghosa is suggesting a derivation from nir + vid (“to find out, get rid of, do away with,”) which would make sense in the context, but requires a complex derivation, and loss of the nasal, as happens in G (pr. p. nirvindaṃ > nivvindaṃ > nibbindaṃ > nibbidam). This would require a further change of the intervocal stop to a fricative (nibbidam > nibbisā) which is not unknown in MI.

515 There are four Ch translations of the Dhp (法句經, Fǎ jù jīng); the first was done around 224 CE (T210). T211, completed c. 308 CE adds in the background stories found in the P commentary. T212 (c. 399 CE) is the UV with brief commentary and T213 (c. 1000 CE) is the UV without. I will usually be quoting from T210 (the earliest version), although in many cases, the later versions seems to be harmonized with this one. The corresponding verse occurs in Chapter 19 T04n0210_p0565c07-08 and only approximates the Pāli:

Saṃsāra is futile, coming and going is tedious. The mind clings to one's body [resulting in] the suffering of birth without end.

517 Dhp-a 3, 128-13.
518 GDhp §46.
519 For example in Dhp 169-d asmiṃ loke paramhi ca (“in this world and the other”) with a GDhp 328-d reflex of asvi loki parasa yi, where parasa appears to derive from paratra. Or Theragāthā v. 536-a asayhasāhino (“enduring what is beyond endurance”), compared to the Mvu (3, 109) corresponding form asahyatāyino (translated by Jones Mvu 3, 108, as “the invincible”) where -t > -s-
As well as being a present participle *anibbisaṃ* can also be a *bahuvrīhi* or adjective, modifying *saṃsāraṃ. nibbisa* (= *S nirveśa*, “wages, reward, payment”) is found with this meaning in the *Theragāthā*, verse 607:

*nābhīnandāmi maraṇaṃ nābhīnandāmi jīvitaṃ,*

*kālaṃ ca paṭikankhāmi nibbisaṃ bhatako yathā.*

“I do not long for death; I do not long for life; but I await my time, as a servant his wages,” and the meaning “without reward” would certainly fit the context in Dhp 153: “I have transmigrated in *saṃsāra* for many births without reward…” Another possible derivation is from the adjective *nirviṣa* (> *P nibbisa*) meaning “without poison”; although this meaning for the word is not attested in *P*, it does occur in *AMg* (*nirvīsa*) with this meaning. Here the meaning would be “…in *saṃsāra* which is not without poison…” (*anirviṣa*). This may seem far-fetched; however, in an alternative version of this *gāthā*, found in the Tib translation of the *Nidānakathā*, the editor translates *dug med* (“without poison” = *S nirviṣa*); this *gāthā* is quite garbled from the *P* (which has evidently been harmonized with Dhp 153 as it is identical), but recognizably the same verse:

```
skye ba’i ’khor ba ma lus pa/ /

dug med rnam par dug med tshol/ /
```

520 Norman, *Elders’ Verses 1*, 92. Th. verse 1003.
522 Per Negi, *Dictionary*, 2205.
“For countless samsaric births, when seeking the poisonless state of homelessness, thoroughly seeking it, (I experienced) the suffering of birth again and again and…”

The word *anibbisamḥ* has then several possible meanings, including 1) without respite (Norman), 2) not becoming a householder, or settling down in a home, 3) not enjoying, 4) not finding (wisdom or perhaps permanence), 5) without expiation (Norman), 6) without reward, 7) venomous, i.e. not without poison. 8) poisonless. All but the last are possible and logical within the context of the *gāthā*, although just how many of these nuances would have been sensed by an average MI speaker is impossible to tell.

---

523 Jātakanidāna *skyes pa rabs kyi gleng gzhi*, Pecha 236b. The P version is on page 76-27 of the *Jātaka* volume 1. *khyim med* may be a misprint for *khim byed* (“home-maker” or *gahakārakaṃ* in the P), which phrase occurs in the next *gāthā*, however this would not fit the context unless the privative *a*-prefix was added to *nirviṣa* (*a-nirviṣa*, “not without poison”), which was apparently not in the Tib scribe’s exemplar, since the home-maker (*tanhā*) is obviously “poisonous.” In short, the *gāthā* appears to be somewhat garbled. The corresponding Tib version (31.6-a) has *khang khyim byed* (“home-maker”) and corresponds closely with the Dhp 153-c and the UV 31.6-c except for the choice of main verb. P has *sandhāvisamḥ* (“I have transmigrated”), UV has *saṃdḥāvitvā* (“having run through”) and Tib has *phyung* which ordinarily means “to remove or expel,” but which the commentary glosses with the causative of *sam + ṭrāp* (Tib: *yang dag par thob par byas pa*), “cause to get or obtain.” For Prajñāvarman’s commentary on the UV (the Sanskrit version of which is lost) see Michael Balk, *Arbeitsmaterialien Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivaraṇa*, Transliteration of its Tibetan version (based on the xylographs of Chone/Derbe and Peking) (Bonn Indica et Tibetica Verlag, 1984), vol. 2, 904-3-4.
What does \textit{nirattham} mean? In Dhp 41 it is usually translated as “useless” (< S \textit{nirartha}): \vspace{1em}

\begin{quote}
\textit{acirām vat' ayaṁ kāyo, pāthaviṁ adhisessati.}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{chuddho āpetaviṇṇāno nirattham va kāliṅgaram.}
\end{quote}

“Before long, alas, this body will lie on the earth, rejected, without consciousness, like a useless log of wood.”\textsuperscript{524} In the three other extant reflexes of this verse, two of them use the same word (GDhp 153-d, \textit{niratha}\textsuperscript{525} and PDhp 349-d, \textit{nirātham}), while one has the word \textit{nirastam} (UV 1.35-d) meaning “cast down.” The ambiguity results from the change OI > MI where several conjuncts converge to the -\textit{tth}- consonant cluster: -\textit{rth}- > -\textit{tth}--; -\textit{st}- > -\textit{tth}--; -\textit{sth}- > -\textit{tth}--; -\textit{str}- > -\textit{tth}--; -\textit{śv}- > -\textit{tth}--; -\textit{tr}- > -\textit{tth} to name the common ones.\textsuperscript{526} Conjunct -\textit{st}- in OI can also evolve to -\textit{tt}- as we have seen above with reference to \textit{niratta}, which is the usual P reflex of S \textit{nirasta}. This means that the word \textit{niratth}a can have several possible meanings: < \textit{nirartha} (“useless, meaningless”), \textit{nirasta} (“cast down” < S \textit{väs, “to throw,”} or “without a home” from S \textit{asta, “home”}), \textit{nirastha} (“without bones”), \textit{nirastra} (“without weapons”), \textit{niraśva} (“without horses”); it is left to the context to determine which meaning(s) are appropriate. Since we have two different reflexes in this instance (\textit{niratth}a and the Sanskritized form \textit{nirast}a), we can be fairly certain that the underlying BMI form was \textit{\textasteriskcentered nira\textasteriskcentered\textasteriskcenteredth}a and it was interpreted as derived from \textit{nirartha} in the

\textsuperscript{524} Norman, \textit{Word of the Discourse}, 7.

\textsuperscript{525} which Brough equates with \textit{nirasta}, GDhp, 302.

\textsuperscript{526} See Woolner, \textit{Introduction to Prakrit}, §38, 45, 49, 56. Achim Fahs, \textit{Grammatik des Pali} (Leipzig: VEB Verlag Enzyklopädie, 1985), §2.2.2; Pischel §58, 64, 94. Most of these changes are also attested in the Aśokan edicts. See Hultzsch, \textit{Inscriptions}, lxxv. For example, in the Eastern dialect (Kalsi), -\textit{rth}-, -\textit{st}-, -\textit{str}-, -\textit{sth}- > -\textit{tth}-. 

P version (for Buddhaghosa glosses it as \textit{nirattha} \textit{va} \textit{kaliṅgaram} \textit{nirupārām} \textit{niratthakaṃ} \textit{kaṭṭhakhaṇḍaṃ} viya, “useless, vain, like a piece of wood”), and Sanskritized as \textit{nirasta} “rejected” by the UV translator. Since \textit{kadaṅgara} can also mean fodder (i.e. “straw”), then an equally cogent translation might be “like fodder without horses (to eat it).” The usual meaning of \textit{nirattha} in Pkt is “rejected” or “thrown away;” with the meaning “useless” it is usually spelled \textit{nirattha} or \textit{niratthaga} (= P \textit{niratthaka}); the same goes for AMg. The Tib version of the UV translates it as \textit{nirasta}, and adds the embellishment, “like wood cast off in a cemetery ground” \textit{(dur khrod bor ba’i mgal dum ltar)} which (the cemetery = \textit{śmasāna}) is not in the UV exemplar we possess, but which comes from Prajñāvarman’s commentary. The Ch version tracks the S fairly closely until the last line which is perplexing: 有身不久, 皆當歸土, 形壞神去, 寄住何貪?

527 Dhp-a 1, 321\textsuperscript{2-3}.
529 See Balk, \textit{Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivaraṇa}, vi-vii. The commentary (page 131\textsuperscript{26-132\textsuperscript{1}}) reads:

\begin{verbatim}
sdug pa’i lag mthil gyis gzung dri zhim
phreng ba phye ma’i dris mchod cing/
bde ba’i lus ’di dur khrod gnas su
mgal dum ltar ni yongs bor nas
gdug pa gcan gzan brkam pa’i mthus ni
mig dang sha lpags sna gu dag/
'jig par byed de ngan pa’i rang bzhin
mi brtan ’jig rten sgyur ma bzhin/
ze’o/
\end{verbatim}

"Honoured with a sweet-smelling garland and aromatic powder which were held by the palm of the beloved, this human body was cast away on the charnel ground like a piece of wood. Then, through the power of a fierce, harmful beast, eyes, flesh and skin, and nose were completely destroyed like the illusion of a transitory, evil-natured world."

530 T04n0210_p0563a14-15: Yǒushēn bùjiǔ, jiē dāngguī tǔ, xíng huài shēn qù, jīzhù hé tān? There are four versions of the Ch \textit{Dhammapada}. I am quoting from the earliest one, translated in 224 CE by 维祗難
the spirit leaves - why the craving to stay in a temporary home?” It seems like the translator was taking nirastāṇaḥ as “without a home,” but the translation of this last pada is so different, he/she may have had something completely different as a source.

7) subbatā A1, A3

In Dhp 145, the word subbatā occurs which the commentator glosses as suvadā:

udakam hi nayanti nettikā, usukārā namayanti tejanam
dārūṃ namayanti tacchakā attānaṃ damayanti subbatā.

“Truly canal-makers lead water; fletchers bend the arrow [straight]; carpenters bend wood; men of good vows tame the self.”531 The commentary reads, tattha subbatā ti suvadā sukhena
ovaditabbā anusāsitabbā ti attho.532 “subbatā means those of nice speech, compliant;533 ‘they are easily instructed or admonished’ is the meaning.”534 Norman takes subbatā as derived from


531 Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 21.
532 Dhp-a 3, 9915-16.
533 There is no P word suvada attested; however suvaca is attested with a meaning of “of nice speech, compliant” (PED).
suvratā, as the commentary on Dhp 95, subbato (vatānaṃ sundaratāya, “because of the goodness of his vows”) explains it. He opines that the “equation of subbata = suvada suggests a transmission through a dialect where the form was su-vrata > su-vvada, with -t- > -d-, probably written as suvada.” More likely the correspondence points to an underlying BMI form su(v)aya, where an intervocalic -y- has taken the place of the final stop, leaving it open to interpretation. Since most early writing forms did not double the geminates one would expect to see suvaya in the source document, which was interpreted as suvrata in one tradition (su(v)aya > sub(b)aya > sub(b)ata), while this section of the commentary preserved the interpretation of suvada. In fact AMg preserves the word suvvaya meaning “observing one’s vows” and the word is retained in Pkt as suvaya and suvvaya with the same meaning.

In the Mvu story of Sabhika, which corresponds to the P Sabhiya sutta (Sn P 91-102), the word suvrata occurs in the wanderer’s first question to the Buddha:

kiṃprāptam āhu bhikṣunāṃ

suvratam kiṃ kathaṃ ca dāntam āhu

535 Dhp-a 2, 181
536 Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 103.
537 With the common -vv- > -bb- change seen in P; von Hinüber, Das ältere Mittelindisch, §255.
538 See Mylius, Wörterbuch, s.v. and Sheth, Prakrit Dictionary, 924. suvvaya was also a fairly common proper name. See Klaus Mylius, Wörterbuch des kanonischen Jinismus (Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag, 2005), entry §2515.
which Jones translates as “What has a man attained that he should be called a monk? How does he come to be called gentle and tamed?” He amends the word suvrata > surata because he doesn’t think the meaning “pious” (svrata) suits the context, and because of the P text which is

kimpattinam āhu bhikkhunam, iti Sabhiyo

sorata (var. sūrataṃ, sorataṃ) kena, kathañ ca dantam āhu, Sn 513

where Norman translates sorata as “meek” presumably because of the commentary: soratan ti suvūpasantam, sūratan ti pi pātho, suṭṭhu uparatan ti attho; “soratam = well calmed. There is also a reading sūratam, ‘thoroughly quieted’ is the meaning,” (although he derives it from suvra). The suvra/su(o)rata parallel points to a possible confusion between these two words which in fact do have a semantic overlap - both are “devoted” (S su-vrata, and su-rata), one to religious practice, the other to humility and restraint (in the BHS meaning of the word). Phonologically they are of course related, but generally -rv- > -vv- in MI and there is almost no precedent of -v- > -r- (svaya > suraya) or -b- > -r- (sub(b)aya > suraya) or -r- > -b-/v- to

540 Group of Discourses, 61: ‘When one has obtained what, do they call him “bhikkhu”?, said Sabhiya. ‘On account of what do they call one “meek,” and why do the call one “tamed”?
542 Per Norman, “Four Etymologies,” 149.
543 In S surata has the sense of both “compassion” and “amorous or sexual pleasure” (MW), but in BHS, the meaning is entirely positive: “gentle, kind, humble, self-restrained (PED s.v. sorata) < ̣vṛam, "to stop."
account for the confusion here.\textsuperscript{544} Nevertheless, as in the case of Dhp 145, the simplest explanation is that an underlying form \textit{suv(v)aya} was interpreted as \textit{suvrata} by the redactor of the Mvu) and as \textit{suraya > surata} by the P scribe, possibly because he too, like Jones, felt that the meaning of \textit{surata} was more suitable to the context than \textit{suvvata/subbata}.

Verse 513 of the \textit{Sabhiya sutta} also exists in Ch translation as part of the so-called \textit{Abhiniskramaṇa sûtra} (佛本行集經, \textit{Fó běnháng jījīng}, T190.3.655a-932a), reading:

大聖云何名比丘　諸聖伏者何名伏
知見何事名為覺　唯願世尊為我宣

“Great sage, how is one named a \textit{bhikkhu}? All the holy ones are called “subdued” - what does the word subdued mean? Who knows and sees? Why is he called awakened? I only wish that the Revered One will answer on my behalf.”\textsuperscript{545} The word \textit{伏} (fú, “Subdued, suppressed, overcome”) appears to translate both P words \textit{soratam} and \textit{dantam} (The P reads \textit{soratam kena kathañ ca dantam āhu}, “On account of what do they call one ‘meek’, and why do they call one ‘tamed’?”. The word \textit{sorato} is repeated in P verse 515, and here the author uses the word \textit{調} (diào, “tamed”). It appears that the Ch redactor had the word \textit{so(u)rato} in his source document and treated it as a synonym for \textit{danto}, i.e.”tamed” or “self-restrained.”

\textsuperscript{544} In Aśoka’s RE 5, S \textit{pari + ṛudh > pari + ṛbudh} (apalibodhāye, “to remove obstacles”), which the PED suggests is due to dissimilation of the two -r-’s.
\textsuperscript{545} T03n0190_p0834a19-20. \textit{Dàshèng yùnhé míng bǐqiū　zhū shèng fù zhě hé míng fù　zhī jiàn héshì míngwéi jué　wéi yuàn shìzūn wèiwǒ xuān.}
The word *ussadā*, which occurs in Sn verse 515 is another well-known problem in MI semantics. Norman translates it as “haughtiness” and the Ch redactor uses the character 纏 (*fù*, “binding, bonds”). The Mvu corresponding verses has *utsanno*, which Jones translates as “puffed up with pride,” which he relates to BHS *utsada* (adj. and noun, “elevation, protuberance; addition, supplement; abundant, abundance”) which is believed to derive from S *ut+ṣyand*, “to flow out,” stem form-*syada* per the PED. In the context, however, *utsanno* appears to have a positive, not negative meaning:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{sarvatra-ukeśo smṛtimāṃ} \\
\text{na ca so hiṃsati kamci loke} \\
\text{tīṇo śramaṇo anāvilo} \\
\text{utsanno yo na karoti āśravaṃ (Mvu 3, 39515-18)}
\end{align*}
\]

---

546 T03n0190_p0834a26. There are two other translations of the word (presumably *ussada*, but of course we can’t be certain of that), in the Ch *Arthapada sūtra* (translation of the Sn *Aṭṭhakavaggo*), verse 783-d where the P has *yass’ ussadā n’atthi* (“he has no haughtiness…”) and the Ch uses the character 著 (*zhù*, “attachment”) T04n0198_p0177c10; and verse 920-d where the P has *ussadam bhikkhu na kareyya kuhīṇci* (“a bhikkhu would not show haughtiness about anything”) and the Ch has 增識 (*zēng shí*, “increased consciousness”), T04n0198_p0184b23. Bapat, *Arthapada Sūtra* translates this as “protuberances,” which as Norman suggests (*Group of Discourses*, 257) shows a confusion with the *satta ussada* of the Mahāpurisa (DN 3, 151).


548 Both the CPD and the DP derive it from *ut + ṣad*, however.
“Everywhere he is equanimous, mindful, he does not harm anyone in the whole world. He has crossed over, the recluse, he is undisturbed, elevated (utsanno) and does not make any more outflows.”\textsuperscript{549} utsanno appears to be the past participle of ut + \textit{śad}, “to raise oneself up” which makes sense in this context. The P word \textit{ussada} is, per the PED, derived from S \textit{ud+ syad} (unattested in this form) which would mean “to flow out” or “to overflow,” (p.p. \textit{utsyanna}, \textit{ussanna} in P). One might conclude therefore that P \textit{ussada} and BHS \textit{utsanno} were simply unrelated were it not for their phonological similarity and the almost identical correspondence of the first three lines of the parallel gāthās:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P (Sn)</th>
<th>BHS (Mvu)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Sabbattha upekkhako satimā}</td>
<td>\textit{sarvatra-upekṣo smṛtimāṃ}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{na so hiṃsati kañci sabbaloke},</td>
<td>\textit{na ca so hiṃsati kañci loke /}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{tiṇṇo samaṇo anāvilo},</td>
<td>\textit{tiṇṇo śramaṇo anāvilo}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>\textit{Ussadā yassa na santi, sorato so. 515.}</td>
<td>\textit{utsanno (var. utsanto) yo na karoti (var. yena karotī) āśravāṃ (var. aśramaṇī) Mvu 3, 395.}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{549} Jones, P 395, translates, “Ever patient and mindful, he harms no one in the world; he is an immaculate recluse who has crossed the stream. He does not, puffed up with pride, contract any asrava,” and admits that S \textit{utsanno} in the sense of “raised” and “exalted” would work. However, with \textit{tiṇṇo} and \textit{anāvilo} modifying \textit{śramaṇo}, both positive terms, I cannot see how the third adj. \textit{utsanno} can be taken in any but a positive sense.
The P tradition associates *ussada* with seven bad qualities, but the word also has several other meanings, both positive and negative which seem to be the result of phonological simplification and convergence of several different word forms. In MI the conjunct -*ts*- usually changes to -*cch*-, except at compound junctions where it goes to -*ss*-, either directly or through -*cch*-. This change also happens in OI where we find such forms as *ucchvāsa* (“breathing out”) and *ucchvasita* (“inspired”) < *ut + śvas*, or *ucchraya* (“elevation”) < S *ut + śri*; in MI, these forms invariably changed to -*ss*- (or long vowel + -s-), e.g. *ucchvāsa* > AMg. *ussāsa*, or *ucchraya* > *ussaya*. In MI often -*ts*- will go to -*ss*- directly even where there is no compound boundary; as early as the Aśokan edicts we have S *cikitsā* (“medicine”) > *cikisakā* (K), *cikis* (Sh), and *cikisa* (M), while in Gir > *cikīch* (RE 2 A). With three different forms (*ut+s/s, ud+s/s, uccḥ*) evolving to one homonymic form (*uss/ūs*) there is obviously a possibility of significant confusion. And if, on top of the initial syllable confusion, intervocalic consonants drop out or change, then the meaning can be even more obfuscated. The Mvu and P forms *utsanna* and *ussada* point to an underlying form *ussaa* or *ussaẏa* which was interpreted as derived from different roots by the respective redactors (P < *ut+śyand*, “haughtiness” and Mvu < *ut + śsad*, “elevated”). The form *ussaẏa* is extremely malleable; it is attested in AMg in the meaning “rising,” or “growth”

---

550 Pj 2, 425²⁹-³⁰ (ad Sn 515): *yassa c’ime rāgadosamohānaṁadīṭṭhikilesaduccaritasankhātā sati’ ussāda keci olārikā vā sukhumā vā na santi,* “…and who does not have these seven conceits, neither coarse nor subtle, called craving, hatred, delusion, arrogance, views, afflictions, bad conduct.”


552 We of course do not know if the redactors had a source document in front of them or were listening to a *bhāṇaka* (reciter). The geminate -*mn*- is not derivable from an intervocalic glide, so to arrive at *utsanna* < *ussayā*, the scribe would have had to hypercorrect based on his opinion of the supposed derivation, perhaps assuming *ussayā* < *ussata* and taking -*sata* as Vedic p.p.. (satta) of *ut + śsad.*
(< S ucchraya), in the form ussayana with the meaning “pride, haughtiness” (< S ucchrayaṇa), in the form ussava with the meaning “to raise, toss” (<S ut + śru) and in the form ussava with the meaning “festival” (<S utsava). If ussayā is the underlying BMI form, it would also account for the multiple meanings of the P word ussada, which is itself a back-formation from ussayā and encapsulates the meaning of several different source OI words:

1) “prominence, height, growth, elevation” = ussada < Pkt ussayā < S utsada < S ut + śad (“to raise oneself”); or ussada < Pkt ussayā < S ucchraya < S ut + śri (“rise up”); or ussada < ussayā < Pkt ussava < S ut + śru (“to raise”; AMg = ussava).

2) “anointing” = ussada- < Pkt ussayā- < S ucchādana < S utsādana < ut + śad in causative sense (“to anoint, rub”).

3) “crowd, abundance” = ussada < Pkt ussayā < Skt uccaya < uc + cī (“heap, multitude”)

4) “supplementary” = ussada < Pkt ussayā < Skt uccaya < uc + cī (“adding to”)

5) “attribute” = ussada < ussayā < uncertain.

6) “arrogance, conceit” = ussada < ussayā < ussava < S utsava (“festival, joy, elevation, insolence, passion, wrath”) < ut + sū (“to stir up, agitate”) or ussada < ussayā < utsyada < ut + syand, (“overflow, outflow, ooze out”).

Although much of these reconstructions are conjectural, one thing is apparent: the word ussada is derived from multiple OI roots which accounts for its many divergent meanings; the P redactor took its meaning from the root ut + śū or ut + syand in a negative sense, the Mvu

553 Mylius, Wörterbuch, 179. Mylius’s derivations must be considered conjectural.
554 The intervocalic -v- is often replaced by the -y- hiatus glide as per Pischel §186,187.
scribe from \textit{ut+ śri} in a positive sense - and there are many other meanings which are neutral and depend on the context.

9) \textit{sutta/sūtra/sūkta/sūtta/} A3

Norman has already commented on the derivation of the BHS word \textit{sūtra} from MI \textit{sutta}, which he considers a hyperform, i.e. a mis-Sanskritization or misinterpretation of the meaning of the source word, which is more probably derived from \textit{sūkta} ("well-spoken"). Mayrhofer calls this suggestion "entbehrlich" (dispensable), which is echoed by von Hinüber who claims that this derivation has "no support, as the long discussion in the \textit{Atthāsalinī} (As) shows in all clarity." Here we find the following:

\begin{quote}
\textit{Atthānāṁ sūcanato suvuttato savanato \textit{tha sūdanato}}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{suttāṇāsuttasabhāgato ca suttāṁ Suttan ti akkhātaṁ} (As 19\textsuperscript{15-16}).
\end{quote}

"Because of pointing out the benefits, because of being well spoken, well-heard, and because of flowing forth, because of the orders in a \textit{sutta} and because of being like a line of orders on a string, a \textit{sutta} is called a \textit{Sutta}." The commentary on the \textit{gāthā} then goes on to define \textit{sutta} in

\footnotesize

555 Norman, "Buddhism and Sanskritisation," 135.
556 Mayrhofer, KEWA, 492.
terms of the usual understanding of the term’s derivation from śīva, to sew, i.e., a thread or string: “It is a common thread. For just as a line is a measure for carpenters, so a sutta is a measure for the wise. And just as flowers are collected together by a string so they are not destroyed, in the same way benefits are collected by a sutta.”

Nevertheless, the derivation of sutta/sūtra from śīva/syū with the meaning of “thread, line, cord or string” - metaphorically extended to include the rules “strung together” in a treatise - is problematic. Most nouns ending in -tra are neuter with the suffix indicating the means or instrument of the action expressed by the root. So gātra (“limb”), the means of going, pattra (“wing”) the means of flying, pātra (“cup”) the means of drinking, yoktra (“bond”) the means of binding, vastra (“garment”), the means of wearing, śrotra (“ear”), the means of hearing, etc.

558 As 1922-25: Suttasabhāgañ c’etaṃ. Yathā hi tacchakānaṃ suttaṃ pamāṇam hoti evam etam pi viññūnam, yathā ca suttena saṅghāṭiṇi pupphāni na vikirīṇyanti evam etena sarīghāṭā atthā. K. Klaus, “Zu den Śrautasūtras,” in Indoarisch, Iranisch und die Indogermanistik, Bernhard Forssman und Robert Plath, eds., (Wiesbaden: Reichert Verlag, 2000), 186-187, argues that the literary genre sūtra was borrowed from the term for fabric from the textile industry where different fibres are woven together: Die Śrautasūtras beruhen sie inhaltlich und auch sprachlich auf sich teils deckenden, teils ergänzenden, teils widersprechenden Informationen, die zuvor systematisch aus verschiedenen Quellen gesammelt worden sind. ("Content-wise and also often linguistically, the Śrautasūtras are based on information which is in part congruent, in part complementary and in part contradictory that was previously systematically assembled from different sources.") In a review of Klaus’ work on the Pātimokkhasutta, Oskar. von Hinüber, "Nochmals über das Pātimokkhasutta, Anmerkungen zu K. Klaus: "Zur Enstehung des Pātimokkhasutta der Theravādin",, Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Südasiens, 55; also available in Kleine Schriften, Teil 1, 285, says that the earliest usage of the term sūtra (in the Baudhāyanasūtra) was as a technical term meaning aphorism or rule, which accords well with the derivation in this paper ("that which should be followed" - see below).

559 See Whitney, Grammar, §1185. Usually the roots are guṇa strengthened, but not always.
*sivtra or *syūtra, not sūtra, would be the analogous forms for the roots ṑsiv/ syū (“the means of sewing”); if *syūtra > sūtra, this would be an unusual and very early example of the change sy- > s- in OI, a change which was later common in MI. The change, however is gainsaid by the existence of the p.p. syūta (“having been sewn”) and absolutive syūtvā (“having sewn”), alongside the forms sūta (“impelled”) and sūtvā (“having impelled”) - presumably the -y- of the conjunct sy- was preserved to differentiate these two roots, so it was probably also the case with *syūtra vs. sūtra. However, with the meaning of “a series of rules or precepts” for sūtra, a more likely and simpler explanation (which requires no change of the root) is a derivation from ṑsū, a common Vedic verb meaning “to urge, vivify, consecrate, authorize.” In this derivation sūtra is the means of urging, impelling, authorizing, etc., or “that by which something is [verbed],” and by extension, “that which should be followed.” These latter definitions are appropriate to both the Buddhist use of the word sutta (which, as has long been remarked, significantly differs from the Brahmanical use of the term), and the Brahmancial usage. Here the classic definition is

\[svalpākṣaramasamāṇdigdhāṃ sāravādviśvatomukham\]

\[astobhamanavadyaṃ ca sūtraṃ sūtravido vidut\]

“Those who know sūtras, know them as a concise expression, unambiguous, substantial, comprehensive (lit: “facing in all directions), complete (“without stop”) and irreproachable.” Buddhist suttas are generally not a series of succinct and pithy aphorisms which require

---

560 Quoted in B&R s.v. sutra and attributed to the Trikāṇḍāśeṣa, the Medinīkośa, and Hemacandra’s Anekārthāṃgraha.
explication for their understanding, but a lengthy record of the teaching of the Buddha and his followers and an injunction to practice; the term is sometimes used in the Vinaya to mean “rule” but that is not the norm.\textsuperscript{561} The meaning and derivation of both \textit{sūtra} and \textit{sutta} are therefore in question. There are then approximately five possibilities: 1) \textit{sūtra} is derived from the root \textit{vśiv/syū} (“syūtra > sūtra) as noted above and the concept of a string or chord metaphorically extended to cover the Brahmanical use of the term as a series of rules strung together; the Buddhist term \textit{sutta} is therefore the normal MI reflex of this word. 2) \textit{sūtra} is an instrumental noun derived from the root \textit{vśū} and has the meaning of “that by which something is impelled or legitimated.” That which impels or legitimates is of course the correct understanding and implementation of the rules as laid down in the appropriate \textit{sūtra}; this could be the case for both the Buddhist and Brahmanical tradition or only the former. 3) the Buddhist word \textit{sutta} is derived from S \textit{sūkta}, meaning “well-said” as has been proposed since Walleser made the suggestion in 1914.\textsuperscript{562} 4) \textit{sutta} is derived from S \textit{sūta} (= su-datta, “well given”). 5) it is derived from the S verb \textit{ṛṣ}, p.p. \textit{sūrta} (“bright, illuminated”). A derivation from \textit{supta} (“sleeping”) is of course possible but not germane.

The word \textit{sūtra} predates Buddhism by several hundred years. It first appears in the Artharva \textit{Veda} with the clear meaning of “string” or “chord.”\textsuperscript{563} When exactly it took on its present

\textsuperscript{561} von Hinüber believes that this was the original meaning of the term, before it was broadened to include the discourses. See “Neun Aṅgas,” 130-31.

\textsuperscript{562} Those who have supported this view are listed (and dismissed) in von Hinüber, “Neun Aṅgas,” 132, footnote 28.

\textsuperscript{563} For example, \textit{Atharva-Veda}, 10.8.37-38 in Whitney’s translation: 37. Who so may know the stretched-out string in which these offspring are woven in, who so may know the string of the string (\textit{sūtra sūtram sūtrasya yó vidyād), he may know the great brahmaṇa. I know the stretched-out string (\textit{sūtraṃ

---

\[\text{(Footnotes continued on the next page...)}\]
meaning I have been unable to determine, but presumably somewhere around 800 BCE when the Śrauta sūtras were first composed. Whether its history, etymology and semantic nuances can be recovered is questionable, requiring a systematic study of the word diachronically and in all its multifarious contexts, a research project which goes well beyond the purview of this paper.564 In Ch the term is 經 (jīng, “warp, longitude, channels, scriptures”), which, although it appears to be related to the S word sūtra meaning “string,” is in fact a pre-existing term with a similar meaning. In Tib sūtra is translated by the term mdo, which means “a point of confluence, a meeting place, junction” which presumably refers to the writings as a compendium of the Buddha’s teachings. In MI and OI there does appear to have been some convergence of meaning and an interesting epilogue is the word’s use in later Pkt where the convergence continues: here sutta has a host of meanings derived from Ṁśū, “to impel” and Ṣśū, “to give birth, produce,” i.e. sutta as verb (suttai < S suttaya-), “to create, to appoint, to construct, etc;” sutta as noun, “ear” from śruta, śrotra < Ṣśru (“to hear”); sutta, “flood” < śrota < Ṣśru (“to flow); sutta, “asleep” < supta < Ṣsvap (“to sleep”); sutta, “well spoken” < sūkta < Ṣvac (“to speak”) and of course sutta, “thread” < sūtra < Ṣśiv/syū?).565

---


The meaning of the term ṭādin/tāyin is a well-known problem in Buddhist philology. The earliest appearance that we have of the MI form of this word is in RE 4, C, where it occurs in the relative/correlative combination: yadiśaṃ bahuhi vasaśatehi na bhutapruve tadiše aja vaḍhite devaṇaṃpriyasa priyadraśia (Sh), “That which had not existed before in numerous ages, has now increased thanks to King Priyadraśia, beloved of the gods...” There are several different reflexes of the pair: in Sh yadiśaṃ/tadiše, in M adiše/tadise, in K ādisā/tādise, in Dh adise/tādise and in Gir, yārise/tārise. The western reflex in Gir is an anomaly; here there is a progression ṭadvṛṣa > tādiśa > tārisa, which is the earliest example we have of the change -d- > -r- in MI, an unusual change in any case. Wackernagel took this as an example of a MI form which was not derived from OI but from other Indogermanic languages; he relates it to Gk. τηλίκος (“so great,” Latin talis). However Pischel notes that da becomes ra in adjectival and pronominal compound words formed with -drṛṣa, -drśa, -drkṛṣa as in AMg erisa < S īdrṛṣa and AMg tārisa < S ṭadvṛṣa. In P the word appears in two forms, as tādisa and tādin, which reflects a


567 K. R. Norman, ”The Dialectal Variety of Middle Indo-aryan,” Sanskrit and World Culture (Berlin, 1986), 391, footnote 6. Also available in Collected Papers 3 (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1992), 118, footnote 6. The change -d- > -r- is attested in Vedic times (see Bloomfield & Edgerton Vedic Variants §227a) although rare. There are also a few examples in MI like Dhp 151 where P pavedayanti (“they teach”) has a reflex of GDhp 160 praverayadi; as Brough, GDhp, 229, says, “the appearance of -r- for -d- is extremely rare in Middle Indian (Pischel §245).” Pischel notes that da becomes ra in adjectival and pronominal compound words formed with -drṛṣa, -drśa, -drkṛṣa as in AMg erisa < S īdrṛṣa, but why the -d- > Ø, rather than the -r- is not explained.

568 Wackernagel, Grammatik, 1, xxi, quoted in Norman above. Mayrhofer disagrees, KEWA, 494.
further change from S tāṛṣa > tāṛśa > tādisa > tādin, where the -sa ending has been dropped and replaced with an -in declension.

The word also occurs in BHS as tāyin, where the intervocalic stop has been dropped and replaced by a glide. So in the Sobhiyasutta of the Sn, P has tādi in verse 522-d, but the Mvu has tāyi (3, 397) in the parallel form. Similarly in the BHS version of the Mahāparinibānasutta, we find tāyinaḥ corresponding to the P tādino (DN 2, 157). It also occurs in AMg in two forms, as tāi, as well as tārisa (like Gir above). There appears to be some confusion as to what the word means, despite Edgerton’s confidence that tādin = tāyin = tāṛśa. He defines it as “attaining salvation, i.e. holy, religious; one who protects himself and others,” and suggests its original meaning (< S tadṛṣa) was “such as the Buddha,” or “such as a religious man ought to be.” Norman generally translates the word as “such a one” (Sn 522-d) or “such a kind” (Dhp 95-d) or “venerable” (Sn 957-a). The traditional P commentary glosses it as “for one of such a kind there are no saṃsāras, caused by wandering around in good or bad states,” or “tadinam means the one who has reached such a state in regards to what is known. Just as former fully enlightened Buddhas are to be honoured, such a one [the current Buddha] is to be honoured in this way. This is the explanation of ‘Go to that Buddha for refuge.’ This is also the meaning regarding [go to] the dhamma and saṅgha [for refuge]. It means the dhamma of the venerable,

569 Waldschmidt, Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, §44.9, vol. 3, 400.
570 Edgerton, BHSD, 251, s.v. tāyin.
571 Dhp-a 234, 182 (ad Dhp 95): tādino ti tassa pana evarūpassu sugatiduggatissu saṃsaraṇavasena saṃsārā nāma na honi ti.
noble Buddhas together with the *saṅgha* of the eight noble persons.\(^{572}\) The Tibetans, however, translate \(\text{tāyin}\) as *skyob mdzad* or *skyob pa* (“protector”), apparently taking it from S *trāyin*, and Burnouf has interpreted \(\text{tāyin}\) in the same way, in his translation of the *Lotus Sutra*.\(^{573}\) in the Jaina writings there are also two traditions of understanding \(\text{tai}\) with different meanings (“Protector” or “Saviour” and “A Saint Like that”), and divergent derivations.\(^{574}\) The form \(\text{tāpin}\) (“majestic, powerful, glowing”) also occurs in the Mvu (2, 349\(^{12}\)) which Jones and Kern call a mistake.\(^{575}\) There is a further S word \(\text{tyāgin}\) (“an ascetic that has abandoned worldly objects,” P *cāgin*), from which \(\text{tā(y)in}\) might also derive; although it is not attested in P, G or AMg, where \(\text{ty-}\) usually changes to \(\text{c-}\) (except in the case of *pratyeka* discussed above where -\(\text{ty-}\) > -\(\text{tt-}\)); however, it does show this form in the Pkts, where \(\text{tāi}\) has the meaning of “renouncer” (< \(\text{tyāgin}\)), “protector” (< \(\text{trāyin}\)), “burning, glowing” (< \(\text{tāpin}\)), “seer, sādhu” (< \(\text{trāyin}\)), and “benefactor” (< \(\text{tāyin}\)).\(^{576}\) The most parsimonious explanation to account for all the different

\(^{572}\) Paramatthadīpanī, Thī-a, 197\(^{25-29}\) (ad Thī 249-50): Verse 249 reads

\(\text{upehi buddhaṃ saranaṃ dhammaṃ saṅghaṃ ca tādināṃ}\)

samādiyāhi sīlāni tan te atthāya hehiti

which Norman, Elders’ Verses 2, 27, translates "...go to the venerable Buddha as a refuge, to the doctrine, and to the Order; undertake the rules of virtuous conduct; that will be to your advantage."

Commentary: \(\text{tādinān ti diṭṭhādisu tādhīhāvappatam. yathā vā purimakā sammāsambuddhā passitabbā, tathā passitabbato tādi. tam Buddhaṃ saranaṃ upehi ti yojanā. dhammasaṅghesu pi es’ eva nayo. tādinām varabuddhānaṃ dhammaṃ atthanaṃ ariyapuggalānam samghaṃ samūhan ti yojanā.}\)


\(^{576}\) Sheth, *Prakrit Dictionary*, 431. \(\text{tāi} = \text{tyāgin}\) is found in the *Gāthā Saptasatī*, approx. 200-600 CE.
reflexes of this term is Lüders suggestion that tāyi- (or tā-) was the early eastern form of the word whose flexibility allowed the different interpretations we have seen above. They are all positive, and fit the context, which is usually a description of the Buddha or his followers; and the various strata of meanings provide a rich series of overtones embellishing the core meaning of the term < S tadrś, i.e. “such a one like that,” who, as the Niddesa says is such-like because of five modes: “His indifference to the pleasant and unpleasant, his abandonment of the world, his crossing over to the other side, his liberation and his exposition of it.” There is no need to insist on only one “true meaning” to a word with such a fluid semantic field.

*Excursus on words*

Unlike his contemporaries the disciples of the Buddha did not believe in the inviolability of language. In the Vedic tradition, “all the vowels are corporeal forms of Indra. All the spirants are corporeal forms of Prajāpati. And all the stops are corporeal forms of Death.” In the Buddha’s teachings, however, words, whether Vedic or otherwise, were not the immortal creation of a

577 Lüders, *Beobachtungen*, §108, 92-94. “…glaube ich, dürfen wir annehmen, daß tāyin für Sk. tadrś, mit Ausfall des d, aus der Ostsprache stammt und unverändert ins Sanskrit übernommen wurde…” I believe we may assume that tāyin originated from the eastern language from Sanskrit tadrś with the loss of the -d- and was taken over into Sanskrit unchanged” (page 94). The P therefore would be a back-formation (a hyper-form) from tāyin, by reintroducing the original -d- from tadrś.

578 Nidd 1, 2, 459-10 (ad Sn 957, Sāriputtasutta) tādin ti Bhagavā paṇicah’ ākārehi tādi: itthāniṭhe tādi, cattāvī ti tādi, tinnāvī ti tādi, muttāvī ti tādi, tamniddlesā tādi.

579 Olivelle, *Upaniṣads* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996), 116, from the Chāndogya Upaniṣad, 2.22.3: sarve svarā indrasyātmānaḥ | sarva ușmānaḥ prajāpater ātmānaḥ | sarve sparśā mṛtyor ātmānaḥ| This is only one of the Vedic traditions; In Yāska’s *Nirukta*, for example, etymology can be quite flexible and polyvalent. See footnote 599.
supreme being, but were arbitrary and man-made.\textsuperscript{580} In the \textit{Poṭṭhapadasutta} the Buddha makes it clear that he uses words without misapprehending them; they refer to something at a particular stage in the continuum, but they have no absolute existence, \textit{svabhava} or self-nature in and of themselves. Talking about the intergrading of the gross, mind-made and formless acquired selves, - all of which must be eliminated for liberation to occur - the Buddha likens them to the transformation of milk in its various forms: “In just the same way, Citta, from the cow we get milk, from the milk curds, from the curds butter, from the butter ghee and from the ghee cream of ghee” (DN 2 201\textsuperscript{25-26}). These are simply various stages of interdependence: although we call them separate entities, none exists without the other that brought it into being and each conditions the next, ceasing to exist when the next one comes into being: “Whenever the formless acquired self is present, we do not speak of the gross or mind-made acquired self [and so forth with the other acquired selves]…But Citta, these are merely names, expressions, turns of speech, designations in common use in the world, which the \textit{Tathāgata} uses without misapprehending.”\textsuperscript{581} As Buddhaghosa explains in the commentary, the selves are merely names and designations, “From the point of view of ultimate truth, a being does not really exist; this world is void and empty.”\textsuperscript{582} In the same way the \textit{Tathāgata} himself who has gone beyond all names and naming cannot be described with words; therefore questions as to his survival or


\textsuperscript{581} Quotes are from Walshe’s translation, \textit{Long Discourses}, 169. DN 1, 201-02: \textit{seyyathā pi Citta, gavā khīraṃ, khīramhā dadhi, dadhimhā navanīlam, navanīlamhā sappi, sappimhā sappimando} (DN 1, 201\textsuperscript{25-26})… \textit{yasmiṃ Citta samaye arūpo attha-paññābhino hoti, n’eva tasmā samaye oḷāriko attha-paññābhino ti saṅkham gacchati, na manomaya attapaññābhino ti saṅkham gacchati, …imā kho Citta loka-samaññā loka-nīruttayo loka-vohārā loka-paññāttiyā, yāhi Tathāgato vohari ti aparāmasan ti} (DN 1, 202\textsuperscript{3-9}).

\textsuperscript{582} Sv 2, 382\textsuperscript{23-28}: \textit{tathā loke niruttī-mattakāni vacana-patha-mattakāni vohāra-mattakāni nāma-paññatti-mattakāni etānī ti… yasmā param’ atthato satto nāma n’atthi, suñño tucco esa loko.
not after death are irrelevant, they do not apply: “So too, great king, that form by which one describing the Tathāgata might describe him, that form has been abandoned by the Tathāgata, cut off at the root, made like a palm stump, obliterated so that it is no more subject to future arising. The Tathāgata, great king, is liberated from reckoning [sarīkhāya, i.e. naming] in terms of form; he is deep, immeasurable, hard to fathom like the great ocean. ‘The Tathāgata exists after death,’ does not apply; ‘the Tathāgata does not exist after death,’ does not apply; the Tathāgata both exists and does not exist after death,’ does not apply; ‘the Tathāgata neither exists or does not exist after death,” does not apply. (Similarly, the Tathāgata is freed of reckoning in terms of feeling, sense perception, mental volitions or consciousness”). Words and names simply do not reach into this realm: “And if anyone were to say to a monk whose mind was thus freed: ‘The Tathāgata exists after death…’ that would be [seen by him as] wrong opinion and unfitting, likewise: ‘The Tathāgata does not exist..., both exists and does not exist..., neither exists nor does not exist after death.’ Why so? As far, Ānanda as designation and the range of designation reaches, as far as language and the range of language reaches, as far as concepts and the range of concepts reaches, as far as understanding and the range of understanding reaches, as far as the cycle reaches and revolves - that monk is liberated from

583 Khemāsutta, Translated by Bodhi, Connected Discourses, 1381-82. The speaker is the bhikkhunī Khemā. SN 4, 376b20-2b: Evam eva kho mahārāja yena rūpena tathāgatam pahīnaṃ tathāgatassa paññāpayamāno paññāpeyya, tam rūpam tathāgatassa pahīnaṃ ucchinnamūlam tālāvatthukatam anabhāvarikatam āyatāṃ anuppādadakatam. Rūpasarīkhāya vimutto kho mahārāja tathāgato gambhīro appameyyo duppariyogāho seyyathāpi mahāsāmuddo hoti tathāgato param maraṇāti pi na upeti. Na hoti tathāgāto param maraṇā ti pi na upeti. Neva hoti na na hoti tathāgato param maraṇāti pi na upeti.”
all that by super-knowledge, and to maintain that such a liberated monk does not know and see would be a wrong view and incorrect."584

Names were in a certain sense, the “root of all evil.” Like the word atta, which purports to describe a permanent self with its own intrinsic nature, yet on examination this self can not be found. Names create the illusion of a permanency by artificially delineating and differentiating that which has no absolute existence and can only be differentiated in a conventional sense. All is interconnected, but names suggest independence and isolation; names have everything under their control, but they have no ultimate validity, as the Buddha outlines in the Namāsutta.585 According to the Dīghanakhasutta, "a monk whose mind is liberated thus, Aggivessana, sides with none and disputes with none; he employs the speech currently used in the world without adhering to it."586

In the Mahānidānasutta, this thought is taken to its logical conclusion. Here, in an early nine-member dependent origination cycle, the Buddha discusses the mutual interdependence of

584 Mahānidānasutta, translated by Walshe, Long Discourses, 228. DN 2, 6811-24: Evam-vimutta-cittha kho Ānanda bhikkhuṁ yo evaṁ vadeyya “Hoti tathāgato param maranā” ti, iti ’ssa diṭṭhiṁ, tad akallan. “Na hoti tathāgato param maranā” iti ’ssa diṭṭhiṁ, tadakallam. “Hoti ca na ca hoti tathāgato param maranā” ti, iti ’ssa diṭṭhiṁ tad akallam. “N’eva hoti na na hoti tathāgato param maranā” ti, iti ’ssa diṭṭhiṁ ti, tad akallam. Taṁ kissa hetu? Yāvat Ānanda, adhivacanaṁ yāvatā adhivacana-patho, yāvatā nirutti yāvatā nirutti-patho, yāvatā paññatti yāvatā paññatti-patho, yāvatā paññā yāvatā paññāvacaraṁ, yāvatā vaṭṭaṁ vaṭṭaṁ, tad abhiṁñā vimutto bhikkhu, tad abhiṁñāsā patto bhikkhu na jānati na passati iti ’ssa diṭṭhiṁ tad akallam.

585 See page 138.

586 MN 1, 50032-35: Evam vimuttacitto kho Aggivessana, bhikkhu na kenaci saṁvadati na kenaci vivadati, yaṁ ca loke vuttam tena voharati aparāmasan ti. For English translation see Nānamoli & Bodhi, Middle Length Discourses, 606.
consciousness (*viññāna*) and name & form (*nāmarūpa*, sometimes called “mentality-materiality” or “mind and body”). Each depends on the other; in the absence of *viññāna* there can be no *nāmarūpa* and in the absence of *nāmarūpa* there is no *viññāna*. The Buddha first asks Ānanda whether mind and body could come to birth without the conditioning of consciousness, to which Ānanda replies in the negative. The Buddha then says, “If consciousness did not find a resting-place in mind and body (*nāmarūpa*), would there subsequently be an arising and coming-to-be of birth, ageing, death and suffering?” “No, Lord.” “Therefore Ānanda just this, namely mind and body, is the root, the cause, the origin, the condition of consciousness. Thus far then Ānanda we can trace birth and decay, death and falling into other states and being reborn, thus far extends the way of designation, of concepts, thus far is the sphere of understanding, thus far the round goes as far as can be discerned in this life, namely to mind and body together with consciousness.”

Here *nāmarūpa* is responsible not just for consciousness but for the whole samsaric cycle. About five hundred years later Nāgārjuna was to rephrase this thought in what was to become one of the most quoted *ślokas* in Buddhist philosophy:

---

“The pacification of all objectification and the pacification of illusion is ultimate beatitude: no dharma was taught by the Buddha at any time, in any place, to any person.” Some scholars define prapañca as “naming” - the process that objectifies, reifies and is responsible for the creation of the appearance of the manifold:

… the very coming to rest, the non-functioning of perceptions as signs of all named things, is itself nirvāṇa. And this coming to rest being, by its very nature, in repose, is the ultimate beatitude (śiva). When verbal assertions (vācas) cease, named things are in repose; and the ceasing to function of discursive thought is ultimate beatitude. Again, the coming to rest of named things by the non-functioning of the basic afflictions, so that personal existence ceases, is ultimate beatitude. The coming to rest of named things as a result of abandoning the basic afflictions and hence of totally extirpating innate modes of thought (vāsanā) is ultimate beatitude. Again the coming to rest of named things through not seizing on objects of knowledge or on knowledge itself, is ultimate beatitude.

588 From Nāgārjuna’s Mūlamadhyamakakārikā, chapter 25, verse 24. Everybody has their own definition of the word prapañca. In S it means “prolixity, expansion, development” but it has come to have several specialized meanings in Buddhist thought, including “illusion,” “naming,” “false imagining,” “error of false statements,” etc; see BSHD. It is the conceptual superimposition on reality of something that does not really exist.

Or, as the commentator to the Sn put it in his explication of verse 538 and the difficult compound *saññakkhara-saññanissitāni* (modifying *osaraṇāni*):\(^{590}\)

“But that which does arise is the percept-word, and the name which is merely a designation 'woman, man,' and false perception arises on the part of fools, who think by virtue of [the force of past ] tradition and false mental conceptions, 'The self must be of such a form/kind' - because of these, dependencies on both of these things [conventional designation and inverted perception] arise, which are not evident to the self. These (dependencies) the Blessed One has put away.”\(^{591}\)

But we do name things (and without the names there would be no teachings and no Buddhism), and that is what creates the conventional world we call *samsāra*. Naming therefore is simply a necessary negative; only through understanding the meaning of names and transcending them can we achieve liberation, recognizing the illusion that naming creates. Ultimately there is no dharma, no Buddha and no people to teach it to - these are simply arbitrary designations which do not exist in any absolute sense. But in practical, conventional (samsaric) terms, there are words and teaching and a path, and “those with little dust in their eyes” will understand.\(^{592}\)

\(^{590}\) Norman, *Word of the Doctrine*, 65: “...heresies...dependent upon perceptions and the conventions of perceptions.”

\(^{591}\) Pj 2, 2, 434-475:\(^\text{5}\): *uppattivasena pana, yad etam 'itthi, puriso' ti saññakkharam vohāranāmaṃ [var. vohāramattāṃ nāmaṃ] yā cāyam micchāparivitakkānussavādivasena 'evarūpena attā bhavitabban' ti bālānaṃ viparītasaññā uppajjati, tadubhayanissitāni tesāṃ vasena uppajjanti na attapaccakkhāni, tāni ca Bhagavā *vineyya* vinayitvā. I thank Khristos Nizamis for his suggestion “percept-word” to translate the compound *saññakkharam*.

\(^{592}\) *Brahmayācanakathā*, Vin 1, 6:\(^\text{2}\): *satte apparajakkhe*. 
such a way Brahma convinced the Buddha to turn the wheel of the dharma after his enlightenment, for the Buddha had decided not to teach, as his insights were too profound to communicate in words and would only frustrate him and those trying to understand him.

The Buddhist view of language certainly affected the Buddha’s teaching style that has come down to us in the suttas. As we have seen names were artifical designations that had no intrinsic nature, no necessary, essential meaning; they inherently misrepresented reality by providing the illusion of permanence and independence to entities “out there.” Since no single word can pinpoint “the truth,” the suttas feature a decentered approach to discourse by use of synonymic or near-synonymic word repetition, as a characteristic of the Buddha’s teaching style, a type of circumlocutory play. For example, this description of his enlightenment insights is typical of his approach to language:

\[
\text{adhiṅgato kho my āyaṃ dhammo gambhīro duddaso duranubodho santo paṇīto } \\
\text{atakkāvacaro nipuṇo paṇḍitavedaniyo.}
\]

This dharma that I have attained is deep (gambhīro), hard to see (duddaso), hard to understand (duranubodho), peaceful (santo) and excellent (paṇīto), unattainable by mere reasoning/difficult to know/beyond logic (atakkāvacaro, lit, “not in the realm of reasoning”), subtle (nipuṇo), to be experienced by the wise (paṇḍitavedaniyo).\(^{593}\)

\(^{593}\) This phrase occurs about a dozen times in the P writings, e.g. Vin 1, 04\(^{32-34}\). Instances like this where there is a repetition of synonymic or near-synonymic words occurs regularly. For example, see the Buddha’s description of language above, footnote 584; \textit{adhivacanaṃ yāvatā adhivacana-patho, yāvatā nirutti yāvatā nirutti-patho, yāvatā paññatti yāvatā paññatti-patho, yāvatā paññā yāvatā paññāvacaram, yāvatā vaṭṭaṃ vaṭṭati}, where each phrase adds a subtly different nuance to the meaning.
According to the suttas, when the Buddha uses the term “I” he does so recognizing that no such I truly exists; in the Arahantasutta (“The Worthy One”) of the Saṃyutta Nikāya, he says

\textit{yo hoti bhikkhu arahāṃ katāvī}

\textit{khīṇāsavo antimadehadhārī,}

\textit{ahaṃ vadāmītipi so vadeyya}

\textit{mamaṃ vadantī ti pi so vadeyya}

\textit{Loke samaññaṃ kusalo viditvā,}

\textit{Vohāramattena so vohareyyā ti.}

“If a bhikkhu is an arahant,
Consummate, with taints destroyed
One who bears his final body,
He might still say, ‘I speak,’
And he might say, ‘They speak to me’
Skilful, knowing the world’s parlance,
He uses such terms as mere expressions.”

The Buddhist tradition then was aware of both the imprecision of language and its propensity to be misconstrued in an absolute sense and adopted as a fixed view, as in the case of the \textit{atta}. Language was contextual and different shades of meaning were present in different environments, depending upon the impact of the surrounding language. Also, interdependent origination - \textit{patīccasamuppāda} - was equally relevant in a linguistic context. And just as the

\footnote{594 SN 1, 14:14-19. Translated by Bodhi, \textit{Connected Discourses}, 102.}
suttas, as a characteristic of the Buddha’s teaching style, used many similar, near-synonymic words to describe a particular phenomenon, his disciples must also have been aware of the polysemic meaning inherent in such malleable terms as bodhisatta, nirvāṇa, pratyekabuddha, sutta, atta, etc. Indeed, in some cases the MI terms have a paranomasic plasticity - as in the case of pahitatta (resolute self and abandoned self) and atta/niratta (self and not-self; taken up and laid down) discussed in previous chapters - which any MI speaker (not to mention the Buddha himself!) must have been aware of. The compound ahamkāra can be understood both as “making an I” (the Sāṃkhya sense), “the action of an I” (saṅkhāra = S samskāra) and “the utterance ‘I’,” as in omkāra (“pronouncing the syllable om”). 595 We also know, from the Dhp and other writings, that MI speakers were very fond of etymological puns and were attuned to this particular genre of word-play. Dhp 388-a, for example derives the word brāhmaṇo (a back-formation from the MI “bāhana”) from the root 𑀏 (to remove < S 𑀏ṛh;): bāhitapāpo ti brāhmaṇo: “‘He who has removed his sins’ is a brahman,” which also echoes the root 𑀏bh ( < S 𑀏ṛh, “to be strong”) the conventional etymon of the word; the roots 𑀏bāh or 𑀏vāh, “to endeavour, make effort” are also relevant. Many other examples of this kind of verbal trope are found in the writings, like the dual derivation of samana from 𑀏śram (“to make an effort”) and 𑀏śam (“to rest, be tranquil”), both of which are captured by the root 𑀏sam in MI. 597 The Sabhiyasutta (Sn p. 91-102) is itself a study in ancient Indic folk etymology. 598

595 Steven Collins, Selfless Persons (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982), 100. See discussion of ahamkāra on page 434 below.
596 Norman, “Buddhism and Sanskritisation,” 134.
597 Ibid, 134.
598 Norman, Word of the Doctrine, gives a list of word-plays in the Dhp on page 64 (ad Dhp 9-10).
Language changes over time. Changes of meaning occur because of context, broadening of usage and metaphorical extension. Phonological simplification creates homonymic convergence and semantic overlap. The MI love of double et triple entendre was consciously cultivated, as a mark of creativity and sophistication. There is no a priori need to fix a single meaning to any of these ambiguous, polyvalent words that we have been discussing; the word “ambiguous” suggests that while two or more meanings are available, only one is “correct.” In fact, this may not be the case, and the semantic nuances sometimes appear to be deliberately exploited by the speaker, or, - since it is impossible to penetrate the mind of someone who lived two and a half millenia ago - partly or fully so understood by the average MI listener; and these additional strata of meaning contribute to the dense and rich fabric of the Buddha’s teachings, going far beyond language’s putative ability to accurately reflect reality on a one to one correspondence basis. Instead, this broader, intergraded semantic spectrum provides a more faithful representation of the interdependent, multivalent life continuum with all its subtleties.

For an excellent introduction to the Indian love of etymologizing and finding multiple meanings in words see M. Deeg, Die altindische Etymologie nach dem Verständnis Yāska’s und seiner Vorgänger. (Dettelbach: Verlag J. H. Röll, 1995), 33-73. For an example of "Die sprachwissenschaftliche Etymologie," practiced by vaidikas and also by the Buddhist commentators, see Pj 2, 20812-13 where Buddhaghosa tries to explain why the Buddha is called nāga, "snake," evidently an embarrassing epithet: nāgan ti punabbhavāṃ n’ eva gantāram, atha vā āgu na karoti ti pi nāgo, balavā ti pi nāgo, tam nāgam, "he is called 'nāga’ since he does not go to a new birth [taking the ga- in nāga as derived from the MI verb gam, "to go" with na- as the negative adverb], or he does not commit a fault [na- -āgu, "no, fault"] and also since he is strong."
Chapter Eight, Ambiguities in the Canon 3 and the Transmission Process.

The Sabhiyasutta

11) virato/virajo/virayo A1

We are very fortunate to have preserved three complete versions of the Sabhiyasutta, two in MI and one in Ch. The P version occurs in the Sn, as the sixth sutta of the Mahāvagga (third chapter, pages 91\textsuperscript{12}-102\textsuperscript{16}); the Mvu version occurs in volume 3, pages 389\textsuperscript{13}-401\textsuperscript{18} where the questioner is known as Sabhika. The Ch rendition occurs as part of the Abhinīṣkramaṇa sūtra (佛本行集經);\textsuperscript{600} here Sabhiya’s name is transliterated as娑毘耶 (Suōpíyé; phonetic transcription in PB: sa-bji-jia) which is close to the P version (the \textit{\texttt{-ji}} in \textit{\texttt{jia}} representing a high front glide like \textit{-y-}). Although the Sabhiyasutta may not be one of the oldest suttas in the Sn (as here the Buddha appears with a saṅgha, whereas in others of the Sn suttas he wanders alone), Norman argues that the original composition predates the division between the Theravādins and the Mahāsaṅghikas sometime after the Second Council of approx. 300 BCE, and that the answers the Buddha gives to Sabhiya’s questions may well date back to the Buddha himself.\textsuperscript{601}

\textsuperscript{600} T03n0190\_p0833b07 - T03n0190\_p0835b25.

\textsuperscript{601} Norman, “Four etymologies from the Sabhiya-sutta,” §7.7, §8.1. Here Norman gives the date of 383 BCE for the Second Council, 100 years after the Buddha’s death, traditonally dated to around 480 BCE in the so-called “long chronology.” This article was written before 1995 Bechert's monograph which argued for the date of the Buddha’s paranibbāna at between 400 and 350 BCE, about 80 to 130 years before Aśoka's coronation (269 BCE) and not very long before Alexander's Indian campaign (327-325 BCE), an approx. date which most scholars now accept (see Keown, Dictionary, 71). See H. Bechert, “The Dates of the Buddha and the Origin and Spread of the Theravāda Chronology.” In When did the Buddha live? The Controversy on the Dating of the Historical Buddha, H. Bechert, ed., (Delhi: Sri
The *sutta*'s importance linguistically cannot be overestimated as it proves the existence of an earlier BMI source text and gives us direct evidence of the nature of the transmission process over time.

Aside from the prose introductions which are different, the P and BHS versions track each other fairly consistently (sometimes word for word), but often with significant differences. The word *virato/virajo* is one of these. In P verse 520, the Buddha defines the word *samaṇa* as

<samitāvi paḥāya puṇṇapāpaṃ</s>

<virajo īatvā imaṃ paraṇ ca lokaṃ</virajo>

<jātimaraṇaṃ upātivatto</jātimaraṇaṃ>

<samaṇo tādi pavuccate tathattā.</samaṇo>

“Calmed, having abandoned merit and evil, without pollution, knowing this world and the next, gone beyond birth and death, such a one is rightly called “ascetic.” 602 The corresponding Mvu form has

<samitāvi prahāya puṇyavipākaṃ</samitāvi>

<virato jñātva imaṃ param ca lokaṃ //</virato>

602 Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 62.
“One who has quieted himself, who has abandoned merit and the consequences of actions, one who has ceased, who knows this world and the other world, who has passed beyond birth and death, such is called as recluse in truth.”

P uses the word virajo (<S vi-rajas, “free from dust”) and the Mvu (vol. 3, 396) uses virato (< S vi + víram, “ceased, abstaining”). The same phenomenon happens, but in reverse in gāthā 531-a where P reads virato and Mvu (vol. 3, 398a) virajo. Here the Buddha is defining the nature of a vīra (P, “hero”) or vīryavat (Mvu, vīryavān in nom. sing., “possessing valour”), both virato and virajo clearly have a common ancestor in virayo/virajō which, in gāthā 531, also appears to be a word-play on P viriya, the MI form of S vīrya. The existence of virato and virajo point to an underlying from virayo, where a glide has replaced an intervocalic stop, leaving it up to the translator to “fill in the blank” with the “correct” interpretation. The Ch also has a variety of translation terms. Verse 520 translates the source text (virayo?) as 無惱 (wú nǎo, “no affliction” = vīrajā?) and verse 531 translates it as 捨 (shé, “abandoning” < virāta). In later Pktṣ, vīrayo has several different meanings, including “ceased” (virāta), “pure” (vīrajā), “to do, to make, to perform, etc.” (< S vi + vīrac) and “water-course” (a deśī word).

603 The P reads dhīro, but I accept Norman’s emendation to vīro, as per his discussion in “Four Etymologies,” §3.1.
604 Norman, “Four Etymologies,” §3.3. vīrayo is also a AMg word for “ceased, abstaining” < S virāta.
605 Sheth, Prakrit Dictionary, s.v. vīrayo, P 796.
The underlying source text regularly dropped intervocalic stops, replacing them with a glide, as is also apparent in other parts of the *sutta*. 1) The name of the Mvu questioner, Sabhika, points to a form Sabhiya (as per the P and Ch versions) where the -k- appears to be a hyperform created by a translator who assumed that the -y- was a consonantal replacement. 2) The P form viceyya (“having investigated”) has two BHS reflexes (*vikīrya*, “having dispersed,” *vicārya*, “having considered”) which point to a source word in the form “*vijyya*/*vijeyya* to account for the differences.606 The P form vijeyya (“having conquered”) would then be a valid alternative and suit the context, which the commentator realized in his gloss to *viceyya* (ad 525) where he suggests the word has two meanings: “having conquered these (treasuries), having conquered, having overcome; having investigated (these treasuries), having considered their impermanent state, etc. having examined them.”607 The flexible source form points to four possible verb forms (*vi + vīci*, “to examine”; *vi + vīji*, “to conquer”; *vi + vīkīr*, “to disperse”; and *vi + vīcar*, caus. to consider), all of which have semantic validity. 3) In *gāthā* 535 Norman postulates the existence of a source form ārayo, translated in the Mvu as ārato (“ceased, gentle, quiet”), intended as a pun on āriyo (“noble”) which the adjective describes.608

The *Sabhiyasutta* is also a valuable source document for semantic ambiguities arising through phonological confusion. The compounds puññapāpaṃ (“evil and merit,” Sn 520-a) and

---

607 Pj 2, 2. 42827-29. *tāni vijeyya vijetvā abhibhavitvā—viceyya vā aniccādibbāvena vicinītvā upaparikkhitvā.*
608 Ibid §4.3. No P reflex.
puñyavipākaṃ ("the ripening of merit," Mvu, vol. 3 p. 396), point to an oral transmission error and seem to confirm Norman’s belief in the antiquity of the sutta (i.e. antedating the first century BC when writing became common). It seems unlikely that mistakes of this nature could happen if the translating scribe had a written copy in front of him; this phonological alteration is probably the result of faulty memorization on the part of the Theravādin or Mahāsaṅghika bhāṇaka or the scribe’s misunderstanding of the reciter’s dictation. There are several other examples of what are probably phonological mix-ups in the sutta: epenthesis of a svarabhakti vowel in P khettrajinaṃ ("field-conqueror," Sn, 523-a) vs. Mvu kṣetrajña ("field-knower," vol. 3, p.398); word metathesis in verse 524-c, P sabbakhettamūlabandhanā pamutto ("completely released from the bond, the root of all fields") and Mvu sarvamūlakṣetrabandhanāt pramukto (vol. 3, p. 399, "free from the bond, the field of all roots");609 word deletion as in v. 525-c sabbakosamūlabandhanā pamutto ("completely released from the bond, the root of all treasuries") vs. Mvu sarvakośabandhāt pramukto (vol. 3, 399, “free from the bondage to any treasure”).610 Word alteration in the inlaut (middle sound) while preserving the anlaut (initial sound) and auslaut (final sound) as in verse 526-a (paṇḍārani, “sense-fields” and Mvu vol. 3, 399, prahīnāni, "cast-offs"); consonantal and vowel change, P verse 530-b rogamūlam ("source of illness"), Mvu rāgabhūtām (vol. 3, 398, “instinct with passion”);611 syllable epenthesis and voicing of intervocalic stops (-th- > -d-), P verse 540-c, muni monapathesu pattipatta ("the muni who has achieved the highest accomplishment in the pathways of wisdom"); Mvu, muni mauneyapadeṣu prāptiprāpto (vol. 3, p. 401, “who has achieved the

609 Norman, Group of Discourses, 63. Jones, Mvu, 398 translates “freed from every bond that ies at the root of the fileds.”

610 Norman, Group of Discourses, 63; Jones Mvu, 398.

611 Jones, Mahāvastu 3, 397.
highest achievements in the footsteps of sagehood”). All of these examples seem to be the result of transmission errors, either from the reciter or scribe; only the last one may point to the use of a glide for an intervocalic stop in the source (-paya, attested in AMg), interpreted as an aspirated voiceless stop by the P redactor and as a unaspirated voiced stop by the Mvu scribe. Another example of this alteration (in reverse) occurs in Sn 232-d where P diṭṭhapadassa (“one who has seen the state [of quenching]”) is mirrored in Mvu dṛṣṭapateṣu (vol. 1, p. 292, “to those in whom the way is manifest”), pointing to an underlying form diṭṭhapay-, differentially interpreted.612

The Khaggavisāṇasutta (Rhinoceros Horn)

13) oropayitvā A1 A5 (-r- =>$\rightarrow$ -t- > sibilant)

The Khaggavisāṇasutta (Khvs) is one of the oldest suttas of the Sn, considered by some scholars to hearken back to a pre-saṅgha time when samaṇas wandered alone.613 There is also a tradition extant that these verses were spoken by 500 pratyekabuddhas, each of whom passed away immediately after uttering the udāna.614 Like the Aṭṭhakavagga and

612 Mvu translation by Jones, vol. 1, 243; Sn by Norman, Group of Discourses, 28.
614 Senart, Mvu, 1.357. The Mvu preserves only 12 verses of the putative 500. For discussion of the age of the Khvs, see Norman, Pāli Literature, 84-86 and Salomon, Gāndhārī Rhinoceros Sūtra, §1.5.2.
Pārāyanavagga of the Sn, the Khvs is old enough for a commentary on it - the Culla Niddesa - to be included in the canon. Its age and popularity is confirmed by the fact that several versions of it are extant: The P canon preserves two versions, an early recension consisting of 41 verses which is found in the Uragavagga of the Sn and the same verses (plus one extra) incorporated into the much later Apadāna - a Sanskritized Pkt version preserved in the the Mahāvastu - which, however, contains only 12 of the verses; and a G recension of 40 verses, the oldest manuscript copy we possess, which may be dated from the 1st century CE.615 A comparison of these different recensions can tell us a lot about the early oral transmission process of the teachings, and often provide clues about the nature of the underlying BMI “proto-canonical” source language.

P versions

Oropayitvā gihivyājanāni,

saṃchinnapatto [var. saṃhiṇa corr. to saṃsīṇa,616 saṃbhīṇa] yathā koviḷāro.

chetvāṇa vīro gihibandhanāṇi,

eko care khaggavisāṇakappo. Sn 44

The earliest reference I can find to the tradition of the 500 paccekabuddhas is in the Isigilisutta, MN 3, 6826. In Ps 4, 12719-20 they are described as the 500 sons of Padumavatī.

615 Salomon, Gāndhāri Rhinoceros Sūtra, §2.1.2.

616 Corrected saṃhiṇa > saṃsīṇa by Dines Andersen and Helmer Smith, Sutta-Nipāta (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1913), 7, footnote 16.
“Having removed the marks of a householder, like a Kovilāra tree whose leaves have fallen, a hero, having cut the householder’s bonds, should wander solitary as a rhinoceros horn.”

*Ohārayitvā gihivyañjanāni,*

*saṃchinnapatto [var. saṅchanna-, saṃchanna] yathā pārīchatto.*

*kāsāyavattho abhinikkhamitvā,*

*eko care khaggavisāṇakappo. Sn 64.*

“Having discarded the marks of a householder, like a coral tree whose leaves are fallen, having gone out [from the house] wearing the saffron robe, one should wander solitary as a rhinoceros horn.” 617

BHS version

*otārayitvā gṛhivyaṃjanāni*

*saṃśīrṇapatro yatha pāripātro l*

*kāsāyavastro abhinikṣramitvā*

*eko care khadgaviṣāṇakalpo Mvu 1.3585-8*

617 Norman, *Group of Discourses*, page 5 and 7. See alternate translation below.
“Throwing off the marks of a householder, like the pāripātra tree denuded of leaves, and going forth from home clad in the yellow robe, let one live in loneliness like a rhinoceros.”

Gāndhāri version

ośaḍaita gihivimjaṇaṇī

[o]śinapatro yasa kovirāḍa

ka [ṣa] verse 19.

“Casting off the marks of a householder like a mountain ebony tree shorn of its leaves, ("leaving home, wearing) the saffron robe, ("one should wander alone like the rhinoceros).”

The first gerund appears in four different, phonologically related forms: oropayitvā/ohārayitvā/otārayitvā/ośaḍaita. The caus. absolutive ending -ayitvā/-aita is identical in all four cases, with the G showing the original Pkt form of the -tvā > -t(t)ā suffix; both the P and the BHS are back-formations. All share the same first vowel o- which is usually a contraction of S apa- > MI ava- > MI o-, a prepositional prefix with the sense of “off, away, down.” Following the prefix the CVC combination are almost all different -rop-/hār-/tār-/ṣad-, although the vowel is in three of four cases is -ā-. They all seem to be derived from different roots, but with similar meanings: oropayitvā, caus. of oropeti (“cause to descend, lay aside” < S ava + ṛuh, caus.); ohārayitvā,

618 Jones, Mvu, vol. 1, 304.
619 Salomon, Gāndhārī Rhinoceros Sūtra, page 146-47. Underline -s- is written for -th- or -dh- per §5.9.2.
621 We may assume that the G version simply failed to notate the long -ā- which was commonly the case.
from *ohareti*, (“to take down, put down, cause to throw away” < S *ava/apa + ṛḥ*, caus.);
*otārayitvā*, (< S *ava +īṭ*, caus. “take down, take off, turn away from”); and *ośaḍaita* (< S from *ava + śaṭ*, caus. “cast off” or < S *apa + śad* in caus., “to cause to fall off or away”). They all share a similar meaning, viz., “after getting rid of the marks of a householder (*gihibaṅgaṇāni*)...”

Given the close correspondence of the second word in *pāda a*, (*gihibaṅgaṇāni/ grhivaṃgaṇāni/ ghihiṃgaṇāni*) - and the other words in the other *pādas* - how can we account for this anomaly?

The assumption that there was an “original nucleus to which later accretions gradually were added” seems *prima facie* evident;⁶²² that nucleus must have contained some structure like *o-CVC-ayitva*, flexible enough so that each tradent could interpret it as he/she wished. The other hypothesis - that each tradition spontaneously came up with a similar causative gerund meaning “eliminate” - is highly implausible.

-rop-

-hār-

*o* + -tār- + ayitvā

-śāḍ-

The most likely scenario for a “root” transmission is *“o’ārayitva*, where the -t- has been dropped, which is attested in AMg and Māhāraṣṭrī (*o’āra = avatāra*).⁶²³ This would account for both *otārayitvā* and *ohārayitvā*, either through replacement of the missing intervocalic stop or a

---

⁶²² See Salomon, *Gāndhāri Rhinoceros Sūtra*, 47, for his argument against this notion, which I discuss above on page 19. Salomon here seems to be paraphrasing Norman’s introduction to the Dhp, *Word of the Doctrine*, xx: “The fact that any two or more of them agree in some feature tells us only that in some way, in the history of the texts, they were dependent upon a common source for that particular feature.”

dialect change of -t- > -h- which is common in the eastern dialects. Similarly, the interchange between -r- > -d- is quite common. The G redactor either added a sibilant (which would be unusual) or more likely, had a source transmission where the stop had changed to a sibilant, a phenomenon which is common in G, i.e. *otārayitvā > *otādayitvā > *oSādayitvā (S = sibilant) > ośādaita. This only leaves oropayitvā, whose derivation is not at all clear and may represent a separate tradition; nevertheless, at least one of the P gāthās (v. 64), the Mvu and the G Khvs all seem to share a common source.

14) *saṃhinna-*saṃhanna A2, A5 (-i- >< -a-)

The same must also be the case for the first word in pāda b of these parallel gāthās, which has a number of different reflexes: in the P manuscripts, for verse 44-b we have sañ(m)chinnapatto with variants saṃhīna- and sambhinna- (with further variant of saṃśīna- in the Nidd 2, and Pj 2, 9027) and in verse 64-b, sañ(m)channapatto (var. saṃchinnna-); in Mvu saṃśīmapatro and in

---

624 Pischel §207. e.g. bhārata > bhāraha in AMg.
625 Ibid §241, 258.
626 See footnote 519 and Brough, GDhp, §43a. The change of a voiceless stop to a fricative (through a voiced stop) is very common in language change in general; the reverse direction almost never happens. See Campbell, Historical Linguistics, 130.
627 Nidd 1 (Burmese, p. 290 and PTS p. 117, entry 180) glosses ohārayitvā as oropayitvā samoropayitvā nikāhipitvā patiamppassambhitvā (“having laid aside, having laid aside completely, having given up, having put to rest”).
628 See Nidd 2, p. 60 and page 66-67 (PTS edition) which has a long list of variants for 44-b including sañchinnna, saṃsīna, saṃsinna, sambhinna, sañchanna, sañchinna, as well as for the whole pada: sinnāni saṃsinnāni pitānī and sināni chinnāni pitānī. For verse 64-b Nidd 2 lists sañchinna, saṃsinna, sañchanna, saṃchanna, and saṃchinnna as variants.
G Khvs [ofśinapatro, apparently “corrected” from saṃśinapatro.629 These words sometimes have contradictory meanings: in verse 44 the meaning is “fallen down” (saṃśinapatto with var. saṃchinna-, glossed as patitapatto in Pj 2, 9121),; saṃśīna (“fallen off”) also has this meaning (< S saṃ + śī, “smash to pieces, crush, destroy”) and sambhinna (< S saṃ + ṛbhid, “completely broken”) and saṃchinna (< S saṃ + ṛchid, “cut off”) have similar meanings; the past participles like saṃchanna, normally mean the opposite (“completely covered”). All of these meanings have relevance in the context; the kā uppattī (“what is the origin?”) source story in the commentary explains that king Cātumāsika-Brahmadatta rested under a koviḷāra tree which was thickly covered with leaves (patta-sañchannam < S saṃ + ṛchad, “to cover over, envelop”), but that when the seasons changed the tree became sañchinnapatto sukkharukkho (“dried up tree with all its leaves fallen down”). This suggests a source word *saṃhinna (where the stop has dropped out leaving only the aspirate, common since Vedic times) which was back-formed to saṃchinna, or sambhinna, or samhīna (metrically equivalent); Mvu saṃśīna and G saṃśīna are either a backformation from *saṃhinna,630 or as Senart suggested, a Sanskritization of the Pkt saṃchaṇṇa- in verse 64 [sic; verse 64 reads sañ(h)channa] with the meaning of dépouillé de ses feuilles (“stripped of its leaves”).631 In this case saṃchanna would not be derived from S saṃ + ṛchad, (“to cover over, envelop”) as above, but from saṃ + ṛsad, caus. “to cause to fall down”), with the Pkt change of ś- > ch-.632

630 Pischel §262-64: The change of the sibilants > -ḥ- occurs in all the Pkts.
631 Senart, Mvu volume 2, page 630. For the change in aspirated stops see footnote 78. For change of sibilants to -ḥa- see Pischel §262. For the ṛcc/ṛc alternation see Norman, Group of Discourses, 158 (ad Sn 44) and 140 (ad Sn 4).
632 Pischel, §211; Norman, Group of Discourses, 165, (ad 64).
The linguistic transmission gets even more complex in verse 64; here three P manuscripts have *saṃchinnapatto* and two have *sañ(ṃ)channapatto*. Although grammatically this looks like a parallel structure to verse 44 - about a tree which, having lost its leaves and flowers, precipitates an awakening on the part of King Cātumāsika-Brahmadatta - the commentary only explicates *saṃchanna-* and interprets it in the sense of “covered (with leaves),” not “(leaves) fallen down.” In order for this metaphor to work, *pāda b*, instead of modifying *pāda a* (discarding the householder marks like a coral tree whose leaves are fallen) must be connected to *pāda c* modifying *kāsāyavattho* (“wearing the saffron robe like a tree which is covered in leaves”). So, following the commentary, the translation of this *gāthā* would be, “Having removed all household marks, going forth from home, clad in only a yellow robe, like a coral tree covered with leaves, one should wander solitary as a rhinoceros horn.” Here are the relevant parts of the commentary: “What is the origin? In Vārānasī, this other king by the name of Cātumāsika-Brahmadatta goes for amusement in the park every four months (i.e. every season). One day, entering the park in the summer, in the middle of the month, at the gate of a garden he saw a mountain ebony tree (*pāricchattaka-kovilāraṃ*, lit: “a coral-mountain ebony tree” or “a mountain ebony tree like a coral tree”); it was covered with leaves and its branches were adorned with flowers; he took one flower and entered the garden. Thinking “The king has taken an excellent flower,” one of his retainers, standing on the back of an elephant took a flower as well. By this means, the entire army took a flower. When the flowers were gone they also took the leaves. So the tree, without leaves or flowers, was merely a trunk. When the king was leaving the garden in the evening, he saw the tree and thought “What has happened to this tree? When I arrived it was adorned with flowers like coral in between branches coloured like crystal; now its flowers have been plucked,” and he saw another tree without flowers, full of
leaves (sañchannapalāsām), very close to it (the coral-mountain ebony tree). Seeing it he thought, "This (first) tree was coveted by a great many people because its branches were adorned with flowers; in just a moment misfortune befell it, but this other one is not coveted and remains just the way it is. This kingdom is also coveted like a tree in flower, but monkhood is not desirable like a tree without flowers. Therefore as long as this kingdom is also like the coral tree (pāricchattako) not plundered, then it will be full of leaves/petals (sañchannapatto); thus, completely covered (kāsāvena parisañchannena) with a yellow robe, I must go forth." So, abandoning the kingdom he went forth, with insight he realized personal enlightenment and uttered this inspired verse.\(^{633}\) Nidd 2 (Cūḷa Niddesa) makes the following comment: "Just as a coral tree (pāricchattako) is covered with thick leaves, giving dense shade (sandacchāyo), in just

---

\(^{633}\) Pj 2, 116\(^{18}\)-117\(^{17}\): Bārāṇasiyāṁ kira ayām aṁño pi Cātumāśikabrahmadatto nāma rājā catutthamāse catutthamāse uyyānakālaṁ gacchati. So ekadivasāṁ gihānaṁ majjhime māse uyyānaṁ pavisanto uyyānadvāre pattasañchannaṁ pupphālaṁkatavīṭapam pāricchattakakovilāram disvā ekam pupphaṁ gahetvā uyyānaṁ pāvīsi. Tato ‘raññā aggapupphaṁ gahitan’ ti aṁñātaro pi amacco hatthikhandhe ṭhito eva ekam pupphaṁ agghahesi, eten eva upāyena sabbo balakāyo agghahesi; pupphaṁ anāsādentā pattam pi gañhimsu: so rukkho nippattapuppha khandhamatto va ahosi. Taṁ rājā sāyañhasamaye uyyānā nikkhhamanto disvā ‘kim kato ayām rukkho; mamāgamanavelāyaṁ maṇīvaṇṇasākhantaresu pavālasadisapupphālaṁkato ahosi, idāni nippattapuppha jāto’ ti cintento tass’ eva avidūre apupphitarukkhaṁ sañchannapalāsāṁ addasa, disvā c’ assa etad ahosi: ‘ayām rukkho puphahbaritasākhattā bahujanassa lobhaniyo ahosi, tena muhuttass’ eva vyasanaṁ patto, ayām pan’ aṁño alobhaniyattā that’ eva ṭhito; idam pi rajjaṁ pupphitarukkho viya lobhaniyam, bhikkhubhāvo pana apupphitarukkho viya alobhaniyo. tasmā yāva idam pi ayām rukkho viya na viluppati, tāva ayām aṁño sañchannapatto yathā pāricchattako evaṁ kāsāyena pi sañchannena huttā pabbajītabbān’ ti. so rajjaṁ pahāya pabbajītvā vipassanto paccakabodhiṁ sacchikatvā imāṁ udānagāthāṁ abhāsi. In the kā uppatti origin story for Sn verse 44, the king achieves the state of paccakabuddha on seeing the tree denuded of leaves and he “removes the marks of a householder, like a Kovilāra tree whose leaves are fallen.” ( Norman, Group of Discourses, 5). This story is told in Pj 2, 90\(^{16}\)-91\(^{17}\).
this way, the *paccekabuddha* wears the yellow robe which is full of leaves - covered with leaves (sañchannapatto) like the coral tree."^634

As Norman points out, the Mvu reading *samśīrnapatroyathapāripatro* ("like the pāripatra tree denuded of leaves") has a different tradition and this is shared by the G Khvs (*ojśinapātro or *samśinapātro);^635 here the simile modifies *otārayītvā grhivyaṁjanāni*, rather than *kāśāyavastro*. The P commentators seem to have been unaware of the alternate reading *samchinnapatto* in verse 64 and unconcerned with the inconsistent exegesis with Sn 44 where "fallen leaves" clearly modifies *gihibyaṅjanāni;^636 and with the awkward grammatical structure where the compound from *pāda* b must be moved to *pāda* c. Presumably they were translating the same source word as in verse 44 (*saṃhinna) and changed the -*i* -> -*a*, i.e. *saṃhinna* > *saṃhanna > samchanna*); the presence of the variant readings (*saṃchinnna*) indicates that later tradents felt *saṃchanna* was the wrong reading.

Why this ambiguity? The *sañchanna* reading is lectio difficilior, so it is likely to be correct.

Rather than seeking to derive it from S ʿśad (p.p. śanna, "fallen decayed") with a meaning

---

^634 Nidd 2: *sañchannapatto yathā pārichattakoti yathā so pārichattako kovilāro bahalapattapalāso sandacchāyo, evameva so paccekasambuddho paripuṇṇapattačīvaradharoti — sañchannapatto yathā pārichattako*. In the Burmese edition, page 290; PTS page 69^1^4, with some variation.

^635 Jones, Mvu vol. 1 304, translating Mvu 1, 358^6. The phrase modifies "Throwing off the marks of a householder" (*otārayītvā grhivyaṁjanāni*). Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 164 (ad Sn 64).

^636 Nidd I I, bu 254: *sañchinnapatto yathā kovilāro* yathā kovilārassa pattāni chinnāni sañchinnāni patitāni paripatitāni, evameva tassa paccekasambuddhassa gihibyaṅjanāni chinnāni sañchinnāni patitānīti — sañchinnapatto yathā kovilāro. "Just as the leaves of the Kovilāra tree were cut, destroyed, fell down, fell to ruin, in just this way the household marks of the *paccekabuddha* were cut, destroyed, fell down - the leaves cut off like the kovilāra tree."
contrary to the exegesis, we should seek to explain the anomaly in terms of the commentators’ understanding. The mountain ebony in verse 44-b (*kovilāra*), per the commentary has a normal life cycle of leaves, flowers, dormancy (*saṅchinnapatto* *sukkharukkho,* “leaves fallen like a dried up tree”), while the coral tree loses its leaves first and then erupts in large crimson flowers on leafless branches; since the tree described in the source story has both flowers and leaves, it is probably not a true coral true, but a species of mountain ebony tree that is *like a coral* (*pāricchattaka-kovilāraṁ*) in terms of the look of its flowers. The species of the nearby tree, which retains its leaves but is without flowers, is unknown. The likeness to the coral, however is important, for as a result of its spectacular display the coral tree represents the highest stage of realization of the *ariyasāvako* (“disciple of the noble ones”), as detailed in the *Pāricchattakasutta* (AN 4, 117⁵-20³); so, while the fall of the leaves represents the going forth from home, the buds (*jālakajāto*, presumably of the flowers) represent the first *jhāna*, the shoots (*khārakajāto*), the second, the blossoms’ formation (*kuṭumalakajāto*) the third, and the flowering (*korakajāto*) the fourth *jhāna*, the flowers in full bloom (*sabbaphāliphullo*) represent the destruction of the outflows and full realization. Since this was a well-established sequence it was natural then for the commentators to liken a *bhikkhu* who had “torn one’s fetters asunder” (verse 62-a) to the coral tree in full bloom, the climax of the cycle, not simply to its beginning. In this way then, *saṃchannapatto* (“covered with leaves/petals”) is an appropriate epithet modifying *kāsāyavattho* (“dressed in a saffron

---

637 As Norman does in *Group of Discourses*, 164-65 (ad Sn 64).
638 PJ 2, 90²⁷.
640 Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 7 (sandālayitvāna saṃyojanāni).
robe”). Although in the source story *patta* refers to the leaves of the tree, here in *gāthā* it represents either the leaves of the tree that had not been picked (i.e. monkhood in general), or the flower petals of the coral tree in full blossom, representing the attainment of arhanthood. As can be seen from the above, the exegesis of the compound *saṃchanna-patto* is itself not clear, which accounts for all the variant forms of the first word.

15) *pannabhāra, pannadhaja* A2, A3

There has been a longstanding confusion over the word *panna-* (“fallen, fallen down”) which (in P) is simply the past participle of S *vipad* (“to fall, fall down”). The PED regards it as the past participle of *pa + vim* (“to bend forward”), which is “difficult to understand.”\(^{641}\) The word is homonymic or near-homonynic with other dialect words which has caused widespread confusion in the transmission process: in G *pana* = S *panna or prāna* (“life”) or *pana* (“leaf”); in AMg *panna* = S *prājña* (“wise”) or *panya* (“astonishing, glorious”) and *panṇā* = S *prajñā* (“wisdom”).\(^{642}\) We find therefore, in corresponding MI, Ch and Tib verses, significant differences of interpretation which are not easily resolvable, as they are all possible.


\(^{642}\) The change of -\(n\) > -\(n\) is very common in all the dialects. See Pischel §224.GDhp §45. There are sporadic instances of this change occuring in the Asokan edicts, usually after an -\(r\), but also spontaneously. See Hultzsch, *Inscriptions*, lvi (Gir), lxxxv (Sh), c (J). But Sanskrit retroflex -\(n\) often remains as -\(n\) in the edicts which complicates matters for a scribe trying to figure out the “original form” of a word CV-\(n\)-V. According to Brough (GDhp §45) the anorganic -\(r\) in *parna* “was written merely to emphasize the fact that the nasal was already retroflex…” See Pischel §273 and 282 and Mylius, *Wörterbuch*, for AMg references.
In the *Alagaddūpamasutta*, a liberated *bhikkhu* is called one who is *ukkhappalīgho iti pi*, *saṅkinnāparikho iti pi*, *abbūlhesiko iti pi*, *niraggaśo iti pi*, *ariyo pannadhajo pannabhāro visamyyutto iti pi*, translated as “one whose cross-bar has been lifted, whose trench has been filled in, whose pillar has been uprooted, one who has no bolt, a noble one whose banner is lowered, whose burden is lowered, who is unfettered.”

However, in the Ch version of this *sutta*, 阿梨吒經 (Ālīzhā jīng) these two phrases are translated by 聖智慧鏡 (*shèng zhìhuì jīng*, “The sage is a noble mirror of wisdom.”). The Ch translator was working from a G original, presumably *paṇa*- or *parṇadaśa*; he interpreted the first member as < *prajñā* and the second < *ādarśa*, which von Hinüber argues is a G form of S *dhaja*. The second compound (*pannabhāro*) was apparently missing from the Ch source or not translated.

At the end of the *Upālisutta* is a *stotra* praising the Buddha with various epithets amongst which we find

*paṭimantakassa dhonassa, pannadajassa vitarāgassa
dantassa nippapañcassa Bhagavato tassa sāvako ‘ham asmi.*

_________________________

644 T01n0026_p0765c23. Oskar von Hinüber, “Sanskrit und Gāndhārī in Zentralasien,” in Klaus Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker, ed., *Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien* (1983), 32; also available in *Kleine Schriften* Teil 1, eds. Harry Falk and Walter Slaje (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009), 586, which gives the Ch translation (from L. Schmithausen) as 智慧而金竟, *zhìhuì ér jīn jìng*, which I was unable to locate.
646 In comparison to the P which has seven epithets, the Ch only has five: 阿梨吒經. 過壍．破[郭]壍．無門．聖智慧鏡, *Shìwèi bǐqiū dù qìàn. guòqiàn. pò[guō]guō. wú mén. shèng zhìhuì jīng*. (T01n0026_p0765c22-23). “This *bhikkhu* is called one who has crossed over the moat, who has passed beyond the moat, who has destroyed the wall, who is gateless, the sage is a noble mirror of wisdom.”
“Skilled in discussion, imbued with wisdom, his banner lowered, he no longer lusts. Having tamed himself, he no more proliferates: The Blessed One is he, and I am his disciple.”\textsuperscript{647} A corresponding version in the Sanskritized Prakrit \textit{Varṇaśatam} (“One hundred epithets”) has \textit{panṇajahasya} (“who gave up the leaf or wing”)\textsuperscript{648} and in the parallel Ch translation \textit{慧生} (\textit{huì shēng}, “whose wisdom is born”),\textsuperscript{649} apparently translates G \textit{“panṇajaha} where \textit{-dhaja} has changed to \textit{-jaha} with \textit{-h-} acting as an intervocalic glide and therefore interpreted as \textit{-jāta} by the Ch redactor.\textsuperscript{650}

The P writings regularly interpret \textit{panna-} as originating from \textit{vpat}, and so gloss it in the commentaries, e.g. \textit{pannaddhaho ti patitamānaddhaho} (“\textit{pannaddhaho}, he whose banner of conceit has fallen.”); \textit{pannabhāro ti khandhabhārakilesabhāra-abhisarikhārabhāra-paṅcakāmaguṇabhārā pannā oropitā assā ti \textit{pannabhāro}. Api ca idha mānabhārass’ eva oropitattā \textit{pannabhāro ti adhippeto}. (“\textit{pannabhāro}, the person whose burden of the aggregates, burden of the afflictions, burden of the mental intentions, and burden of the pleasures of the

\textsuperscript{647} MN 1, 386\textsuperscript{16-17}; translation by \v{N}ānamoli \& Bodhi, \textit{Middle Length Discourses}, 490-91.

\textsuperscript{648} Ernst Waldschmidt, “The \textit{Varṇaśatam},” p. 8\textsuperscript{15}, p. 16. Epithet #47.

\textsuperscript{649} T01n0026_p0632b19: \textit{應辯才清淨 慧生離憂慼} (\textit{Yīng biàncái qīng jìng, huì shēng lí yōu qī}), “Skilled in eloquence and pure, wisdom born, having given up worry and grief.”

\textsuperscript{650} This is von Hinüber’s interpretation in "\textit{Upāli’s Verses in the Majjhimanikāya and the Madhyamāgama},” in L. A. Hercus, Kuiper, F. B. J., Rajapatirana, T., Skrzypcak, E. R., ed., \textit{Indological and Buddhist Studies Volume in Honour of Professor J. W. de Jong on his Sixtieth Birthday} (Canberra, 1982), 247. Also available in Kleine Schriften Teil 1, eds. Harry Falk und Walter Slaje (Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz Verlag, 2009), 307. For von Hinüber’s equation of \textit{dhaja = jaha}, see “Sanskrit und Gāndhārī, 32 (Kleine Schriften, 586). K. R. Norman, "Gāndhārī,” 52, footnote 3 (\textit{Collected Papers} 5, 69) thinks that they are unrelated. For \textit{-h-} as an intervocalic glide in G, see GDhp §39.
five sense, has been laid aside; and also who has laid aside the burden of conceit in this world, that is the meaning of pannabhāra.\textsuperscript{651} A similar gloss is found in the Vāsetṭhasutta (MN 2, 196\textsuperscript{9-12} & Sn 115-123\textsuperscript{16}) where tam aham brūmi brāhmaṇaṃ, “he who I call a brahman” is termed pannabhāraṃ, glossed as ohitabhāraṃ khandhakilesa-abhisankhārakāmagunabhāre otāretvā ṭhitaṃ (“pannabhāraṃ means a burden laid down, having laid down the burdens of the sensual pleasures and the constructions of afflictions and aggregates, he is steadfast”),\textsuperscript{652} and Dhp 402-c where pannabhāraṃ is glossed as ohitakhandhabhāraṃ catūhi yogehi sabbakilesehi vā (“he who has laid down the burden of the aggregates with the four attachements or all the afflictions”).\textsuperscript{653} The Ch do not always mirror P pannabhāra with translations involving “wisdom”: in their translation of Dhp 402-c, the Mi compound is rendered as 能下重擔 (Néng xià zhòngdàn, “able to put down the heavy burden”),\textsuperscript{654} and in the Vacchagottasutta (AN 1, 162\textsuperscript{21}) P pannabhāro is mirrored by 離重擔 (lǐ zhòngdàn, “leaves a heavy burden”) in the parallel Ch version.\textsuperscript{655} Of course we do not know which exemplar the translator had in front of him and whether it was different from those above where “wisdom” was understood in the meaning.

In the case of the pannadhaja compound, despite the P glosses, a translation involving “wisdom” would be just as intelligible (“he whose banner is wisdom”) and in some cases

\textsuperscript{651} Ps 2, 116\textsuperscript{7-11}.
\textsuperscript{652} Ps 3, 438\textsuperscript{4-5}.
\textsuperscript{653} Dhp-a 4, 168\textsuperscript{6-10}.
\textsuperscript{654} T04n0210_p0572c21
\textsuperscript{655} T02n0099_p0026b07
perhaps even more apt. We have examples of similar compounds involving dhamma- (dhammaddhaja, “whose banner is the dharma”), and, with the P reflex of prajñā, there are examples describing both the Buddha and his bhikkhus: for example in the Nidd 2 gloss on Sn 1138-c, gotamā bhūripaṇṇāṇā ti gotamā bhūripaṇṇāṇā nāṇapaṇṇāṇā paṇṇādhajā paṇṇāketumhā (“...from Gotama of great intelligence whose sign is wisdom, whose emblem is wisdom, whose banner is wisdom...”) and the gloss on Sn 969-a a paṇṇāṃ purakkhatvā (“preferring wisdom...” paṇṇādhajo paṇṇāketu, “whose banner is wisdom, whose flag is wisdom”) describing aspiring bhikkhus. So one can not say that the P tradition “got it right” in their understanding of panna-.

The ambiguity and confusion is even more glaring in the case of a gāthā from the P Vandana-sutta (which has several MI and Tib parallels):

P pannabhāra anāṇa SN 1, 233 (“whose load is set down, debt-free”)660

Mvu pūṭabharo...anṇa 3.315 (“whose load is full, debt-free”)

SBV parṇalopāṇigha vol. 1, 121 (“free from the evil of harming a leaf/feather”?)

656 See von Hinüber, “Upāli’s verses,” 248 (Kleine Schriften, 308).
657 DN 3, 614-6: dhammaṃ apacāyamāno, dhamma-dhajo dhamma-ketu dhammādhipateyyo dhammikam rakhī-varaṇa-guttīṃ samvidahassu (“...honouring dharma, with dharma as your flag, with dharma as your banner, with dharma as your dominion you should establish righteous protection, restraint and watchfulness...”

658 Nidd 2, 215 in Burmese edition. PTS p. 221. Norman, “Dialect Forms in Pāli,” 388 (Collected Papers 4, 69) says that paṇṇā-dhaja “is not used of the Buddha,” but perhaps he was referring to the canonical, non-commentarial tradition.

659 Nidd 1, 49116-17.

660 These lines are also found at Vin 1, 63, without pannabhāra in pāda b which reads satthavāha anāṇa vicara loke (...caravan leader, debtless one, wander in the world...”), mirroring SN 1, 2343.
LV *prajñākārāṇṇo* 25.17, p. 289²⁹ (“wisdom-maker, debt-free”)⁶⁶¹

CPS *pūṇalopānigha*, 76, §1.7 (“free from the evil of selfish injury”?)

Tib Vin *nga rgyal bcom...sdig pa mi mnga*’ (“pride-destroyer...without evil”) CPS, p. 77, §1.7

Tib LV *shes rab ‘od dbyung* (“emit the light of wisdom”).⁶⁶²

Ch: 怨賊今退散 一切垢已, *Yuàn zéi jīn tuì sàn yīqìè gòu yí chú* (“the enemy senses have now withdrawn and been dispersed; all impurities have been purified”).⁶⁶³

In his study of these verses Alsdorf makes the comment that of all these mutilations (Entstellungen) only *pannabhāra* “einen wirklich guten Sinn gibt,” and therefore concludes that the P version comes closest to the MI original.⁶⁶⁴ The Mvu has the exact opposite sense, while both the SBV and CPS are obscure. The Tib translation of CPS seems to have taken *pūrṇa* in the sense of “pride” (“full of oneself”? MW lists “selfish, self-indulgent” as a meaning), which led Waldschmidt to reconstruct *garvalopa* (“destroyer of pride”) in his edition of the work.⁶⁶⁵ The compound *prajñā-kāra* in LV is not “sinnlos” as Alsdorf suggests and the Tib translation has interpreted this as “emit the light of wisdom.” The Ch version appears to be translating a compound with -*lopa* in it, as that means “to rob, plunder,” (with 贼 = thief, as a metaphor for

---

⁶⁶¹ Vaidya, LV, 289²⁹ has *prajñākāra timisrā (timisra(ā) = “darkness”). Alsdorf, *Die Āryā-Strophen*, 295, quotes a variant *prajñākārānṇo* (similar to Mvu).


⁶⁶³ T24n1450_p0125a11-12: in *Mūlasarvāstivāda-vinaya-vibhaṅga*; 根本說一切有部毘奈耶破僧事, *Gēnběn shuōyīqièyǒu bù pínáiyé pòsēngshì*.

⁶⁶⁴ Ludwig Alsdorf, *Āryā-Strophen*, 297.

⁶⁶⁵ Waldschmidt, CPS, 76. Alsdorf reconstructs *pūrna-or pamalopa* which I am following.
the senses), but the rest of the compound is obscure; their next phrase perhaps translates
anāṇa or anigha ("free of debt, free of trouble").

All versions seem to be translating from *pa(r)n(ṇ)ahāra; and all except for the P redactor seem
to have forgotten that paṇ(ṇ)a in its Pkt form can derive from S panna, the past participle of
v ād. Norman suggests that if the P redactor’s exemplar had contained pañña or pannon, he
would not have rendered these as pannon however, assuming his exemplar was *pa(r)n(ṇ)a,-
he would certainly not have used pañṇa ("leaf") as it made no sense in this context. That the
exemplar probably was *parna (with the -r- if present, as mentioned above, simply an
orthographic reminder of the retroflex -n-) is in fact proven by the fact that both Mvu, CPS
and SBV rendered it as such, although the former two changed the -a- > -u- in order to try and
make sense of the compound. The LV version strongly suggests that -bhāra was transmitted as
-hāra with the aspirated stop subsituted with an aspirate alone, which has been the case since
Vedic times. The scribe then recognized *pa(n)ṇa-as a dialect form of prajñā (or took it as
derived from S paṇḍā, “wisdom” = G paṇa) and for -hāra, back-formed -kāra, apparently
taking the -h- as a glide, which is sometimes the case in G, as we have seen. A second
member -dhāra would probably have made better sense ("wisdom holder" from v dhṛ “to hold,
bear, carry” or “stream of wisdom” from v dhāv “to flow”) and the Tib translation dbyung ("draw

667 See footnote 642. Brough, GDhp, §45. S sampanna, for example, is rendered in G as sabaṇo and
sabarṇo. See verse 27 for GDhp reflex of pannabhāra as paṇabhara.
668 See footnote 78.
669 In G -ṇḍ- > -ṇ-. See GDhp §45, e.g. S paṇḍita > G panida, etc. The shortening of the -ā- > -a- was
prevalent in G and other MI dialects per von Hinüber, “Sanskrit und Gāndhārī,” 31 (Kleine Schriften, 1,
585).
out, draw forth, extract, breathe out”) is closer to these meanings. The other possible meaning
panna < S panya (“glorious, astonishing”) seems not to have been picked up by any redactor.

Although it does not make sense in the *pa(r)ṇ(ṇ)ahāra context, it is relevant to the pannadhaja
compound (“glorious banner”), paralleling dhammadhaja (“whose banner is dhamma”)
discussed above. G pañña- is also a reflex of S prāṇa (GDhp 315: pāṇaṇu abisa corresponding
to S pāṇa-anukampin, “compassionate for life”).

One might also postulate two transmission traditions - a P one with panna, and a G or other
dialect transmission with *pa(r)ṇ(ṇ)a, but this seems needlessly complex when the one tradition
through G (or a dialect which regularly retroflexed all S dental nasals), can account for all these
forms. The P and the LV redactors seem to be the only ones, however, who understood the
dialect changes. As to what these compounds pannabhāra and pannadhaja “originally” meant -
or whether indeed they only had one meaning - it is impossible to tell; nevertheless their
transmission and various modulations over time are an important example of the complexities
of the buddhadhamma succession.

16) damayam/ramayam A4

The interchange of consonants -d- and -r- is a not uncommon occurrence in Middle Indic, with
antecedents in the Vedic texts. In P, consonant -d- appears for -r- quite commonly
intervocally in compound numerals with dasa such as ekārāsa (beside ekādasa, “eleven”)
as well as with compounds with -disa or -dikkha (<S -drśa, -drkṣa), e.g. erisa, erikkha (beside

---

670 Bloomfield & Edgerton, Vedic Variants, §272a.
edisa, edikkha, “such-like”) < S īḍṛśa, īḍṛkṣa, mādisa, mārisa (“such as I”).\(^{671}\) The interchange also occurs in the other MI dialects, like AMg jārisa = S yāḍṛśa (“which like”).\(^{672}\) There are also examples of this phenomenon in GDhp 160-d where P pavedayanti (“they make known,” Dhp 151-d) appears as praverayadi and GDhp 256-d, S śarvarī (“night”) > G śadvari. Brough interprets the -d- > -r- change as a continuant (r) used as an approximation to [ō], or a single-tap r as a substitute for a very short intervocalic stop.\(^{673}\) In Dhp 305-c P reads eko damayam attānam (“alone taming the self”),\(^{674}\) while all the corresponding MI verses we have read r- for d- of damayam:

G: eku ramahi atvana GDhp 259-c
PDhp eko ramayam āttānam PDhp 313-c
UV: ramayec caikam ātmānaṃ 23.2-c

Brough suggests here that the change d- > r- is a reflection of the tendency d > r in rapid speech.\(^{675}\) Both are very close in meaning (damayam: “taming”; ramayam: “calming”) although damayam seems more appropriate in the context because of the common meaning of “enjoying” associated with ṛ̐am, and Brough believes that ramahi = damahi, present participle,

\(^{671}\) Geiger, Grammar, §43.1, 112.3.
\(^{672}\) Pischel §245/
\(^{673}\) Brough, GDhp §43b. See also GDhp 290, G ruyida (“pleasant”) = P rucirām. See also GDhp 81-a sara (“essence”) > London GDhp 4-a sada in Timothy Lenz, A New Version of the Gāndhārī Dharmapada, 55. Vedic mayi daksāḥ > mayi raksāḥ in Bloomfield and Edgerton, Vedic Variant, §272a; P anamatagga (“without beginning and end”) = BHS anavarāga (BHSG 2.48) = Pkt anavadagga or anavayagga; and P purindadassa (“breaker of fortresses” < Skt puramḍara) = BHS purantarasya in Waldschmidt, Varṇasātatam, #49, page 9.
\(^{674}\) Norman, Group of Discourses, 44.
\(^{675}\) Brough, GDhp, 255.
“taming.” The Tib version has *gdul bar bya* (“should tame”) which translates *damayet*, not *ramayet*. The Ch version also appears to be translating *damayam*: 守一以正心 (*shǒu yī yǐ zhèngxīn*), “(practicing) meditation in order to correct one’s mind.” There is also of course the possibility that both meanings are present, because of dialectal phonetic mellifluity, with both sounds orally interchangeable. At the very least the *dam-/ram*-counterpoint is a conscious word-play on the part of the composer of the *gāthā*. This is confirmed by other figures of speech involving this common MI *(am)*aya structure. So in the *Lokasutta* we find

*Danto damayatam seṭṭho santo samayatam isi*

*Mutto mocayatam aggo tiṇṇo tārayatam varo*

“The tamed one is the best of those tamed, the calmed one, the sage of those calmed, the freed one, the topmost of those freed, the one who has crossed over the best of those who have saved,” where the composer is clearly playing on the parallel structure, sonically and rhythmically, *damayatam/samayatam/mocayatam/tārayatam*. Something similar is also going on in Dhp 145 where we find

*udakaṃ hi nayanti nettikā usukārā namayanti* (var. *damayantī*) *tejanam*

*dāruṃ namayanti* (var. *damayantī*) *tacchakā attānaṃ damayanti subbatā.*

---

676 Negi, *Dictionary*, vol. 6, 2584; *gdul ba* (stem form) usually translates *vinaya* (“discipline”) and *damana* (“taming”).

677 T04n0210_p0570a04.

678 AN 2, 2424-25.
which is mirrored word-for-word (including variants) in Th 19: “For the canal-makers lead the water, fletchers cause their arrows to bend (or tame their arrows); carpenters bend (or tame) their wood and those of good conduct tame the self,” where the interchange of the verbs /vndnaya and /vndam are used for stylistic emphasis. It is clear that both nam- and dam- suit the context, as the appearance of the variant forms confirms; each means something similar and the words resonate (at least on a folk-etymology level) as /vndam means “to domesticate by bringing into the house” (cf. S dams, “house”) and namaya- means “to cause to bow or submit.”

The consonants d- and n- and r- are of course closely related by their common place of articulation. Whether this alteration of damyanti/ramayanti/namayanti is a genuine dialect ambiguity or simply phonological word-play is not determinable; nevertheless the variant flexibility adds a richness to the semantic fabric of these gāthās.

17) viṣa/veśma/viṣama A3. A4 (-i- << -e-)

There is a well-known case of semantic ambiguity in Dhp 266 which reads as follows:

na tena bhikkhu hoti yāvatā bhikkhate pare,
viṣaṃ dhammaṃ samādāya bhikkhu hoti na tāvatā,

---

679 The alternation of -n- > -d- in Dhp 280-a and GDhp 113-a (S antthāna > P antthahāno > G antthehadu, “not exerting oneself”) suggest that this is a dialectic feature.
“One is not a bhikkhu simply because one begs others for alms: having adopted the domestic way of life, thereby one is not a bhikkhu.”\(^{680}\) There is a lot of confusion over the meaning of the P word vissam. This verse also occurs in the Bhikkhusutta (SN 1, 182\(^{18-19}\)) where the commentary glosses vissam dhammaṃ as duggandhaṃ akusala-dhammaṃ, “foul-smelling, not meritorious conduct.”\(^{681}\) The commentary to the Dhp itself has vissan ti visamaṃ dhammaṃ, vissagandhaṃ vā kāyakammādikaṃ dhammaṃ samādāya caranto bhikkhu nāma na hoti. “vissam means wrong conduct, or a smell like that of raw flesh; having taken up bodily conduct, etc., wandering about, he is indeed not a bhikkhu.”\(^{682}\) Norman maintains that vissa < S veśman where the -ss- results from the assimilation of -śm- > -ss- and the -e- > -i-, that is P vissa stands for vĕssa.\(^{683}\) This is in part confirmed by the G version of this verse, which may have the reading veśma (the reading is unclear and it could well be viśpa = S viśva, “all”) and also by the UV reading which has vešman dharmāṃ. Grammatically veśman is a noun and in this structure it should be either an adjective or a compound member, vešmadharmāṃ (“conduct of the household”); in fact there is one Tocharian version which has been preserved in this fashion, thus corroborating this interpretation.\(^{684}\) The Mvuf version, which has višamaṃ dharmāṃ, shows the development of an epenthetic vowel (eastern tradition) which was misunderstood as vi-ṣama (“uneven, disharmonious”). So the derivation is veśma > *viśma > *visma > vissa in the western tradition and > *visma > visama in the east.\(^{685}\) This is fine except for two problems: P vissa, if it stands for vĕssa and derives from vešman is a noun which is not

---

\(^{680}\) Norman, Group of Discourses, 40.

\(^{681}\) Sp 1, 266’. In the Sn versions visam is a variant reading.

\(^{682}\) Dhp-a 3, 393\(^2\)-\(^4\).

\(^{683}\) Norman, “The Language in which the Buddha taught,” 20 (Collected Papers 2, 94).

\(^{684}\) See Brough GDhp, 192.

\(^{685}\) Norman, “Buddhism and the Commentarial Tradition,” 199-200.
grammatically correct in the context (as noted above), and the back-translations in the other witnesses destroy any play on words which was present in the P.686

The only attested usage we have of *vissa* < *veśman* in P is *pativissaka* ("neighbouring") which has the adjectival -ka suffix; but as an adjective *vissa* is attested as < S *viśva* and also < S *visra* ("musty, smelling of raw meat"). In fact, Max Müller took it in this former sense in his 1881 translation: “A man is not a mendicant (Bhikshu) simply because he asks others for alms; he who adopts the whole law is a Bhikshu, not he who only begs.”687 This requires some twisting of the grammar, taking the correlative tāvatā as referring back to the begging bhikkhu, rather than to the conclusion ("as long as ...therefore he is not a bhikkhu") and the awkwardness is probably due to the misconstruing of *vissa*; as is already noted, none of the commentaries took *vissa* in the sense of “all.” The meaning of *vissa* as “smelling of raw meat” is appropriate in the context, and Norman’s suggestion that the vā indicates uncertainty on the part of the commentator may in fact only be the commentator’s explication of *vissam* = kāyakammādikam.688 It may also be derived from S *viśya* > *vissa* (“a man of the people or of the third caste,” i.e. vaiśya, P *vessa*), with echoes as well of veśa (“house, whorehouse, brothel”) and veśyā (“prostitute”), all of which are guṇa forms of viś (“settlement, house, tribe, people, man of the third caste”), the nominal form from the verb viś (“enter, settle, go home, belong, mind one’s business”). In fact, if Norman is correct that *vissa* stands for P *vēssa*, the more

---------------------------

686 Brough, GDhp, 192: “The Sanskrit and the North-western Prakrit, on the other hand, were able to preserve veśma, but, as in other cases also, were unable to retain the original play upon words.”
likely derivative is from S vaiśya, which is also more appropriate to the context ("conduct of a householder" assuming that it was originally a compound vi(e)ssadhammaṃ). The Tib version of the UV translates grong paʾi chos which literally means “dharma of the village” but has a meretricious sense ("sexual union"), as is confirmed by the BHSD which so defines veṣya ("occupation of a harlot, common, vulgar"). Edgerton suggests that the original word might derive from S veṣa ("dress, apparel") and mean ("of garb or external appearance only"). The Ch Dhp has 邪行 (xiéxing), “erroneous ways evil deeds,” apparently taking the compound < S viṣva ("injurious, hurtful, mischievous" presumably < S viṣa, "poison").

The interchange of the -e- and -i- in vVs- also occurs in the Aggañṇāsutta where the etymology for the third class vessa caste is defined as "some beings, taking up sexual behaviours, engage in vissu- business (vissukammante)… and thus the word vessā arises. There are four different variants on this word in the commentary, so it is evident that it was not understood at an early date. Schneider suggests that the word derives from S viṣvañc ("separate, different, ubiquitous") referring to the various occupations that they practiced, which became vissa in Pkt and from which P visu or vissu derived (P visu, "separately, individually; separate, apart").

689 Oskar von Hinüber, "The Development of the Clusters -tm-, -dm- and -sm- in Middle and New Indo-Aryan," Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft, 40 (1981), 69, also available in Selected Papers on Pāli Studies (Oxford, Pali Text Society), 171, points out that the word veṣman has "scanty evidence in MIA and has no equivalents in NIA.

690 T04n0210_p0569a06.

691 DN 3, 954-8: sattānam ekacce sattā methuna-dhammaṃ samādāya vissuta-kammante (var. vissukammante, vissu-kammante, visum kammante, visukammante) payojesuṃ. methuna-dhammaṃ samādāya vissuta-kammante payojentī ti kho Vāsēṭṭha, vessā, vessā tv eva akkharaṃ upanibbatam.

Norman suggests the correct etymology is from S veśma, with vissu showing labialisation of -a to -u after m. The Ch Āgama translates it as 各各諸方 (gègé zhū fāng, “each of various directions”), apparently taking it from S viṣvaṅc.

To conclude, there are several possible derivations for the word vissam and the term has multiple signification:

vissa /vessa < S viśya or vaiśya (the third caste of householders, with an additional allusion to prostitution and vulgarity, BHS veśya or S vaisyā). Also derivable < S dveṣya (AMg vesa, “hateful”) or S veṣa (“dress, apparel”), as per Edgerton’s suggestion above.

vissa < S visra “smelling of raw meat.”

vissa < S viṣva, “harmful, injurious.”

I omit viśva and viśvaṅc which are unlikely in the context. We may now re-translate the verse in the way it may have been understood by a native, MI speaker, “One is not simply a bhikkhu because one begs others for alms. Having taken up household/sexual/vulgar/foul-smelling/harmful/injurious/appearances-only (vissam) behaviour, one is not thereby a bhikkhu.”

All these meanings are present to one extent or another, although how many an average MI speaker would actually understand, is impossible to tell.

693 Norman, “Four Etymologies from the Sabhiya-sutta,” 178, footnote 1; (Also in Collected Papers 2, 155, footnote 1).

694 T01n0026_p0676b15.
18) *vata/tapa/tava* A1 (-p- > -v-), A5 (metathesis)

Typically intervocalic -p- in MI changes to -v-, so S *tapas* ("heat, austerity") > *tava* (AMg) and in other Pkts. Thus when one sees the interchange of P *vata* (< S *vrata*, "vow," Dhp 312-b) and UV *tapa* (11.3-b) which is most likely a Sanskritization of MI *tava*, it looks like a simple metathesis or inversion of consonants has taken place, *tava* > *vata*, although it is impossible to tell which is the earlier, as both suit the context:

Dhp: *saṃkiliṭhaṇī ca yam vataṃ* ("whatever vow has been soiled")

UV: *saṃkliśṭaṃ vāpi yat tapaḥ* ("whatever austerity has been tarnished")

The Ch translation uses the character 劉 (láo, "hardship, suffering") which is translating *tapa* and the Tib UV translates *dka’ thub* (lit: "to withstand difficulty") which is ambiguous as, although it usually translates *tapa*, it is also used for *vata* (so in that respect a perfect choice). The commentary, however, suggests it is here translating *vata*: "Any manner of inverted action through not practicing, like eating a little at the wrong time, etc. or becoming impure because of not practicing due to one’s afflictions." The specific example given, eating at the wrong time, is of course a violation of a monk’s vows (*vata*). Such a case as this,

---

695 Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 147-48 (ad verses 20-21) has a long list of metathesized words, starting with P *makasa*, "mosquito" = S *maśaka* in the Sn and other part of the *Sutta Piṭaka*.

696 See Pischel §199; Geiger §38.5; See Also GDhp *tavada* = S *tapati* ("he regrets").

697 Negi, *Dictionary*, 97.

698 Prajñāvarman’s *Ched du brjod pa’i tshoms kyi mam par ‘grel pa*, Pecha 185b: *gang yang cung zad dus ma yin pa’i zas la sogs pa las ldog pa’i tshul gal te ma spyad dam/ kun nas nyon mongs pas ji lta ba bzhin du ma spyad pas dri ma can du gyur pa.*

involving sound inversion, is much more likely the result of oral dictation, rather than manuscript copying, especially as the two words - *vata and tapa* - sometimes occur together in other canoncial contexts: ‘*imināhaṃ sīlena vā vatena vā tapena vā brahmacariyena vā devo vā bhavissāmi devaṅnātaro vā’ ti. “With this morality, vow, austerity or religious observance I will become a god or inferior deity.”

19) *nekkhamma, naiṣkramya* A3

According to the PED the word *nekkhamma* (AMg *nikkamma*) is derived from the verb *nis + kamati* (< S *niṣ +vram*, “to go out, depart, leave worldly life”) and the metaphorical sense (“giving up the world & leading a holy life, renunciation of, or emancipation from worldliness, freedom from lust, craving & desires, dispassionateness, self abnegation, *Nibbāna*”) has superseded the literal sense. It may also be a “bastard derivation” from *nikkāma* (< S *niṣkāma* “desireless, disinterested, unselfish” or S *naṣkāmya*, “suppression of desire, profound contemplation”). BHS back-Sanskritizes the word to *naiṣkramya* (“departure from the world, renunciation of worldly things”) and there is also a third possibility of a derivation from *naiṣkarmya* (“inactivity, abstinence or exemption from acts and their consequences” = AMg *ṇikkamma*, a technical Jaina term meaning “freed from *karma*) or even *niṣkampa*

699 AN 4, 46117-19.
700 PED, s.v. *nekkhamma*, page 377. The aspirated consonant is not normal and AMg only has a geminate. Why *nekkhamma* is a “bastard derivation” is unclear; the phonology is completely regular, *naiṣkāmya > nekkhamma*, with change of -ai- > -e; -ṣk- > -kkh- and -my- > -mm- with consequent shortening of -ā- > -a-.
As Norman says, one must be wary when reading a BHS text that the word *naiśkramya* should not be limited to one meaning. The Tibetans seem to have recognized the ambiguity in the Sanskritized word *naiśkramya* and translate it as *nges ‘byung*, “definite emergence” which is also apparently a translation of S *niḥsaraṇa* (“going forth or out, departure, death, final beatitude”). It eschews any single derivation and opts for a broader, more abstract definition, like the Tib translation of *nirvāṇa* as *mya ngan ’das pa* (“transcending suffering”). The Ch translator of the *Dhammapada* seems to have interpreted his exemplar as derived from *naiśkramya*, as he translates quite literally with 出家 (chūjiā, “leaving home”). In the Middle Indic Dhp we have several witnesses for the word and its cognates: *nekkhamma* in Dhp 181-b with PDhp *nekkhammo* (244-b) against BHS *naiśkramya* (UV 21.9-b, with Tib *gnes ‘byung* as above), and similar correspondences in Dhp 272-a: P *nekkhamma*, PDhp *nekkhamma* (272-a), G *nekhaṇa* (66-a, which Brough derives from *naiśkramya*), and Mvu *naiśkramya* (vol. 3,422^10). The commentary to Dhp 181-b glosses *nekkhammūpasame ratā*

---

702 This latter word could only derive from a G form (S *niṣkampa > G *niṣkamma*) where labial stops are assimilated to nasals, which is not usual in MI (they are usually maintained as per Pischel §272). See Brough §46. *niṣkamma* is, however, not attested in G.

703 Norman, “Pāli philology and the Study of Buddhism,” 36; also in Collected Papers 4, 86). However, he does not mention the possibilities of *naiśkarmya* or *niṣkampa*. See Genjun H. Sasaki, Linguistic Approach to Buddhist Thought (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1986). 1-14 for a discussion on *nekkhamma* and various forms which the author believes are only dervied from *nis + v kam*. He does not consider the possibility of a multiple derivation.

704 Illuminator Dictionary, s.v. “that turning away from cyclic existence because of seeing it to be unsatisfactory and turning towards emancipation is called *nges ‘byung.*” According to Negi, Dictionary, 996, *nges ‘byung* translates *niryāti* (“departure, dying, final emancipation), *niryāṇam* (same), *niḥsaraṇam* (idem), *naiśkrāntaḥ* (“gone out, departed); *naiśkrāntaḥ* (“conducive to emancipation”); and *niḥsṛta* (“going out, foing forth”).

705 法句經, Fājū Jīng, Dhammapada, T04n0210_p0567a13.
(“delighting in the peace of nekkhama”) as “taking up the ascetic life (paribajjā) is not to be understood as “renunciation” (nekkhammam), but is named with reference to the enjoyment of nibbāna and the pacification of the afflictions,” and in Dhp 272-a nekkhamma is simply glossed as anāgāmi (“not returning”). So the P commentators well understood the wide semantic range of the word and quite possibly its threefold derivation from naiśkramya, (“leaving home”), naiśkāmya (“without desire,” “the pacification of the afflictions,” as the commentator describes it), and naiśkarmya (“without karmic action,” i.e. nirvāṇa/nibbana, as it was understood in the commentarial and Jaina tradition. Once the word was back-translated into S, the richness of its heritage was obfuscated.

20) niddaro/nirjvaro/vītaddara/vītajjara/vikadadvara A5 (palatal >< dental)

Lüders believed that the unusual change of -j- > -d- which he observed in P was foreign to the dialect and a characteristic taken over from the eastern dialect, i.e. the dialect of the “Urkanon.” In Aśoka’s RE 10 E Gir pariccajiltpā (“having given up”) and M, Sh and Dh palitijitu

706 Norman, Group of Discourses, 28 translates nekkhama here as “absence of desire.”
707 Dhp-a 3, 271-3: ettha pabbajjā nekkhamman ti na gahetabbā, kilesa-vūpasama-nibbāna-ratīṃ pana sandhāyetām vuttām. The Tib translation of Prajñāvarman’s commentary on this verse is similarly broadened from simply renunciation to “zeal for attaining the path and the fruits of the path.” See Balk Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivaraṇa, vol. 2, 615-29-31: nges ‘byung zhi la dga’ ba dang zhes bya ba ni nges par ‘byung ba dang zhi ba de la dga’ ba ste/ lam dang lam gyi ‘bras bu ‘thob pa la ‘dun pa zhes bya ba’i don to/

nges ‘byung zhi la dga’ ba dang = the enjoyment of peace and renunciation; zeal for attaining the path and the fruits of the path is the meaning.”
708 Dhp-a 3, 399-400 (ad verse 272), nekkhammasukhan ti anāgāmisukham phusāmi ti. “The joy of nekkamma: I attain the joy of the non-returner.”
709 Lüders, Beobachtungen, §116.
have a Kālsī correspondence palitiditu where it appears -j- > -d-. Geiger gives several other examples of a palatal changing to a dental, i.e. jaghana > dighaṇṇa (“situated behind”); jājvalyate > daddallati (“it glistens”); cikitsati > tikicchati (“he/it cures”); jigucchati > digucchati (AMG dugucchai, “feel abhorrence”); and Mehendale cites Pasenaji > Pasenadi and vijita ("conquered") > vidita, parissajissati > palissadissati (“he embraces”), jighacchā > dighacchā ("hunger"). Many of these occur before the high front vowel -i-, i.e. in a palatalizing context.

We have two apparent examples of this interchange occurring in the Dhp. In verse 205-c the word niddarlo (“free from fear, pain or anguish”) occurs with a UV reflex of nirjvaro (28.5-c, “feverless, healthy”), and in verse 385-c the compound viṭaddaram (“free from fear, sorrow, pain,” var. visāraddaram, vihaddaram) has a PDhp reflex of viṭajjaram (verse 40-c, “free from fever,” “free from old age,”) and a G reflex of vikadadvara (GDhp 35-c, “free from fever”?). The phonological alteration seems to go back to an ambiguity between the Vedic roots √jf and √df which have overlapping semantic fields. The root √jf means “to grow old, decay, break up, perish” and the root √df also means “decay” and “break up” but also has the meaning of “burst,:

710 Bloch, Inscriptions, 118. Bloch considers Kālsī’s -d- a simple mistake. Note that this example also shows a change of voiceless dental stop -t- > voiceless palatal stop -c-.
711 Geiger §41.2 and Mehendale, Aspects of Indo-European Linguistics, 39. Mehendale’s examples are from Lüders Beobachtungen §117-121. Pasenadi occurs as Pasenaji in the Bhārhut-Inschrift list; vidita is a Burmese variation in Sn 250-a and samvijīta has a corresponding Sinhalese var samvidīta in Sn 935-d. Palissajissati is a Burmese var in Jā. 5, 215 (story 527, verse 66) and dighacchā occurs in the commentaries and has an AMG reflex digimchā ("hunger," Mylius, Wörterbuch, s.v., 368). The exchange of jy- and dy- (e.g. jyotis and dyut) "erkennt einen alten Prakritisum" per Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, 1, §140a and he cites several examples of interchange of -j- and -d- both within OI and between OI and other IE languages (Greek and Latin). See also Bloomfeld & Edgerton, Vedic Variants, §159.
712 See Brough’s discussion in GDhp, 185-86.
split open,” and “to be frightened or afraid.” Each are associated with their own nominal forms, jara, (“becoming old, the act of wearing out”) and dara (“cleaving, breaking, tearing, fear”). The word jara is also a normal Pkt form for S jvara (< S vīval, “to burn”) for “fever,” (cf. AMg jara) and dara could also < S dvara, meaning “obstructing” (< vṛ, “to obstruct, to cover”). All of these are possible meanings appropriate to the context. The Tib translation of UV 28.5-c nirjvaro is rims nad med, “free from fever,” which the commentary glosses as “because of being free from constant suffering, the state of attaining the abandoning of afflictions.”

There is no Ch equivalent of this verse, while the Ch translation of Dhp 385-c is 捨離貪婬 (shē lǐ tān yīn, “discard craving and debauchery”); the Tib equivalent for this verse seems to come in UV 33.27-c S, UV 33.30-c Tib, where the S has vītarāgāṃ visamyuktāṃ, and the Tib ‘dod chags bral zhing mi ldan de (“free from craving, detached”), glossed as “having abandoned craving for the three realms;” whether the Tib and Ch renditions represent a misunderstanding of vītaddaramaḥ/vītajjaramaḥ, or simply the interpolation of a different verse (e.g. P vītārāgā from Dhp 99-c Arahantavagga or vītarāgāṃ visamyuttāṃ from Thī 335-c) is impossible to tell.

The commentaries define niddaro in a general way which does not give much help as to the specific meaning of the word: niddaro means “with the drinking of both tastes [the taste of solitude and the taste of tranquility, referred to in pādas a and b], the bhikkhu’s mind is free from mental obsessions because of the absence of passion (rāga) and anxiety (daratha)

---

713 See Balk Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivaraṇa, 774-10-13: rims nad med cing zhes bya ba smos te/ gtan du gdung ba dang bral ba’i phyir ro/ nyon mongs pa spangs pas na de thob pa nyid do/

714 UV 33.24, pāda c does not correspond to Dhp 385-c (P vītaddaramaḥ visamyuttāṃ vs. S pāragaṃ sarvadharmāṇāṃ). Tib commentary in Balk, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivaraṇa, 1012-26-27: ‘dod chags dang bral ba zhes smos te/ khams gsum gyi sred pa spangs pa’o/”The three realms are the realm of desire, form and formlessness.”
indeed he is both niddaro and sinless.”715 Similarly vițaddaram is glossed as “free from all afflictions.”716 The use of rāga….abhāvena in the commentary is interesting in terms of the other versions discussed above, where there seems to be another parallel tradition of vițarāgam alongside vițaddaram and vițajjaram. We may conclude therefore that vițaddara/vițajjara (and niddaro/nirjvaro, the latter probably a back-formation from niijaro) combine a variety of meanings including “free from fear,” “free from fever,” “free from worry and anxiety,” or more generally, “free from afflictions,” “free from obstructions,” and even - by metaphorical extension or metathesis - “free from passion.”717

21) *paligha/pal(r)ikhā* A2, A5 (-r- -> -l-)

In the discussion on pannabhāro above (page 261) two other compounds describing an arahant occur whose meanings are not clear: ukkhitapaligho and saṃkīṇṇaparikho; these are usually translated as “whose cross-bar has been lifted, whose trench has been filled in.”718 The first compound also occurs in Dhp 398-c as *ukkhilapalighaṃ* (“having thrown up the bar [got rid

715 Dhp-a 3, 269-4: **niddaro hoti** ti tena ubhayarasapānena khīṇāsavo bhikkhu abbhantare rāgadarathānam abhāvena niddaro ceva nippāpo ca hoti

716 Dhp-a 4, 14113-14: **vițaddaram** sabbakilesehi *visamyyuttaṃ*.

717 S *niṟaṅa* (“without passion”) > *niṟāya*, metathesis > *niyāra* > (with the -y- treated as a stop substitute as per Pischel §195) > *nidara/nijara*. The doubling of the consonant would have been a later addition, added by the scribe to account for the prefix (*nis*) or the words’ putative derivation from *jvara/dvara*. An alternate possibility is *nirada* (“without sex” in G where *rada = rata*) > *nidara* through metathesis.

of obstacles”) and in the Vaseṭṭhasutta of the Sn, verse 622-c (“rid of his obstacles”), describing the Buddha. The word palīgha, (“cross-bar, bolt”) is an eastern form (with -r- > -l-) of parīgha, “iron bar or beam for locking a gate” < S pari + ṭhan, “obstruct, hinder”; related phonologically to parikhā (“moat”) < Skt pari + ṭhan, “to dig around.” That both words were probably transmitted as par(l)i(h)a with the intervocalic stop dropped is suggested by the GDhp parallel verse (42-c) which has -phali’a with no intervocalic and aspirated -ph-, and the UV reflex (33.58A-c) which has -parikham, with the P -gh- > -kh-. The GDhp thus leaves the word ambiguous and the UV makes a decision in favour of “moat” (parikhā). This then would have to be translated as either “whose moat has been erected,” meaning (in a positive, not negative sense), i.e., “who has become impregnable,” as in a similar verse in the MBh 12, 6250 (parikhā-sthita), or could also mean “whose moat has been rejected/removed.”

The P commentary takes parikha/parigha in a negative sense, as a “bond” and glosses it, “ṇandhiṃ

719 Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 57 and Norman, Group of Discourses, 77. Square brackets in original. The first occurrence of the word palīgha that I have been able to find occurs in the Chāndogya Upanisad, 2.24.6, upa jahi parigham (“Throw back the bolt!”), in reference to the patron of the sacrifice opening the door to the world of immortality, because of his sacrifice. Translation from Patrick Olivelle, Upaniṣads, 117. The root verb pari + ṭhan occurs in RV 2, 27.6 with the meaning “to destroy” (dusparihantu, “difficult to be destroyed”). The word parikhā first appears in Manu and the MBh and the root verb (pari + ṭhan) in the Āśvalāyana Grhya Sūtra, 2, 7.

720 See footnote 191. For the dropping of stops in aspirated intervocalic stops, see Pischel §188. Lüders, Beobachtungen, §130, believed that the confusion between -gh- and -kh- was the result of a hyperpālism i.e. the translator systematically devoiced “eastern” forms, which had voiced originally voiceless forms, and were voiced in the “Urkanon.” In AMg the word for parigha is pariha, which form Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 173 suggests is the source of the confusion.

721 Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 173 (ad Dhp 398) suggests that this (parikha = “moat”) was simply a misunderstanding on the part of the UV redactor; however ut + kṣip does not just mean “raise” as in raising a cross-bar, but can also mean “set up, erect” as in building a moat and raising a berm on the side to contain it. A secondary meaning of ut + kṣip is “to get rid of, reject,” so the bahuvrīhi could also mean “whose moat has been removed” (now in a negative sense).
(“thong” var. naddhiṃ, nandīṃ, nindiṇḍa) means anger which happens because of its nature of binding; varattaṇī (“strap”) means craving which happens because of its nature of attachment; sandānaṃ sahanukkamaṃ (“chain plus a bridle”) - the sixty-two chains together with the bridle of the proclivities, - having destroyed all that, one is established as having removed the paligha of ignorance.” The Tibetans translated yongs su gdung spangs which is itself ambiguous, meaning “has abandoned gdung pa (“mental anguish” = paridāha?) or gdung ma (“roof-beam, joist” of a house, =parigha?). Rockhill translates “thrown off all affliction,” which Brough thinks is a mistake, assuming that “beam” and parigha, “cross-bar” are the same thing. But the word pariha - which may be what the Tibetans had in their exemplar - is also a deśī word (indigenous, non-IA) which Hemacandra equates with S roṣa (“anger, rage, wrath, passion, fury”), a meaning which makes better sense in the context than “has abandoned a roof-beam.” This uncertainty as to meaning is expressed in Prajñāvarman’s commentary which reads: “yongs su gdung spangs means completely abandoning suffering, a solid bolt/crossbeam; others say ‘crossing over a moat;’ crossing over by arising ( ‘byung bas brgal); going beyond, - it is a moat

---

722 Dhp-a 4, 1611-5: nandin ti nayhanabhāvena pavattāṃ kodham, varattan ti bandhanabhāvena pavattāṃ taṇham, sandānaṃ sahanukkaman ti anusayānukkamasahitam dvāsaṭṭhidīṭhisandānaṃ, idam sabham pi chinditvā ṭhitam avijjāpalighassa ukkhittattā ukkhittapalighaṃ
723 yongs su gdung normally translates paridahyate, “to burn, to be consumed,” per Negi, Dictionary, 5958.
of ignorance.” So the Tibetans seem to have preserved three meanings; yongs su gdung, which normally translates some form of the word pari + ṇdah, but is also glossed as ‘khor gtan (indrakīla or parigha, “cross-bar, bolt”) and ‘obs (parikhā “moat”). The Ch also translate “moat”: "He who has cut off the stream of life and death, able to endure [difficulties], and rise to cross [the world], is enlightened for himself, has gone beyond the moat, this is what is called a brahmacārī.”

More confusion results when paligha/palikha occur sided by side as they do in the Alagaddūpamasutta in the passage previously examined re: panna-bhāro. Here we find ukkhitapaligho and samkiṇṇaparikho as two attributes of an arahant, along with three others (the last three being considered as one in the sutta):

ayāṃ vuccati, bhikkhave, bhikkhu ukkhitapaligho iti pi, samkiṇṇaparikho iti pi, abbūḷhesiko iti pi,
niraggalo iti pi, ariyo pannaddhajo pannabhāro visāmyutto iti pi.

726 Michael Balk, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivaraṇa, 1038–20–23: yongs su gdung spangs zhes bya ba gdung ba yongs su spangs pa ste/ ’khor gtan bzang po’o/ gzhan dag tu ni ’obs brgal ba zhes ’byung bas brgal ba ni ’das pa ste ma rig pa’i ’obs lags so’/ ’khor gtan translates S indrakīla, per Negi, Dictionary, 433. 727 T04n0210_p0572c15-16. Duàn shēngsī hé, néng rēn qī dū, zījué chū qiān, shīwēi fānzhī. The Ch appear to be translating a version closer to G or UV, which are quite different in places from the P and point to phonological confusion. P sandāmām (“cord, fetter”) = G. sadana (“continuum”) = UV samtāna (ident). Brough takes sadana as equal to S samdāna (“bond, halter, fetter”) which it could also be, while the Ch take it in the sense of “river of life and death.” P sahanikkamām (“with bridle”) corresponds with G samadikrammi (“transcend”) and UV duratikramam (“hard to transcend”). It is not clear what the Ch had in their exemplar for uksiptaparīkha; they translated “go beyond the moat,” which, as stated above, is a possible meaning.
“This bhikkhu is called one whose cross-bar has been lifted, whose trench has been filled in whose pillar has been uprooted, one who has no bolt, a noble one whose banner is lowered, whose burden is lowered, who is unfettered.”

The Ch versions only has five epithets, two of which were presumably -parihā, as there are two translations of “moat” (度壍 dù qiàn, "cross over the moat,” and 過壍, guò qiàn, "pass beyond the moat”) and no mention of a “cross-bar.” From what we have seen of the homonymic transmission in MI, there appear to be several semantic possibilities in these two compounds; they may be understood as either the removal of a negative quality or the establishment of a positive one, or a combination of the two. Nevertheless the meanings are still elusive. If we are to take ukkhita-paligho in the first compound as “whose cross-bar has been lifted,” why is there another epithet niraggaḷo (“no cross-bar”) which occurs immediately afterwards? These are synonyms per MW (parigha =

728 MN 1, 13916-19. Translation by Bodhi & Ńāṇamoli, Middle-Length Discourses, 233. The Burmese recension has saṃkiṇṇaparikkho (lit. “full of investigation”) with -kkh- which is derived from S parīkṣā (“investigation”), apparently a copyist’s mistake. The two words also occur side by side in the BHS version of the Mahāsamājasūtra, in Lore Sander, "Nachträge zu "Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte Hete 3-4,” in L. Sander, ed., Kleinere Sanskrit-Texte Heft 5 (Stuttgart, 1987), 16820-21: sampradālya khalu kīlam aneyā indra(kīlaṃ pari)ghaṃ pari)khāṃ ca, translated as “Having plucked out (broken) the wedge (the post) and (passed?) the ditch.” Here the words appear to be taken as synonyms, (indrakīlaṃ = parighaṃ = pari)khāṃ = “bolt,”) for there is no separate verb governing pari)khāṃ (usu. "moat") as the translator has noted, and the gerund sampradālya (“plucked out” < S sam + pra + ṭd, "completely tear to pieces") seems to have the wrong meaning governing pari)khāṃ with the meaning of "moat." The P version omits pari)khāṃ: Chetvā khibhaṃ chetvā pari)ghaṃ inda-khibhaṃ u)hacca-m-anejā (DN 2, 25417-18), trans. by Walshe, Long Discourses, 314 as "Bars and barriers broken, the threshold-stone of lust torn up,..." Sander’s version of the Mahāsamājasūtra is an updated version of Ernst Waldschmidt, Bruchstücke buddhistischer Sūtras aus dem zentralasiatischen Kanon (Leipzig: Deutsche Morgenländische Gesellschaft in Kommission bei F.A. Brockhaus, 1932), 149-206, with newly discovered fragments added in. Waldschmidt provides a German translation of the four Ch versions of this sūtra and of this particular verse (157-59) which are all different again.

729T01n0026_p0765c22. See footnote 646.
argala), and apparently redundant, unless we are to take the removed cross bar as now absent. More logically, both words may refer to the moat which is both removed (*ukkhitta*) and filled in (*samkinna*) or crossed over, with *paligho* = *parikho* in both compounds, as the Ch have it.\(^{730}\)

This is quite a common stylistic device in the canon where one word or compound synonymizes and/or amplifies the other. The same argument of course can be made for the *ukkhitta-paligho* and *niraggalo*, although they are not contiguous terms; and in that case there would be no gainsaying others’ understanding of *ukkhittapaligho samkinnaparikho* as “cross-bar removed, moat filled in or crossed over.” Unless new MI sources come to light we will probably never be able to solve the mystery of *paligha/parikhā*; nevertheless we can identify the underlying BMI form with some degree of confidence (*pali’a* or *paliha* in its eastern form or *pari’a/pariha* in the west) which accounts for the confusion and the different MI, Ch and Tib interpretations show the range of potential meanings as actually understood by different tradents.

22) *anejo/aneyo* A4, \((-y\rightarrow<j>-j)\)

---

\(^{730}\) Norman, *Word of the Doctrine*, 173. *samkinna* = “filled.” “Crossed over” as per the Tibetan commentary as above.
We know that in some MI dialects intervocalic -y- regularly changed to a -j-.\textsuperscript{731} This fact led to the creation of hyperforms like P niya < S nija (“one’s own”). Although this could simply be the replacement of an intervocalic stop with a glide, a common enough practice, it is also possibly the result of a mechanical back-formation by a translator who “knew that intervocalic -y- became -j- in the donor dialect, wrongly back-formed the -j- which he found in his exemplar into -y-, presumably not recognising the fact that in this particular case nija was correct in the receiving dialect also.”\textsuperscript{732} An example of this change occurs in Aśokan RE 1 G where S mayūra (“peacock”) appears as majura in Sh and M. This -y- > -j- change is probably the cause of the hyperform aneya (“immovable, free from desire”) which we find in BHS, equivalent to P aneja (“free from desire or lust,” an+ ejā, “motion, turbulence, distraction, seduction, craving” < P iñjati, “shake, stir” < S ṯṛjā, “to fry”). In Dhp 414-d a brahman is described, inter alia, as anejo, which is mirrored in UV 33.41-d by aneyo; similarly Dhp 422-c has anejam corresponding to UV 33.50-c aneyam. Both are similar in meaning and seem to result from this confusion over -y- and -j-. The commentarial tradition understood the compound correctly as “the non-existence of lust.”\textsuperscript{733} The word ejā does not seem to have a S reflex, so we may assume that it was transmitted as either aneja or aneya or ane’a in BMI; probably the first, as it still survives in Pkt (synonymized with niścala, “immovable” and niskampa, “motionless”),\textsuperscript{734} aneya was therefore an attempt to back-form by a scribe aware of the -y- > -j- change in the donor dialect. The form

\textsuperscript{731} Pischel §252. This binary relationship can be confusing as there were also changes the other way, i.e. -j- > -y- as per Pischcel §236 (for Mg). The interchange of -j and -y- has been going on since Vedic times. See Bloomfield & Edgerton, Vedic Variants, 100-101 which shows changes both ways, e.g. S javiṣṭhaḥ (“swiftest”) > S yaviṣṭhaḥ (“swiftest” not “youngest”) and S yajñā > S jajñā (“sacrifices”).

\textsuperscript{732} Norman, “Buddhism and Regional Dialects,” 88-89.

\textsuperscript{733} Dhp-a (ad 414) 4, 194:\textsuperscript{10} tanhāya abhāvena anejo

\textsuperscript{734} Sheth, Prakrit Dictionary 45.
*ane'a* usually = S *aneka* (“not one, many”), attested in AMg. However although MI translators seem to understand the word correctly, Tib and Ch scribes did not. The Tib translation of the UV 33.41-d (33.50-d in the Tib version) has *yid gnyis kyi ni mi bkri* (“not led by doubt”) where the corresponding S form has *aneyo niśkathamkathah* (“free from lust, free from doubt”). The Tibetans have taken *a-neya* as the negativized form of the *participium necessitas* of *vīṇī* (*neya,* “to be led”); similarly, the Tib translation of UV 33.50-c (33.61-c) also has *bkir med* (“not led, without leadership”) for *aneyo* and a commentary which glosses it as “because any harm whatsoever, internal or external is unsuitable to guide/lead (him).” The Ch translators of Dhp 422-c have "correctly" translated 不動 (*Bù dòng*, “motionless”), but in the earlier (414) verse *pāda d* is misconstrued as 不好他語 (*Bù hǎo tā yǔ*, “not liking to talk to other people”), apparently misunderstanding *anejo* in their exemplar for an inflected form of *añña/anye* (“another”) and taking *akathaṅkathī* (“not doubting”), as derived from *kathā* (“speech, talking together”) and *ṅkāṅkṣ* (“to wish, desire”). Of course we do not know what the Ch translator

---

735 Lüders, *Beobachtungen*, §103, says that the UV redactor interpreted *aneyo* as “der nicht zu Führende,” but *aneyo* in this context would more likely mean “immovable, free from desire” as per the BHSD, 37.s

736 The Tib *pāda* reads *yid gnyis kyi ni mi bkri zhiṅg,* “they are not led by doubt and…” The commentary (in Balk, Prajñāvarman’s *Udānavargavivaraṇa,* 10033-7, reads: “karma and afflictions in another lifetime are not able to lead them… because of abandoning the doubt of the three worlds.” *mi bkri ba zhes bya ba ni skye ba gzhan du las dang nyon mongs pas khrīd par mi nus pa’i phyir ro/…khams gsum gyi the tshom spangs pa’i phyir ro /

737 Ibid, 103121-22: *bkir med* ces bya ba ni dang phyi rol gyi ’tshhe ba gang gis kyang khrīd par mi rung ba’i phyir ro /

738 T04n0210_p0573a18. *Pāda c* seems to match up (Ch 欲渡渡岸, *yu dān dù ān,* “desiring only to cross to the (far) shore,” P *ṭīṇḍo pāragato ḋhāyī*,) as does *pāda e* (Ch 唯滅不起, *wēi miè būqī,* “(afflictions) extinguished, nothing arising,” P *anupādāya nibbuto,* although the Ch. translator has apparently mistaken *anupādāya,* “without grasping” for *anuppāda,* “without arising” )
had in his source document; only that it appears to have been misinterpreted, and *aneja/aneya*, which despite the phonological change was understood within India, but, at least in these instances cited, not understood in Tibet and China. One might argue, in support of the Tib interpretation, that *aneya* ("not to be led," "not to be affected") is a suitable epithet of a brahman and a possible additional semantic stratum for the word; however I am unaware of any attested usage of this term with such a meaning.

23) *bhava/bhoga/bhoga/bho’a* A1, A4 (-ava- > -o-)

Dhp 413, 415 and 416 are similar *gāthās* (mirrored by Sn 637, 639 and 640) with parallel structures in *pāda c*, *nandībhavaparikkhīṇaṃ* ("joy and existence exhausted"), *kāmabhavaparikkhīṇaṃ* ("sensual pleasure and existence exhausted" or "the sphere of pleasures exhausted") and *taṇhābhavaparikkhīṇaṃ* ("craving and existence exhausted").

According to the commentary for Dhp 415, these are *dvandvas* within an overall *tatpuruṣa* (*parikkhīṇakāmaṇī c’eva parikkhīṇabhavaṇī ca*, "he whose desire has been abandoned, he whose existence has been abandoned");

740 the commentary to Dhp 413, however, glosses *nandībhavaparikkhīṇaṃ* as "he whose craving has been exhausted in respect of the three states of existence" (*tīsu bhavesu parikkhīṇatānhaṃ*), - which are *kāmabhava* ("sensual")

---

741 Dhp-a 4, 19815-16 (ad Dhp 415). Commentary on Dhp 41617-19 (Dhp-a 4, 221) has *taṇhāya c’eva bhavassa ca parikkhīṇattā tanhābhavaparikkhīṇaṃ* ("the state of condition of having destroyed both craving and existence").
rūpabhava ("corporeal") and arūpabhava ("formless"), and the prefatory story to Dhp 415 (about a courtesan’s unsuccessful seduction of a monk) suggests that kāmabhava-(parikkhīṇam) is a tatpuruṣa, about the destruction of the state of existence dominated by pleasures (one of the three states), rather than “sensual pleasure and existence exhausted” (as Norman has it), although they come to the same thing.

GDhp (nanibhavaparikṣiṇa, GDhp 36-c) and UV (nandībhavaparikṣiṇa, UV 33.31-c) have parallel compounds for Dhp 413, and UV also has a corresponding compound for Dhp 416-c (trṣnābhavaparikṣiṇa, UV 33.42-c); however corresponding forms for Dhp 415-c (kāmabhavaparikṣiṇa) are different (GDhp 20-c: kamabhokaparikṣiṇa, “exhaustion of the enjoyment of pleasure,” and UV 33.35-c kāmāsravavāsamyuktaṃ, “exhaustion of the impurity of desire”), but phonologically related: kāmabhava-, kamabhoka-, kāmāsrava-. Both the G and UV versions of this compound seem to be syntactic or dependent (i.e. tatpuruṣa) compounds, not dvandvas. The Tib translation (33.46-c) of the UV is also a tatpuruṣa, viz., 'dod pa'i zag pa yongs zad de, "exhaustion of the defilement of desire," while the Ch Dhp translation seems

742 Dhp-a 4, 192b. The Sn commentary is the same in all three cases. Norman disagrees with the commentator’s interpretation of the compound as a tatpuruṣa (Word of the Doctrine, 177).

743 Commentary in Balk, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivarana, 101926-30: “Grounded in morality, with the power of calm abiding and special insight, because of completely abandoning the affliction of desire,” zhes bya ba ni tshul khrims la brten te zhi gnas dang thag mthong gi mthus ’dod pa'i nyon mongs pa mtha' dag spangs pa'i phyir ro i
to retain the internal *dvandva* structure (愛有已盡, ăi yǒu yǐ jìn, “exhaustion of existence and desire”). 744

The phonological similarity between the three Indic versions is not easily explainable unless we posit separate transmission traditions, which is unlikely given the shared content and parallel formal structures. One possible clue to an underlying form common to all three recensions is *bhoga*, elsewhere transmitted as *bho’a* (GDhp 323-b) with an *alif* being used as a syllable divider or intervocalic glide.745 *bho’a* might well stand for *bhoga* (“experiencing, sexual enjoyment, eating, pleasure, possession”) as we have it here, the most likely term, but could also have overtones of *bhoja* (“enjoyment of kāma”), and *bhauta* (“the madness of kāma”) and *bhojaya* (“the feeding of kāma” < caus. stem of S ṣbhuj, "to cause to eat, to feed"), all of which are Pkt meanings of *bho’a*.746 More importantly, *bho’a* is phonologically equivalent to *bhava*, a noun which is the *guṇa* form of ṣbhū with the addition of the thematic -a ( ṣbhū > *guṇa* form > bho + -a > *bhava*, with -o- > -av-), and the two may well have been phonetically undifferentiatable, if not identical.747 That the P reading may be uncertain is also indicated by the variant readings in the Sn for this compound (*kāmebhava-, kāmābhava-, kamārāga*).748 This still does not explain how *bh- > sr-* in UV; but it does provide an explanation for the

744 T04n0210_p0573a10. *zag pa* also has the sense of outflow = assava, S āśrava (< ā + ṣsru, "to flow") which is the source of its extended meaning "defilement, sin depravity, impurity," etc. See BHSD s.v. āśrava/āsrava.
745 Brough GDhp §30, 39.
746 Sheth, Prakrit Dictionary, 658.
747 Whitney, Grammar, §28a and 131. The *guṇa* of bhū requires the insertion of -a- before the -ū > bhaū or bho is actually a diphthong and would probably have retained that dual sound, rendering bhaū-َا (i.e. bho-َا) and *bhava* virtually identical.
748 Andersen & Smith, Sutta-Nipāta, 121, footnote 17.
strange alternation of *bhो‘a* and *bhava* and suggests that, with an underlying oral form *bhो‘a* (probably representing *bhoga*, as the most germane in context), this compound is to be understood as a *tatpuruṣa*.

24) *unnalānaṃ/unaḍana/unnaddhānāṃ/uddhatānāṃ* A4 (-I or -I >¬-'), A3

There has been a lot of confusion over the meaning of *unnala* (var *unnaḷa*) in Dhp 292-c (in the gen. plural as *unnalānaṃ*):

> yam hi kiccaṃ tad apaviddham
>
> akiṭṭhaṃ pana kayirati,

> unnalānaṃ pamattānaṃ

> tesaṃ vaḍḍhanti āsavā.

"For what is to be done is thrown away: but what is not to be done is done. Of those who are unseemly and careless the āsavas increase."

That this is longstanding is indicated by the MI variants *unaḍaṇa* (GDhp 339-c), *unnaddhānaṃ* (PDhp 266-c) and *uddhatānaṃ* (UV 4.19-c), with *unnadānaṃ* in the old UV.\(^{749}\) Norman translates “unseemly” with no explanation, referring the reader to the long discussion of

unaḍaṇa in GDhp (ad 339). Here Brough goes through the various possibilities for this word, starting with the PED’s improbable derivation from \( ud + \text{vīl} \) (“to sport”) by dissimilation;\(^{750}\) Kern’s suggestion of its formation from S unṇaḍa (“raised, elevation” p.p. of un (\( ud \)) + \( \text{vīnam} \)) which is supported by Edgerton who believes both unṇaḍa and unṇal(ḷ)a are dialect forms of this latter word (with meaning “haughty, arrogant”); Fausbøll’s suggestion is that it refers to an erect penis and therefore has the meaning “lascivious” and Brough’s own suggestion is that it derives from S \( *\text{unṛta} \) (“one who exhibits heroic frenzy characteristic of the warrior”). In the commentaries it is traditionally understood as derived from \( ud + \text{nal} \) (“up” + “reed”); Norman quotes the gloss in his notes to verse Th 634-a where he translates “frivolous” for the word. Here the word is defined as “Conceit which is lofty and empty, like a reed which has the nature of emptiness, has the habit and appearance of rising upwards.”\(^{751}\) The commentary ad Th 635-c which is almost identical to Dhp 292 talks about various things which are not to be done by a monk, the doing of which “raises the reed of arrogance” (\( \text{māna-ṇal} \text{aṃ ukhipitvā} \)) and “causes the negligent ones’ four outflows to increase by abandoning mindfulness on the part of the arrogant \( [\text{unṇalāṇaṃ}] \).”\(^{752}\) Here \( \text{mānaṇaḷaṃ} \) is obviously a play on words for \( \text{unṇalāṇaṃ} \) and at the same time an etymology and derivation.

---

\(^{750}\) The CPD simply has “etym.?” (page 428), and refers to the BHSD \( \text{unṇaḍa} \) (see below).

\(^{751}\) Th-a 2, 2698-9: \( \text{unṇaḷassā ti, uggata-tuccha-mānassa; māno hi unṇa-manākāra-vuttiyā tuccha-bhāvena nalo viyā ti, nalo ti vuccati.} \)

\(^{752}\) Th-a 2, 26922-23 and Dhp-a 3, 45218-19: \( \text{Tesaṃ māna-ṇal} \text{aṃ ukhipitvā carāṇena unṇalāṇaṃ sati-vossaggena pamattānāṃ cattāro pi āsavā vaḍḍhanti.} \) The \( \text{gāthās} \) are identical and the commentary almost so.
Prefix un (ud) + noun (where the ud > un because of assimilation to the following nasal) is in fact a common OI/MI word form: there is S un+nāla (“having an upraised stalk”) from ud + nāla or nala (“reed”) and several phonetically related forms, un+māda (“mad, insane”), un + mada (“intoxicated, mad, furious”), un + nāda (“crying out, clamour”), un + nāma and un + ṇāma (AMg, “arrogance”), both from < S un + nāma, “raising oneself”), P un + nati (“haughtiness” = S un + nati, “elevation, height”). These additional phonetically similar words, may or may not be resonant in unnaḷa; it is clear, however, that the word has a definite meaning which is clearly explained by the commentary as a “raised reed.” The hollow reed, like the hollow plantain tree, (“empty, void and worthless”) is a metaphor for the empty skandhas, for anatta and also may be a sexual pun; certainly the word has perjured in meaning over time and developed the additional sense of “something which seems to have substance, but doesn’t,” i.e. “pride,” or “arrogance;” Norman’s translation “unseemly” captures both senses of the word perfectly - something which seems to be what it isn’t and “improper.”

In the canon the word unnaḷa usually occurs in company with uddhata (“haughty” < S ud + ādhṛ and capala (“thoughtless, ill-mannered, fickle). For example, in the Anangaṇasutta (MN 5) we find unnaḷa within a long list of adjectives describing a person who has gone forth into homelessness, not out of faith, but to get a livelihood. The commentary defines unnaḷa as

753 Phēṇapiṇḍūpamasutta SN 3, 1419-10: rittakaḥṣeṣa khāyeṣya. tucchakaḥṣeṣa khāyeṣya asārakaḥṣeṣa khāyeṣya. “It [the lump of foam] appears empty, it appears void, it appears worthless.”

754 MN 1, 328-10: saṭhā māyāvino ketubhino [Burmese var. ketabind], uddhatā unnaḷā, capalā mukharā vikīṇṇavācā, indriyesu aguttadvārā,... (“... who are fraudulent, deceitful, treacherous, haughty, hollow [unnaḷa], personally vain, rough-tongued, loose-spoken, unguarded in their sense faculties...”). Translation by Ñañamoli & Bodhi, Middle-Length Discourses, 113.
“pride which is raised, empty.”

Sometimes it also occurs along with other pejorative terms; in the commentarial introduction to Th 680, “One day a thera, saw a certain co-resident monk who was lazy, low-energy, haughty and unnalā because of his association with bad company…” The G form of this word unada, with the substitution of P -ṝ- for G -ḍ- is very common in MI and suggests that the G form is earlier because of directionality (-ḍ- > -ṝ- is the normal change).

UV uddhata (“haughty, vain arrogant,” echoed by Tib rlom pa, “pride”) seems to be either an interpretation of unnalā as the meaning was no longer understood, or a substitution with a closely associated word (through oral mis-transmission). unnada (< S un + nāda, “crying out, clamour”? which is found in the earlier UV version and unnaddha (“unbound” < S un + ṯnah?) from PDhp, appear to be phonological confusions or again, attempts to grapple with a lost meaning of unnalā. The Ch Dhp translated 伎樂放逸 (ji lè fàng yì, “for those engaged in pleasure and negligence…”).

Here the Ch translator appears to identify what is in his exemplar with sexual and/or worldly pleasures (樂= "pleasure" lè).

This short history of various understandings of unalā is particularly illuminating; it shows that even when the semantic pedigree of a word has been preserved - in this colourful and evocative image of the hollow, raised reed - various transmission/translation errors and other

755 Ps 1, 15210-11: unnalāti uggatanaḷā. Uṭṭhitatucchamāṇā ti vuttaṁ hoti.

756 Th-a 3, 67-9: ath’ ekadivasaṁ thero, attano saddhi-vihārikaṁ ekam bhikkhum akalyāṇa-mitta-saṁsaggena kusītam hiṇa-viśiyam uddhatam unnalam viharantam disvā,…

757 Pischel §240.

758 T04n0210_p0569c14. 已為多事，非事亦造，伎樂放逸，惡習日增。Yǐ wèi duōshì, fēi shì yì zào, ji lè (yuè) fàng yì, èxi rì zēng
fanciful derivations can accrue, with each new tradent adding to the complex linguistic stratigraphy.

25) *khettajinam/ksetrajño* A1, A4 (nasals), A5 (epenthetic vowel insertion $\emptyset$ > -i-, or deletion -i- > $\emptyset$)

In the Sn’s *Sabhiyasutta*, Sabhiya asks the Buddha what a *khettajina* ("field-conqueror") is and the latter answers:

*khettāni viceyya kevalāni Sabhiyā ti Bhagavā
divyam mānusakañ ca brahmakhettam
sabbakhettamūlabandhanā pamutto
khettajino tādi pavuccate tathattā.* 524

"Having considered all fields, Sabhiya," said the Blessed One, "the divine one, and the human one, [and] the Brahma-field, completely released from the bond, the root of all fields, such a one is rightly called ‘field-knower.’" On the strength of the Mvu version which has *kṣetrajño*, and the ambivalent commentary which glosses *viceyya* as both *viceyya* ("having examined") and *vijeyya* ("having conquered"), Norman decides that *khettajina* is derived from *khettajña* with the addition of an epenthetic vowel and change of a palatal nasal to a dental. Norman notes

759 Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 63.
that ksetra-jña is a “brahmanical technical term,” co-opted by the Buddha.760 But there is a problem with this interpretation as the brahmanical compound kṣetrajña is a positive term, used to denote the atman or soul; in the Sn khetta is being used in a negative sense, as something to be overcome, sabbakhettamūlabandhanā pamutto, “released from the bonds which are the root of all fields.” In Manu 12, 12, the kṣetrajña is the individual soul: “The one who makes this body act is called Kṣetrajña, ‘the knower of the field;’ the one who does the actions, on the other hand, the wise call bhūtātman, ‘the elemental self.’”761 Another locus classicus for the “field-knower” is the Bhagavad Gītā, Chapter 13, where the field to be known is that of “beginningless Brahman...settled in the hearts of all,”762 But in Buddhist thought the field is not necessarily a positive factor, whether of human, divine or Brahma origin. A field is the depository of kamma; it can be a “field of merit” (puññakhetta), but is also the source of dukkha: “kamma is the field, consciousness the seed, craving the moisture; for beings whose obstacle is ignorance, who are bound by craving, their consciousness is fixed in the lower realm (and) it is thus reborn again in the future.”763 So in a Buddhist context, a khetta is something to be understood, but also to be overcome. A khettaina (the normal P term is khettañña which is not

760 Ibid, 259. For commentary see Pj 2, 42879-29: vijeyya jetvā abhibhavitvā viceyya vā aniccādībhāvena vicīntīvā upaparikkhivā. vijeyya = “having conquered, having overcome or viceyya = having considered because of the nature of impermanence, having investigated.”


762 For translation see Franklin Edgerton, The Bhagavad Gītā, vol 1. and 2 (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1944, 1994), 129. “anādi matparān brahma...ḥṛdi sarvasya dhiṣṭitam. (verse 12-c and 17-d; most recensions have viṣṭhitam for dhiṣṭitam; for the the alternation of dh/v, see Norman, Elders’ Verses 2, 57).

763 Paṭhamabhavasutta, AN 1, 22322-25: kammaṃ khettaṃ viññānaṃ bijāṃ tāṇhā sneho avijñāvaranānaṃ sattānaṃ tāṇhāsanyojanānaṃ hīnāya dhātuyā viññānaṃ pattiṭhitam. Evaṃ āyātām punabhavābhinibbatti hoti.
derivable from kṣetrajina) must also therefore be a khettajina, as the commentary makes clear: “tāni vijeyya (“having conquered them [the fields], having subdued, having overcome; viceyya (“having examined”), having considered, because of their nature of impermanence, etc., having investigated; kevalāni (“all”), complete, in particular the divine, human and Brahma fields which have become a cause of attachment; having investigated and conquered all these fields,… one is freed from the bondage which is the root of all fields, which is ignorance, existence and craving, etc., the root bondage of all fields. Because one is a conqueror and investigator of these fields one is called a “field conqueror.”  

The commentary clearly indicates that the absolutive viceyya is itself ambiguous and must have been transmitted as *vijeyya, with an intervocalic glide which allowed for both readings of viceyya and vijeyya. The Mvu version, although it has kṣetrajño instead of khettajina, has the word saṃyama (“having suppressed, controlled") in place of viceyya, perhaps a gloss for a ji- (“to conquer”) type verb. The Ch rendition is different from both MI recensions. Here the Buddha is asked about a “field of merit" (福田, fūtián) and he defines this as knowing those fields which deserve offerings and being released from the bonds of expecting recompense for offerings. 

---

764 Pj 2, 428-429: tāni vijeyya vijetvā abhīhavitvā- viceyya vā aniccādibhāvena vicintvā upaparikhitvā- kevalāni anavasesāni, visesato pana saṅghahetiḥuṭāṁ dibbāṁ mānusakaṁ ca brahmakhettaṁ,...taṃ sabbam pi vijeyya viceyya vā tato. yad etam sabbesaṁ khettanām mūlabandhanām avijjābhavatanādi, tasmā sabbakhetamūlabandhanā pamutto, evam etesaṁ khettanāṁ vijitattā vicītattā vā khettajino nāma hoti, tasmā khettānī ti  

765 Norman, Group of Discourses, 259. See also GDhp 81-b where viyi correpsonds to Sn 5-b vicinām (“searching”), the -c- > -y-.  

766 Ibid, 259. The Mvu samyama may be found in vol. 3 398.19.  

767 T03n0190_p0834b22-23: 諸剎一一分別知, 諸梵諸天堪受供, 果報執著解繫脱, 如是乃名為福田, Zhū chà yǐyī fēnbié zhī, zhū fàn zhū tiān kān shòu gōng, guǒbào zhízhūo jiě fù tuō, rúshí nài míngwéi fūtián, “All fields one by one clearly known, both Brahma [fields], and heavenly [fields] that deserve to receive offerings, discarding the bonds of entitlement to recompense, in this way it is known as the field of merit.”
Although *Manu* and the *Bhagavad Gītā* are relatively late works in comparison to the *Sn*, the term “field-knower” (in the form *kṣetravid*) is at least as early as the *RV* (e.g. 10.32.7a)\(^{768}\) with the meaning of someone who knows the land and - judging from the Buddhist use of the term in the *Sn* - also had the meaning of “spiritual soul” well before the time of the historical Buddha. The Buddha’s response to Sabhiya is in fact a redefinition of the word with a complete *volte-face* in meaning: a field-knower is not only someone who knows the various fields of human and divine activity; he is also someone who has conquered them and is no longer dependent on any of them. Implicit in this statement is a rejection of the notion of a soul (*an-atta*) as controller of a body, and further rejection of the body and other fields in terms of their karmic substrate. So a field knower is also a field conqueror and both meanings of the word *khettajina* are explicit in the *Sn*. Although a normal MI hearer may not have been aware of the semantic ambiguity in *khettajina = khettajña*, he/she would certainly hear both *viceyya* and *vijeyya* (fairly common MI forms from the roots *vi + ćit* and *vi + jī*, in the transmitted from *viyeyya*, as discussed above.

26) āsavāni/āsayāni A4 (glide interchange -y- >< -v-)

Another example from the *Sabhiyasutta* for which intervocalic consonantal ambiguity provides an explanation occurs in verse 535-a, where P has *chetvā āsavāni ālayāni* (var. *chetvā ālayāni āsavāni*) “having cut the outflows and the attachments”) and the Mvu has *hitvā ālayāni āsayāni* (var. *ālepati āsayāni; ālayāni āsanāni*) “having abandoned the attachments and intentions,” in

\(^{768}\) *ākṣetravit kṣetravidam hy āprāt*, translated by Ralph Griffith, *Rig Veda*, as “The stranger asks the way of him who knows it.”
the parallel verse (vol. 3, p. 400\textsuperscript{3}). The words āsavāni and āsayāni are almost identical phonetically, both showing a glide -v- or -y- in the third syllable, but quite different in meaning; āsavāni is derived from the verb ā + ṣrū, “to flow from” and āsayāni < verb ā + ṣī, “to lie or rest on, to wish.” The outflows (āsava) are the afflictions of sensuality (kāmāsava), rebirth (bhavāsava), views (diṭṭhāsava) and ignorance (avijjāsava). The word āsaya means “inclination, intention, will” but also has overlapped with the semantic field of āsava (“outflow, excretion”).

The word ālaya (<S ā + ṭī) has the sense of “attachment lust,” as well as “fundamental base” as per its use in ālaya-vijñāna (usu. translated as “storehouse consciousness”), a Yogācāra concept representing the receptacle which stores the impressions of past experiences and karmic actions and from which future consciousness arises. Edgerton believed that āsayāni in the Mvu “must probably” be read as āsavāni, as in P, since āśaya (= āsaya) “seems not to be used in a pejorative sense,” but Senart apparently felt differently as he did not emend āsayāni.\textsuperscript{769} The P gloss in fact suggests that the Mvu has the correct reading: “the wise person cuts the four āsavas and the two attachments with the sword of wisdom.”\textsuperscript{770} This is redundant as the two attachments are craving and views, which are identical to two of the four āsavas.\textsuperscript{771} In the context what makes more sense is “the wise person cuts the four asāvas and the intentions (to seek them again);” i.e. he/she rids himself of the attachments (ālayāni) and the mental intention (āsaya = saṅkhāra) which creates them. A well-documented interchange of

\footnotesize

\textsuperscript{769}Edgerton, BHSD, s.vv. āśaya, asaya, pp. 109 and 111.

\textsuperscript{770}Pj 2, 433\textsuperscript{3-4}: cattāri āsavāni dve ca ālayāni paññāsatthena chetvā vidvā viññū.

\textsuperscript{771}Pj 2, 216\textsuperscript{2-3}: kāmālaye asattan ti, yv āyam kāmesu taphādiṭṭhivasena duvidho ālayo, “Not attached to clinging to sensual pleasures. This is the twofold clinging on acount of views and craving in respect of sensusal pleasures.” Identical to the kāma- and diṭṭhi- āsavas.
intervocalic OI/MI -y- and -v- is responsible for this ambiguity;\textsuperscript{772} it is of course impossible to tell which is the “original” transmission, whether Mvu āsayani which was then “corrected” to āsavāni (as Edgerton suggests above), or āsavāni, which was modified to āsayāni by a scribe who recognized a redundancy, or *āsa’āni/*āsayāni with an intervocalic glide or hiatus bridge.\textsuperscript{773} The Ch Abhinīṣṭramaṇaṣūtra translates a vijeyya type word in pāda a (截割, jie gē, “cut off, sever”) and “net of wrong views and nihilism” (截割邪見羅網斷 Jié gē xiéjiàn luówǎng duàn) for what corresponded in their exemplar to ālayāni āsavāni/āsayāni; since “wrong views” could refer to both the āsavāni and the āsayāni, the translation does not help to clarify the source material.\textsuperscript{774}

27) dipa/dvipa/divu A1 (lenition -p- > -v-), A3

One of the stylistic features of the Mahāvaṃsa is word-play. For example,

\textit{Te bhayaṭṭhā ’bhayaṃ yakkhā ayācuṃ abhayam jinam.}

\textit{Jino abhayado āha yakkhe te’ibhayaddite} (1.25)

\textsuperscript{772} See Bloomfield & Edgerton, \textit{Vedic Variants}, 127-133; Wackernagel, \textit{Grammatik}, §188c; Pischel §254 and Geiger §46.1, 46.2.

\textsuperscript{773} The gāthā purports to etymologize the MI word āriya. Lüders, \textit{Boebachtungen}, §84, saw a connection between the eastern form of ārīya (āliya, with a long ā- triṣṭubh m.c.) and ālaya. Norman, “Four Etymologies,” 175-76 (\textit{Collected Papers} 2, 152), suggests that pāda c of the corresponding Mvu gāthā, reading arato (“abstaining”) should be ārato < Pkt ārayo, explaining P ārīyo as “one who has abstained.”

\textsuperscript{774} T03n0190_p0834c23.
“The *yakkhas*, overwhelmed by fear, besought the fearless Vanquisher to release them from terrors, and the Vanquisher, destroyer of fear, spoke thus to the terrified yakkhas.” 775 This play on *bhaya-abhaya* is echoed elsewhere in the chapter and in the final *gāthā* by a play on the two meanings of *dīpa* (< S *dvīpa*, “island, continent” and *dīpa*, “light, lamp”):

Āgā tikkhattumetaṃ atipuladayo lokādīpo sudīpaṃ

*Dīpo tenāyamāsi sujanabhumato dhammadīpāvabhāsī ti* (1.85)

“...visited this fair island three times - he, the compassionate Enlightener of the world; therefore this isle, radiant with the light of truth, came to high honour among faithful believers.” 776 Rather than regarding *dīpa* as a pun or *śleṣa* with two valid meanings depending upon context, modern scholars have tended to regard the meaning of “light” as a mistake. 777 This is due to Buddhaghosa’s gloss on perhaps the most famous occurrence of *dīpa* in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*: *Tasmāt ih’ Ānanda, atta-dīpo viharatha atta-saraṇā anaṇṇa-saraṇā, dhamma-dīpā dhamma-saraṇā anaṇṇa-saraṇā*, “Therefore Ānanda, you should abide being an island (light) unto yourselves, being a refuge unto yourselves, with no one else as your refuge, with the *dhamma* as your island (light), with the *dhamma* as your refuge, with no one else as your refuge,” glossed as “having made the self an island, a support, like an island in the great ocean.” 778 Most later works have taken *dīpa* to mean “island” as the *Mahāvastu* (*ātmadvīpā bhikṣavo viharatha*, “Monks, abide being an island unto your selves”); the Turfan


776 Ibid, 9.


778 Sv 2, 54830-31: *mahāsamuddagatam dīpam viya attānām dīpam patīṭham katvā viharatha*. DN quote may be found at vol. 2, 10020-22.
Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra (ātmādvīpair vihartavyam, “Abide as islands unto your selves”); and the Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka (lokasya dvīpā bhavisyāmo lokasyālokā bhavisyāmo, “We will be islands of the world, lights of the world”), where the dual meaning of dīpa is clearly acknowledged. 779 There are also many instances where the Ch translators have chosen “light” over “island” for their translation, although the Tibetans regularly choose gling (“island, continent”). 780

Brough notes the similarity between the Upaniṣadic ātman’s light imagery (ātmaivāsya jyotir bhavati, “the ātman is his [puruṣa’s] light”) and suggests that this was both a reason for avoiding the interpretation of dīpa as “flame” (to distance themselves from the brahmanical doctrine), and also a reason to reinterpret the Vedic ātman in terms of light, but in Buddhist terms. 781 The passage from the Mahāparinnibbānasutta seems to be a good example of a true paranomasia, where both meanings of dīpa are à propos and both add a new semantic dimension to the communication; i.e. there is no need to choose one over the other. As “island” dīpa conjures the image of a safe haven in the flood of saṃsāra, and as “light” or “lamp” places the image of Buddha as light-maker (Dīpaṃkara), with the illuminating glow of the dharma, front and centre; they are not mutually exclusive but complementary. In the Dhp 236-a and 238-a (so karohi dīpam attano, “Make an island for yourself”), we have a similar situation; although Brough believes that the context makes this a clear case of dīpa = light, Norman translates

779 For the Mahāvastu, see Senart, Mvu, vol 3.339; for the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, see Waldschmidt, Teil 2, 200 §14.22; see, U. Wogihara, Abhisamayālaṃkārāloka Prajñāpāramitāvyākhya (Tokyo: Toyo Bunko, 1973), 596.

780 For the Ch translations using “light,” see Sasaki, Linguistic Approach, 62-63. For Tib see Sasaki, 61 and 63.

781 Brough, GDhp, 210. Reference to the Upaniṣads is to the Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, 4.3.6.
“island” on the basis of the commentary, (“you should make a support of merit for yourself like a resting place known as an island for a ship that has broken up in the ocean”), and Brough admits that the commentary is “not altogether perverse.” The UV (16.3-b) and Tibetans translated *dvīpaṃ* as *gling*, “island” (ad Dhp 238-a), and there does not appear to be a Ch correlate extant for either verse. Even in the Dhp 25-c (“the wise man makes an island”), which seems to clearly refer to an island “which the flood does not overwhelm,” there are different opinions on the part of the tradents. Although the commentary glosses *dīpam kayirātha*, as “he makes an island, the fruit of arhanthood which has become a support for the self in the very deep ocean of *samsāra*, a resting place very difficult to attain,” and the Tibetans translate *gling* (“island, continent”), the Ch translator has “misunderstood” *pāda c* (*dīpam kayirātha medhāvī*, “a wise man would build an island”), translating 慧能作定明 (*huì néng zuò dìng míng*, “the wise man (or wisdom) can establish a stable light.” The problems with translations, of course, is that choices have to be made and seldom if ever can the target language capture the double meaning inherent in the source transmission. With regard to *dīpa* (“island” and “light”) there appear to be lots of cases where both meanings are applicable, and both may well have been

---

782 Dhp-a 3, 3362-4: *so tvam samudde nāvāya bhinnāya dīpasārkhātaṁ paṭīṭhānaṁ viya attano kusalapatīṭham karohi.* For Brough see GDhp 210-11.

783 UV Although the UV translates *dvīpaṃ*, since the *gāthā* contrasts *dvīpaṃ ātamanah* with *malaṃ ātmanah*, “light” would seem more relevant. “Make a light (island) of the self; remove the impurities of the self as a smith removes the impurities of silver.”

784 Dhp 25-c, 25-d, *dīpam kayirātha medhāvī, yam ogho nābhikīrati.* “The wise man should build an island which the flood does not overwhelm.”

785 Dhp-a 1, 25513-16: *‘medhāvī imasāṃ atidullabhapatīṭhatāya atigambhīre samsārasāgare attano paṭīṭhānabhūtaṁ arahattaphalam ‘dīpam kayirātha’ kareyya.* Ch at T04n0210_p0562c01. “Light” is contrasted with “darkness” (冥淵, *míng yuān*) in the final *pāda.* See M. Sylvain Lévi, *L’Apramāda-Varga,* 240-241, for comparison of the Ch and MI forms. See also discussion in Brough, GDhp, 211.
meant, so there is no need to choose only one. One may infer that when the bhāṇakas said attadīpa, they were well aware of the overlapping of meanings, and in this and other cases, were content to let both speak to those who could hear.

28) abhikīrati/adhipūrati/abhimardadi/abhimardati. A1, A2, A4

The final verb in pāda d of Dhp 25, nābhikīrati (“does not cover over/destroy” < S abhi + Ṛkṝ, “to cover over”), is mirrored by three other phonologically related MI forms: GDhp 111-d nābhimardadi (“does not destory < S abhi + Ṛmrdd, “to devastate, destroy”); the same verb in UV 4.5-d, but with intervocalic -t-, instead of -DTV, nābhimardati; and nādhipūrati in PDhp 29-d (“does not cover over” < S adhi + Ṛpṝ, “to cover over”). For reference, the P verse reads,

uṭṭhānen' appamādena
saññamena damena ca
dīpaṃ kayirātha medhāvī
yam ogho nābhikīrati,

"By exertion, by carefulness, by restraint and self-control, a wise man would make an island, which a flood does not overwhelm."786 The alternation of abhi >< adhi suggests that the prefix was transmitted as *ahi-which is indeed well attested in Pkt;787 and the lenition or loss of an

786 Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 4.
787 See Pischel §283 where ahimaju = abhimanyu; §405 ahinivesiño = abhinivesiṇaḥ (Ś). For Ch
Intervocalic stop between a prefix and a main verb is also not uncommon. Common to all three verb forms is that they all had a vocalic -ṛ- in the root which is retained in the stem form, suggesting a derivation from *ahiØVrati/*ahijVrati, where Ø = an intervocalic stop which has disappeared, or -y- = an intervocalic stop replaced by a glide and V is in part determined by the restoration of the intervocalic consonant, i.e. the choice of -k- [+high] entails a corresponding vowel -i- [+high, -ī- m.c.]; and -p- [+labial] a -ū- [+labial] vowel. Consonant -m- however is not usually replaced by a glide, so to account for abhîmardâdi, one must assume an adhîpūrati > *ahîvūrati or *ahîvarati > abhîmardâti with common change of -v- > -m-; this also requires a change of -r- > -rd-. The Tib version which reads chu bo chen po mgon du zlog (“the island turns back/repulses the great river”), seems to confirm this derivation, as zlog pa usually translates S ni+vr or vr (“to ward off, check, keep back”) and mgon du is the S prefix abhi-. So the Tibetans are apparently translating abhi+ vr (“to keep off, fend off” abhîvârayati). How exactly this became abhîmardâti is not clear; nevertheless it is even less

788 Pischel §196 paḍīla=pratikula; AMg paḍiaraga = praticaraka, §537 ahûrijiyanti = abhipûryante (Māh.); ahîyâsâna = adhikâsana, AMg (Mylius 121). See also Brough, GDhp §44 abhi > ahi-.

789 The conjunct -rd- would be assimilated to -dd- in most Prakrits (e.g. madava = S. mârdava, "gentle" in K and Gir RE 13 O; notated with a single -d- in the early writings); in G, -r- followed by a dental stop may, or may not be retained, sometimes with metathesis (e.g. anuvatatu = S anuvartate, "follows" at K, Dh, Sh and M, RE 5 O; but see Sh kîtri = S kîtri, "fame" RE 10 A). If the underlying form had -r-, then the change to -rd- in G is either a Sanskritization or a "Gândhâri-ism."

790 See Negi, Dictionary, 5444.

791 See Balk, Prajñâvarman’s Udânavargavivarana, 2442-4, which reads: mkhas pas gling du byas pas ni zhes bya bas chu bo mam pa bzhis zil gyis mnan par mi ʼgyur zhing ʼphrog par mi ʼgyur ro/ “a wise man builds an island which the four different types of rivers will not overpower or take away.”
plausible to suggest that *abhimardati* and the other two MI forms are not phonologically
cognate, considering the close correspondence of all the words in the *gāthā.*

29) **appamatta** A3

This *gāthā* (i.e. Dhp 25) is part of the *appamāda varga* (“carefulness chapter”). The cognate
compound *appa-matta* is a pun in MI with (at least) two different derivations and meanings. The
more common phrase is *a-ppamatta*, negativized past participle of *pamajjati* (&lt; S *pra* + *vīmad*,
*pramādyati*, “to become intoxicated, to be careless, slothful, negligent”), generally translated as
a synonym for mindfulness, i.e. not negligent, and therefore “diligent, careful, heedful, vigilant,
alert, zealous.” The phrase occurs quite commonly in the canon in the description of the
process by which a disciple becomes an arahant, “dwellin

Here, the word can obviously be a synonym for
āḷāpi (“zealous”) as it is usually translated (“vigilant, alert”), or it could be a *bahuvrīhi* meaning

792 For -v- and -y- interchange, see Pischel §254; for intervocalic -v- replaced by a -y- see Pischel §186,
187. For -v- &gt; -m- see Pischel §261 and Brough, GDhp §36 (e.g. S *gageṣate* = G *gageṣati*). One
possible derivation is *ahiyaṃati* &gt; *abhivaṃati* &gt; *abhimaṃati* &gt; *abhimandaṃati*. The -d- was added to make
sense of *abhimandaṃati* which is not a valid verb form. The Tibetans interpreted their source as *abhivaṃati*,
which is a valid form, although not the usual causative one *abhivaṃati*. Another similar example may be
found in Dhp 288-c *antakenādhipannassa* (“for one who is seized by death” &lt; S *adhi* + *vīpad*), with
parallel forms GDhp 261-c *adena abhidunasa* (“for one who is overwhelmed by death” &lt; S *abhi* + *vītud*),
PDhp 366-c *antakenādhibhūtasya* (“for one who is mastered by death,” &lt; S *adhi* + *bhū* and UV 1.40c
*antakenābhihūtasya* (“for one who is conquered by death” &lt; Skt. *abhī* + *vībhū*), where the verbs have
some phonological similarity but the relationship - other than the transmission of *abhī* and *adhi* as “ahi -
is not clear.

793 For example, from the *Mahāparinibbānasutta*, DN 2, 15334: eko vūpakatttho appamatto āḷāpi pahitatatto
viharanto...
“contented with little” (*yasya mātram alpam asti*, “whose measure is little”), reflecting the potential arhat’s indifference to desire. It appears to have this meaning in the *Santuṭṭhisutta* (“Satisfied” sutra), where the Buddha talks about four trifles which are easily obtained (*cattāri appāni ca sulabhāni ca*) by a monk who is practicing, happy, content with little (*tuṭṭhassa, appamattassa sikkhato*), but the meaning “diligent” could also be applicable in this case.⁷⁹⁴ The compound is usually a simple adjective or noun (with -ka) meaning simply “little, small (thing)” (<S *alpa-mātra*), as, for example, in its use in Dhp 56-a (“A little thing is this smell…” *appamatto ayaṃ gandho*) or the *Brahmajālasutta* where the Buddha says that praise of his moral practice by the worldling is “just a trifle, an insignificant thing,” (*appamattakam kho pan’ etam bhikkave oramattakam*), for, as the commentary points out “morality does not reach the excellence of concentration, nor concentration the excellence of wisdom.”⁷⁹⁵ in AMg, where *appa = ātman* (see page 155 above), *appa-matta* also has the meaning “merely an I,” “nothing but an I,” which however is unattested.

The use of *appamatta* in this secondary meaning (“whose measure is little,” “content with little”) is difficult to pinpoint; in fact both meanings are not mutually exclusive, and most instances of *appamatta* (in the meaning of “careful, diligent”) are consistent with the *bahuvrihi* meaning: he/she who is diligent in pursuing liberation has little requirements other than the four basic necessities. Nevertheless, none of the commentary to the *appāmadā vagga*, for example, treats *appamatta* as anything other than a virtual synonym for *sati* (e.g. *appamattā = satiyā*

---

⁷⁹⁴ AN 2, 276. See PED s.v. *appa-

samannāgatā, “endowed with mindfulness;” appamattassā ti = avippavutthasatino, “not neglectful;” appamatto hiḷi upaṭṭhitassatitāya, “with mindfulness present,” etc.), so it is impossible to tell to what extent this secondary meaning resonated with a typical MI speaker.796

30) ujum janapado/nijajanapado A5 (palindrome)

Verse 422 of the Sn’s Pabbajjāsutta and the corresponding Mvu version are almost identical except for the first and last word:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>BHS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>“Ujum janapado rāja, Himavantassa passato. dhanavīryena sampanno Kosalesu niketino.</td>
<td>nijajanapado rāja himavantasya pārśvataḥ dhanavīryeṇa sampanno kośalesu nivāsito 2.19914-15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

“Straight on [in that direction] there is a people, king, [living] on the flank of Himavat, endowed with wealth and energy, [belonging to] one who is indigenous among the Kosalans.”797 In the Mvu version nijajanapado replaces ujum janapado and nivāsito (a caus. past participle < S ni + vās, “cause to stay, receive as a guest, inhabit”) replaces niketino.798 The Mvu version is more

796 Dhp-a 1, 2294; 1, 2396-7; 1, 2588.
797 Norman, Group of Discourses, 49. Brackets in original. “Resident among the Kosalans” would also be a possible translation of niketino, as indeed the Sakyas are not indigenous; they have been made to settle there, by the new king Pasenadi; that is, forcibly annexed to the kingdom of Kosala. See commentary below.
798 nivāsito has two variants: nivācino and nivāsino; both the latter two would be genitives. See Senart, Mvu, vol 2. 199, footnote 15.
elegant, avoiding the awkward phrase “belonging to one who…” in the P, King Bimbisāra of Magadha has just asked the Buddha to “tell me your birth” (jātim akkhāhi). Verse 422/Mvu 2.199\textsuperscript{14-15} is the Buddha’s answer: “My native country, O King, endowed with wealth and energy on the flanks of the Himalayas, has been made to settle (nivāsito) amongst the Kośalas.” He then goes on, in the next gāthā to describe his clan (gotta) as Ādicca and his birth (jāti) Sākiya. In the P, niketino is a genitive which must qualify janapado; in the Mvu nivāsito is in the nom. modifying janapado. The commentator makes it clear that the Buddha resented the vassalship of the Sakyans to the Kosalans: “Saying ‘indigenous amongst the Kosalans,’ he rejects the new kingship. For a new king is not called ‘indigenous’ (niketi). For he whose country has been his home, according to tradition, from the earliest time, only he is to be called ‘indigenous’ (niketi). And King Suddhodana is such a one, with reference to whom he says ‘indigenous among the Kosalans (kosalesu niketino).’\textsuperscript{799} So apparently the use of the word niketino (< S niketa, “mark, sign, house, habitation, home”) is intended to show that the Sakyas are not indigenous niketino, “residents” in the Kosala country, but newcomers, and/or vice versa. In the Mvu this contrast is made explicit. The Buddha’s native country (nija-janapado) has been “made to settle” (nivāsito) amongst the Kosalans. Elsewhere in the canon there are other references to this conflict; in the Aggaññāsutta, for example, the Buddha says Sakyans are vassals of the King of Kosala…” using the pejorative word anuyuttā which means “inferior” or “vassal”;\textsuperscript{800} and in the Jātaka 7 and 465, King Pasenadi’s request for a wife from the Sakyan clan was only reluctantly fulfilled

\textsuperscript{799} Pj 2, 385\textsuperscript{4-8}: Kosalesu niketino ti bhaṇanto navakarājābhāvam paṭikkhipati, navakarājā hi niketi ti na vuccati, yassa pana ādikālato pabhuti anvayavasena so eva janapado nivāso, so niketi ti vuccati, tathārūpo ca rājā Suddhodano, yaṁ sandhāyāhad: Kosalesu niketino ti.

\textsuperscript{800} Walshe, Long Discourses, 409. DN 3, 83\textsuperscript{25-27}: Sakyā kho pana Vāsetṭha, rañño Pasenadi-Kosalassa anuyuttā bhavanti.
by providing him with Vasabhakhattiya, the daughter of a slave girl Nāgamunḍā.\footnote{Whose name (incorporating nāga and munḍa) shows her aboriginal birth; see D. D. Kosambi, The Culture and Civilisation of Ancient India in Historical Outline (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965), 128. nāga refers to the cobra totem of the eastern clans (ibid, P 93); munḍa means “bald.”} When Pasenadi found out, he deprived his new wife and their son Viḍūḍabha of their status, but restored it when the Buddha intervened. When Viḍūḍabha inherited the throne after Pasenadi’s death, he avenged the insult by massacring the Sakyans including women and children. The survivors fled to the mountains where they built a city (Morīyanagara) from which the Moriya dynasty is alleged to have originated.\footnote{See E. B. Cowell, The Jātaka or Stories of the Buddha’s Former Births (London: Luzac & Company, 1957). Vol 1, page 27 and Vol 3/4 page 91f. The story is also told in Bimala Churn Law, Tribes in Ancient India (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Series No. 4, 1943), 251f and the DPPN s.v. sakiyā. This story is told in the commentary to the Mahāvamsa. See M. Deeg, “Secular Buddhist Lineages: The Śākyas and their Royal Descendants in Local Buddhist Legitimation Strategies,” Religions of South Asia, 5, 202-03; the author also documents several other attempts to construct a direct genealogical link between Indian dynasties and the Buddha’s Sakya clan, for purposes of political and religious legitimation.}

With this ancient conflict top of mind, it suggests that in this case Mvu offers the more accurate reading. The word ujun in the vast majority of cases occurs in the monk’s meditation formula to denote the “upright” posture of the body and does not usually mean “straight on [in that direction].”\footnote{Sāmaññaphalasutta, DN 1, 71\textsuperscript{18-20}: paliṅkaṁ ābhujītvā ujun kāyam panidhāya parimukham satim upatthapetvā. “sits cross-legged, causes his body to be straight and places mindfulness in front of him.”} It also is not germane to the verse: why is the Buddha pointing to his home?\footnote{As the commentary justifies it: Pj 2, 384\textsuperscript{24-25}: bāham uccāretvā attano āgatadīsābhāgam niddisanto “…after raising his hand, pointing to the direction from which he had come.”} The word niţa, referring to “native, one’s own country,” makes more sense in the context; Bimbisara is asking the Buddha for his lineage, i.e. “Where are you from?” and the Buddha responds, “My own home….” Phonologically the words are obviously related with niţa (NVjV)
being a palindrome for *ujum* (VjVN), something which could easily be mixed up in the oral transmission. Also *nivāsito* (“made to reside”) seems to state explicitly connotations which are only implicit in *niketino*, although the former word might have been an original gloss on the latter.

31) *amhanā/ asmanā/ambunā* A2, A4 (*bh*> *v*)

In the Sn’s *Padhānasutta* (“striving” or “renunciation” *sutta*, see Chapter Six), Māra approaches the Buddha to try to dissuade him from his enlightenment goal. In verse 443 the Buddha says to him:

*yaṃ te taṃ na-ppasahati senaṃ loko sadevako,*

*taṃ te paññāya bhecchāmi, āmaṃ pattaṃ va asmanā*

“That army of yours which the world together with the devas cannot overcome, that [army] of yours I shall break with wisdom, as if [breaking] an unfired pot with a stone.” The corresponding versions in the Mvu, LV and Tib all have the unfired pot being destroyed with water (*ambunā* < *ambu*, “water,” instr. sing., Tib: *chus, idem*), and the P seems to have some confusion on this point as it has several variants, viz., *ambhanā, ampanasamanā, ampanasā, amunā*. The word *asmanā* < S *aśman*, “stone,” instr. sing. All the words are phonologically related but the derivational muddle is quite complex and some of the forms seem to have no meaning. Based

on the “majority wins” criterion we can assume that the earlier form was *ambunā which was presumably aspirated in one of the source languages > *ambhunā. Over time, the stop would tend to disappear, leaving only the aspirate > *amhunā, which development is attested in such common words as brāhmaṇa > bambhaṇa (AMg) > bambahana (Ś and Mg). The -mh- was probably then misinterpreted as a derivation from original -sm-, which it usually is, i.e. *amhunā > *asmunā > asmanā, resulting in the P word. The other, less likely possibility is that the source word ambunā was transmitted through a North west dialect where the -mbh- > -mm-. A scribe in the receiving dialect (P), not understanding the geminate, traced its derivation back to -sm- which happens (although far less commonly than -sm- > -mh-) in such common forms as the loc. singular ending -smin > -mmi (e.g. AMg.); ambunā > ammunā > *asmunā > asmanā. A derivation the other way is also possible: asmanā > amhanā (one of the P variants) > ambhanā > *ambhunā > ambunā, but less likely as deaspiration is much rarer than aspiration, and because the majority seem to have identified the source as from ambu (“water”), not aśman (“stone”). Although we can not be absolutely certain about the latter conclusion, the laws of directionality allows us to identify the sequence with some degree of confidence.

In pāda c of this same verse, variation in the main verb is also illustrative of the same kind of phonological intergrading. The Mvu and LV versions are quite clear; both have bhetsyāmi, the future of bhindati < S bhid, “to cut, pierce, destroy.” P has bhecchāmi with the typical change of

806 For example bimbisāra > bhimbhisāra in AMg per Pischel §209. Geiger §40.
807 Pischel §267 & 287.
808 ibid §312.
809 Brough, GDhp, 99.
810 Geiger, §40.2.
-ts- > -cch-, but also several other phonologically cognate forms, vejjhāmi, vecchāmi, vajjhāmi and gacchāmi. Except for the last word (whose initial g- is perplexing), these are all well known changes of bh- > v- and -cch- > -jjh- (voicing) which are often witnessed in various dialects of MI.811

32) attasambhavāṇaṇḍasambhavāṇa

In the Mahāparinibbāṇasutta, three months before he attained parinibbāṇa, the Buddha “renounced the life-principle” (āyu-sāṅkhāram ossaji. DN 2, 10622), at which an earthquake occurred; he then pronounced the following udāna (“inspired saying”):

_Tulam atulaṇa saṃbhavaḥ bhava-saṅkhāram avassaji [var. ossaji, avassajji, avassajam] muni,
Ajjhattarato samāhito abhida [var. abhinda, abhindi, abhinoda, abhīdhī] kavacam iv’ attasambhavan [var. ivayambhavan, iva ettasambhavan] ’ti.

“That which had come to be, both gross and fine,

Becoming’s compound did the sage reject.

811 For change of -bh- > -v- see GDhp 157, G vidvara < S bhidura (“breaking”) or GDhp 71 abhīvuyu corresponding to Mvu 3, 422, abhībhūya (“having conquered”). See also GDhp 241 where G has śuhaśuha (= S subhāsubha, “virtuous and unvirtuous”), and P has suve suve (“day by day”) in the corresponding verse. Apparently the G redactor, seeing suve, and understanding the change of -bh- > -v- back-formed P suve to G śuha (S śubha). Presumably he/she interpreted the locative ending -e in suve suve as an accus. plural and changed it to singular (“having examined the good and the bad”, a dvandva, presumably in the collective neuter).
With inward calm, composed, he burst asunder,

Like a shell of armour, the self that had become.”

The gāthā also occurs in five other places in the canon, and there are numerous variants (some of the principal ones shown above) indicating that it was not well understood; indeed, stylistically it is problematic, in that the image of a soldier breaking his armour at the forefront of a battle, does not seem a very apt comparison with the concept of eliminating the self.

The gāthā also occurs in Sanskritized Pkt, Tib and Ch. In the Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra we find quite a different construction in the last compound which reads *hy abhinat kośam* īvāndasāṃbhavaḥ (“... he broke the shell, as if arising from an egg” or “... he broke the shell, like a bird”). Notice that Waldschmidt has reconstructed *sāṃbhavaḥ* in the nominative (modifying *muni*), not accusative (as in P), and here we have a completely different meaning, but one more consistent with the context, as an egg-shell is a fragile substance which, unlike armour, offers no protection, and is suitably compared to the *kilesas*, which the Buddha easily destroyed. This is close to what the Tibetans have translated: *sgo nga mdzod las byung ba*

---

812 This gāthā occurs in several places within the canon: the Mahāparinibbānasutta, DN 2, 1073-6; the Cetiyasutta, SN 5, 2631-4; the Bhūmicālasutta, AN 4, 3121-4; Āyusārīkārossajanasutta, Udāna (Us) 64 29-31; the Paññatthihāravibhang of the Nettipakaraṇa (Nett), 721-2 (Burmese recension); and the Uttādhiṭṭhāniyatīyabhūmi of the Peṭakopadesa (Peṭ), 6810-13.

813 An Yang-Gyu, The Buddha’s Last Days, 97. Sarīgāma-sīse mahāyodho kavaçaṃ viya *attaṃsambhavam ... abhindi* (Sv 2, 55727-29). “Like a great soldier at the forefront of a battle breaking a coat of mail, he broke the defilement of self-becoming...”

814 Waldschmidt, Mahāparinirvāṇasūtra, vol. 2, 212, §16.15. Underlined, bold face type is from the manuscript (see vol. 1, 54); the regular typeface is reconstructed from the Ch and Tib. The compound anḍa-sambhava is a bahuvrīhi meaning “bird” (“whose birth is from an egg”).
bzhin, “like arising from the shell of an egg,” with one version adding the (unmetrical) verb brtson pa, “striving” or “strove,” perhaps translating abhinat (“he broke”). 815 There are five Ch versions, four of which preserve some version of the gāthā, but only two, the Dīrghāgama and the Mūlasarvāstivādin Vinayakṣudrakavastu, preserve the simile structure. In the former it reads 如鳥出於卵 (rú niǎo chūyú luǎn, “like a bird emerging from an egg”); the latter reads 如鳥破於穀卵 (rú niǎo pò yú gǔ luǎn, “like a bird smashing its shell”). 816 The Nirvānasūtra (般泥洹經) preserves the gāthā but the last two pādas do not correspond with the Indic versions; 817 and the Ch Mahāparinirvānasūtra (大般涅槃經) is also a very loose translation or has a different underlying text. 818 It is easy to see how kośa changed to kavaca (or more likely kavasa, “armour” which is a synonym). S-ava- commonly changes to -o- in MI, so, a scribe seeing/hearing the form kośa or kosa, (and not thinking it was apt), restored it to what he thought was the original form, i.e. kavasa or kavaca, meaning

_______________________________

815 Ibid, page 212, §16.15. This gāthā is in vetāliya metre. Waldschmidt’s reconstruction (without the first syllable hy) scans: reconstruction abhinat kośam ivāṇḍasambhavah: s-s-l-s-s-l-s-s-x (16 mattas); per Warder, Pāli metre, §157, it is a pavattaka type vetāliya. The P version does not scan unless one separates the iva and atta- and uses the variant abhida for the verb: abhida kavacamiva-attasambhavam, s-s-s-s-s-s-l-s-l-s-s-x (16 mattas). s= short; l = long. Warder records no instance of a posterior pāda with such an opening as in the P. Thanks to Prof. Dr. Michael Hahn for this last suggestion.

816 T01n0001_p0015c25 from the 遊行經 (Mahāparinibbānasutta). Vinayakṣudrakavastu at T24n1451_p0388a17. Waldschmidt gives a German translation of the gāthā on page 213 §16.15.

817 T01n0006_p0180c10-11: Although the first two pādas correspond to the MI (無量眾德行有為吾今捨, Wúliàng zhòng dé-xíng, yǒu wéi wú jīn shě, “I have now given up the limitless forces leading to existence, even virtuous conduct.”), the last two do not: 近遠應度者已度應度者 jìn yuǎn yīng dù zhě, yǐ dù yīng dù zhě, “For those people near and far who should be rescued, I have already rescued all of them.”

818 T01n0007_p0191c14-15: 一切諸眾生, 皆隨有生死, 我今亦生死, 而不隨於有, 一切造作行, 我今欲棄捨 (Yīqiè yǒu wéi fà, jiē xī guī wú chēng, wǒ jīn yì shēng sǐ, ér bù suí yǔ yǒu, yīqiè zàozuò xíng, wǒ jīn yù qìshě, “All living creatures, after coming into existence, die; now I am also entangled in birth and death, but I will not have another existence - I have abandoned all deeds and actions.”
“armour,” in other words, it is a hyperform. The relationship between atta and āṇḍa is less easy to explain; although there appears to be a phonological similarity between the two, neither one can easily be derived from the other, as the -ṇḍ- conjunct is usually preserved in MI (and if not usually changes to -ṇ- as ḍaṇḍa > ḍaṇa in GDhp 18, 80), and atta is usually transmitted as atta, atva (GDhp), āṭpa (Gir RE 12, H) or appa (AMg) none of which forms are phonetically close to āṇḍa. Assuming āṇḍa and kosa are the earlier forms (as they are most convincing semantically) one would have to assume a loss of retroflex -ṇ- and a change from retroflex -ḍ- > -t- (i.e. āṇḍa > *aḍha > *ata) to account for the connection. The latter change is well-known, but the former is not that common, although the Ch translation of the Dīrghāgama shows the loss of a nasal in a nasal + stop conjunction situatation, and it also occassionnally occurs in G.

The sense of this gāthā is clear, but the actual words less so. Since the muni has already rejected the “intention to become” (bhavasaṅkhkharamavassaj) in pāda b, there seems no need to “destroy the arising of a self” in pāda d; more likely he breaks through a shell, like a bird arising from an egg, as the MPS has it; and both the Tib and Ch translators confirm this interpretation.

---

819 von Hinüber, Das ältere Mittelindisch, §139.
820 See footnote 473.
821 The interchange of -ḍ- and -t- is common (Pischel §218); however, the nasal element in a conjunct usually remains per Pischel §272 and GDhp §46.
822 Seishi Karashima, "Jōangongyō“ no gengo no kenkyū: onshago bunseki o chūshin to shite, Study on the Underlying Prākrit of the Chinese Dīrghāgamasūtra. (Tokyo: Hirakawa Shuppansha,1992), 35. e.g. 富羅大攎 (fù luó dà lú PB: puw̃-la- da’daɪ̯-luó 01n0001_p0080b18) transliterates S purandaraḥ. See GDhp §48 for loss of a nasal before a voiced stop, e.g. saṃḍāṇa > G sadaṇa. Since Middle Chinese allowed syllables ending in -n (Per Pulleyblank, Lexicon, 15-16), it was possible to preserve the nasal before the stop, if such were in the scribe’s exemplar.
I have already discussed (above, page 79) how parallel verses in the P MPN and BHS MPS have different words sahavya ("companionship") and svabhāva ("self-nature"), due to their different interpretation of an underlying transmitted form *sahāva, *sahā or *sahāya which must have been present to account for the two derived forms. This hypothesis is further confirmed by the Tib translation, skal ba which typically translates S sabhaga, “Having a share, common, universal.”\textsuperscript{823} In fact the standard S form for “companions,” or “companionship” is sahāya; the P redactor simply took this as equivalent to P sahavya with the same meaning. In the BHS and Tib tradition the -y- was apparently taken as an intervocalic glide, i.e. in the Mvu it was changed to a -v- s- > sv-, -h- > bh- resulting in sva-bhāva, in the Tib version to sa-bhāga.\textsuperscript{824} Since all three witnesses took the final consonant in three different ways (-vy-, -v-, and -g-) it is probable that the transmitted form lacked the consonant altogether (*sahāa), prompting each redactor to translate as he/she felt appropriate.

\textsuperscript{823} Negi, Dictionary, 172, s.v. skal ba: lha dag dang yang skal ba mnyam par dga’. “He enjoys having a share equal to gods.”

\textsuperscript{824} This of course still does not explain the rather strange derivation of P sahavya < S sāhāyya/sahāya, “companion;” the conjunct consonant deriving from a geminate (S -vv- > P -vy-) is indeed strange. For one possible explanation see K. R. Norman, “Pāli Lexicographical Studies 5 Journal of the Pali Text Society, 12 (1988), 61. Also available in Collected Papers 3 (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1992), 268.
Pāda c of Dhp 156 has two possible forms atikhīṇā (Thai, Burmese, “shot, discharged” < S *ati + ākṣi or “scattered” < S *ati + *āstr<), and atikhīttā (Śrī Laṅkān, “thrown beyond” < ati + ākṣip).

acaritvā brahmacariyam aladdhā yobbane dhanam
senti cāpātikhīṇa va purāṇāni anutthunam

"Those who have not lived the holy life, who have not acquired wealth in youth, lie like [arrows] scattered from a bow, sighing after things of the past."\(^{826}\)

In addition there are two other forms in corresponding MI verses. PDhp 230-c has adhikinno (“scattered”? < S adhi + ākṣi = adhikinna?) and UV 17.4-c atikīrṇā (“scattered” < S *ati + ākṣi). The commentary glosses the word as cāpāto atikhīṇā cāpā vinimuttā “discharged from a bow;”\(^{827}\) however there is nothing in the gāthā which makes this a very convincing explanation: “shot by a bow” (i.e. wounded taṇhayā, by craving) would be a more cogent explanation and is of course supported by the compound (cāpātikhīttā). The commentary goes on to say: “As arrows discharged from a bow fall down after they have gone (a distance) according to the force employed, and when they are not picked up, they are there only food for ants; thus having gone beyond the three ages of life, they will approach death, unable to raise themselves up,


\(^{826}\) Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 23.

\(^{827}\) Dhp-a 3, 132\(^{24-25}\): Cāpātikhīṇā vā ti cāpāto atikhīṇā cāpā vinimuttā ti attho
‘they lie down as if they have been shot from a bow’ it is said.”

There is apparently no Ch version of this gāthā; however, the Tib version is very interesting, for here the metaphor of the bow is omitted from the main verse, but present in the commentary. In the gāthā the cāpātikhīṭṭa type compound is replaced with lus bskums nas (the verb bskums pa usu. translates S saṃ + ṭkuc, “to shrink, shrivel up,”> “having shrunk the body”) which in the commentary is glossed as “by the term ‘root diseases’ (rtsa ba bad skad) it is referring to a body which has shrivelled up like a bent bow (gzhu drangs pa bzhin dū).”

The verb drangs pa usually translates S ā + kṛṣ (“to bend,” as in a bow), and the Tib commentary makes it clear that the subject of the poem - the person who does not practice brahmaçaṛiya - is asleep with ignorance, his limbs slack and bent, drawn up so that his kneecaps are touching his chest, while he/she regrets the “good old days” of past pleasures.

So here we have yet another tradition where the compound being translated is apparently *cāpa- or *dhāṅv-ākṛṣṭa (“bent like a bow”) or perhaps *cāpātiṃkṛṣṭa, whose MI form would be *-kaṭṭha. There are then three semantic possibilities for this cryptic compound: 1) shot from a bow, 2) shot by a bow, and 3) bent (shrivelled up) like a bow. Although the four past participles appear to be phonetically...
related (ati-khitta, ati-khīṇa, adhi-kinna, ā-kattha), there does not appear to be one underlying form that might generate all four, suggesting that the derivational history of these compounds are too complex to unravel. Semantically, “shot by a bow” of craving seems to make the most sense in the context, as the person who has not lead a virtuous life, nor has accumulated wealth in his youth (presumably to sustain him/her through old age) is now lying around lamenting his/her lost, past pleasures. The Tib commentary is very similar. Notice also that within the same gāthā there are three versions of the final verb anutthunanā in P & PDhp (“lamenting” < BHS anu + āśtan); UV anucintitāh (“recollected” < S anu + ācint); and GDhp 139b anūsvaru (“remembering” < S anu + śmat); Tib has rjes dran which usually translates anusmarati. Once again there is some sonic similarity, but no obvious source form uniting all three.

35) vajja/vadya/vāma A3, A8

In Pkt vajja has nine different meanings; in AMg, six. These derive from the S root vṛj, “to remove, avoid, shun, relinquish, abandon, give up, renounce,” (in AMg vajja is both a caus. verb, and an adjective from the gerundive varjya, “to be shunned or avoided”); the root vād (vajja = caus. ger. vādyā, “instrumental music and vajja = ger. avadya, “not to be praised,

832 Dhp-a 3, 133: amhehi khāditaṃ iti pītani khāditatānaccagītavādādānī anutthunanā socantā anusocantā senti ti. “Saying ‘Thus we ate, thus we drank’ they lie lamenting, crying, moaning over former things done, eating, drinking, dancing, singing, and music.”

833 “Despairing over all those things which one is separated from, the continuous enjoyment of beautiful form, and former play and excitement, etc.,” sngon rtse ba dang rgod pa la sogs pa dang gzugs bzangs ba la sogs pa rgyun du myong ba dang bral bas de dag thams ced la re ba med pa’o in Balk, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivaraṇa, 538-19-21.
blamable, vice, shame disgrace”); the root \(^{323}\)vṛ, “to choose,” (vaijja = ger. varya, “to be chosen, excellent, eminent, chief”); the root \(^{323}\)v\(^{299}\)aj, (“to be hard or strong,” vajja = vajra, “thunderbolt”); and the root \(^{323}\)v\(^{263}\)raj, “to go, walk, proceed” (vajja = vraja, “way, road”). The P word vaijja is derived from vajjati (< S \(^{323}\)vṛj, varjya), meaning “that which should be avoided, a fault, sin,” and appears in the common trope aṇumattesu vajjesu bhayadassāvin “seeing a source of fear even in the slightest sins.” Since there are only two homonyms recorded in P (vajja = vadya, “to be said” and vajja = 2\(^{834}\)nd pers. opt. of vadati, S vadeḥ “you might say”), we may be fairly certain of the word’s intended meaning in Dhp 252-a and 253-a where the Buddha talks about people who see and complain about others’ faults:

paravaijjiṇuṇapassissa niccaṃ ujjhānasāññino

āsavā tassa vāḍhanti ārā so āsavakkhayā.

“Of one who sees the faults of others, who is constantly censorious, the āsavas increase. He is far from the destruction of the āsavas.”

Both the G and PDhp recensions use the same word (vaja and vaijja), but the UV chooses vadya (< avadya, “blamable” as above), with a similar meaning, but from a different root. As we have seen the word vaijja meant both “to be shunned and avoided” (< S vṛj) and “blameable” (< S vād), so the UV redactor, when Sanskritizing, had to make a choice between the two; he apparently made the “wrong” choice, only in so far as the original MI word, vaijja, preserved
both senses of the word - which, though close are subtly different - while the S form only one. In pāda b, P ujjhāna, PDhp ojjhāya (= AMg. avajjhāna, BHS avadhyāna, “resentment, spite, thinking ill of”) has phonetic and semantic resemblances to vajja, but derives from a different root (<S ava + ṣdhyai, “to think ill of”). Notice that pādas c and d of the UV are quite different than the corresponding pādas of the other three witnesses with vāmā dharmāḥ (“crooked dhammas”) in the UV replacing various forms of āsavā tassa (“his āsava”) in the three other recensions, and sa hy ārād dharmadarśanāt (“he is far away from seeing the dharma”) in the UV vs. P ārā so āsavakkhayā (“he is far from the destruction of the āsavas’). The unanimity of the three MI versions and the clumsiness of the UV suggests that the Sanskritized Pkt of the UV is late; the Tibetans try to make sense of it by translating de yis ring du chos mi mthong (“He does not see the dharma for a long time”) and Prajñāvarman glosses it as in the S, “in this way, he increases his evil behaviour, because of being far away from seeing the truth.”

The word vāma is also a problem; the Tibetans translate literally gyon phyogs (“left side”) and it is glossed as smad pa (“blame,” usu. translating S nīndā); however in the Vedic writings and in P vāma has primarily a positive meaning (“pleasant, agreeable”) and it does not perjorate until the medieval period, another indicator that we are dealing with a later interpolation.

---

836 Balk, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavivaraṇa, 7362-4. des de ltar ngan par spyod pa ’phel bar byed na ri bden pa mthong ba thag ring ba’i phyir ro.

837 This is the only reference to a vāmadhamma in the entire canon, in MI or BHS. The vamācāra (“the left handed practice” of the Tantras) is of course much later. The earliest reference I can find to vāma in a semi-pejorative sense is in Śakuntalā 4, 18 (“acting in the opposite way or differently”) and the word means “adverse, contrary, unfavourable” in the Kathāsaritsāgara (MW). In the P canon the word commonly occurs in the names of eight respected brahman sages vāmako vāmadevo vessāmitto yamataggi āngīrasso bhāradvājo vāsetṭho kassapo and in the compound vāmūru or vāmurū (DN 2, 2669, “of beautiful thighs”). There is one reference to vāmam karoti in Jātaka 457 (4, 1015) where Devadatta in his former existence as Adhamma makes a “leftwards circuit” around Jambudvīpa which is contrasted
Dhp 271-b contains the strange form *bā(a)husaccena* which should normally mean “with much truth” (*sacca* < S *satya*); however in this case it appears to mean “with much learning” (< S *bahuśrutyena*), per the PED from S *śrautya*.

*na sīlabbatamattena bāhusaccena vā puna*

*atha vā samādhilābhenā vivicasayanena vā*

"Not merely by virtuous conduct and vows nor, again, by much learning, nor by the attainment of meditation, not by sleeping in seclusion,..."\(^{838}\)

Childers says: “There can be no doubt that this word (*bāhusaccena*) represents *bahuṃsuta* + *ya*. The -a- [instead of -u-] is perhaps due to the analogy of *muṭṭhasaccena* (“forgetfulness”) where, however, *sacca* represents *smṛtya* and not *śrutyā*.\(^{839}\) The commentarial tradition says the

with Dhamma’s (the Bodhisatta’s) *padakkhiṇaṃ karoti* (“rightwards circuit”), where the word is developing a negative connotation. All the references in the Vedic works seem to be in a positive sense (“fair, pleasing”), e.g. RV 8.83.4, 10.76.8, 4.30.24, etc. In the *Brāhmaṇas* the word takes on the meaning “left” and later, in the classical period begins to develop negative connotations, perhaps associated with “left.” See Mayrhofer, KEWA, vol. 3, 189, who treats the words as as two separate, but related, entries (*vāmaḥ* = "left" with a younger meaning of "crooked," etc. and *vāmaḥ* = “dear, fair noble”). In Manfred Mayrhofer, *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen* (Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag, 1992), 543 (EWA), he suggests that the use of *vāma* (= "left") in the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (14,6,11,3,) and *Bṛhadāranyaka Upaniṣad* (4,2,3) is a euphemism for the Vedic *vāma* (“pleasant”).


\(^{839}\) Childers, *Dictionary*, 78.
same thing: bāhusacca is the nominal form of bahussuta: e.g. ettha bāhusaccānti

bahussutabhāvo (here bāhusaccamaṁ means having the nature of being learned”);\(^{840}\) in reference to this specific verse Buddhaghosa says: bāhusaccena vā ti tinnaṁ piṭakānaṁ

uggahitamattena vā. “...or merely learning the three baskets,”\(^ {841}\) and the other five extant witnesses all derive from the verb \(\overset{\text{v}}{\overset{\text{s}}{\overset{\text{r}}{\text{u}}}}\): PDhp 271-b, bāhu-śoccena (<S śrauta); GDhp 65-b bahośokena (= S bahuśruta, with -k- a substitute intervocalic glide, used instead of -y- glide).\(^ {842}\) UV 32.31-b and Mvu vol. 3, 422\(^8\) restore the S form, bahuśrutya (Mvu var. bahuśruta), and Tib 32.36-c translates thos pa mang po (“much hearing”). The Ch version is very general and does not mention learning.\(^ {843}\) Nevertheless the P homonym (sacca as “truth” and sacca as “learning”) is a problem which Norman notes “is not easy to explain.”\(^ {844}\) While the meaning seems to be clear - the Buddha is saying that only the destruction of the āsavas leads to liberation, not morality, bāhusacca, meditation or living a secluded life - how the word means what it means is not clear at all. One also wonders whether "much learning" is appropriate in this context where all the other words relate to practice and "learning" seems to be the "odd man out" (more on this below).

The S form śruta ("heard, sacred knowledge") is the past participle of \(\overset{\text{v}}{\overset{\text{s}}{\overset{\text{r}}{\text{u}}}}\), while śrutya is a nominalized gerundive form ("to be heard, glorious, famous"), or a secondary suffix (taddhita) noun formed from śruta + ya, as Childers suggested; nevertheless, -srutyā is unattested in S

---

\(^{840}\) Pj 1, 134\(^{13-14}\) or AN 2, 40\(^9\).

\(^{841}\) Dhp-a 3, 399:

\(^{842}\) Brough, GDhp, §38. The more common G form is bahoṣuda (GDhp 229, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249)

\(^{843}\) T04n0210_p0569a13-15

\(^{844}\) Norman, Group of Discourses, 137.
with this meaning (“learning”). Since in GDhp geminates are not usually noted, bahoṣoka or bahuṣuda (GDhp 249-a = Th 1030-a bahussutaṁ; also as bahoṣuda in GDhp 244-48) could well stand for bahoṣotta, with a geminate -tt- derived from -ty-, as in the change from OI > MI-ty- changes both to -tt- and > -cc. However, since in most other instances in GDhp a -ty- conjunct is palatalized (anitya > anica; prayaya > prace’a; kṛtya > kica; satya > saca), we may conclude that in this case the G exemplar lacked the glide. Since the form soccā/soccam (“having heard, hearing,” < S śrutvā, with change of -tvā > -ccā, instead of the usual change of -tvā > -ttā) is attested in AMg and PDhp has an almost identical form (śocca), this may have been the source exemplar in at least one case; the UV/Mvu back-translated this form (or the zero-grade form *succa from the root ʿśru before it is strengthened by ablaut) to śrutya, although some uncertainty is indicated by the variant Mvu reading śruta; a more logical back translation would have been bahuśrutvā (“having heard much”), based on the AMg example. The only derivation that can accommodate P - sacca is from S smṛta (“remembered, recollected, handed down, taught”) which is attested in the nominal form (smṛta + -ya = sata + -ya = satya = sacca) in the compound muṭṭhasacca with the meaning of “forgetfulness” (lit.: “mindfulness forgotten”). In the derivation of *smṛtya > *sacca or *succa there might well be a confusion of vowels because the influence of the labial -m-. Normally vocalic -r- > -a-, except

845 e.g. AMg patteya < S pratyeka, or accanta < S atyanta. See Pischel §280 and 281. In the Aśokan edicts -ty- in Sh and Gir usually changes to -c(c). In the eastern dialects an epenthetic vowel is added (e.g. Dh apatiye = Sh apace < S apatya, “child”), at RE 5 E.

846 See Pischel §587. In the Jaina Āyāraṅgasutta, 2, 16, 1 the phrase soccam idam appears, translated by Jacobi as “hearing.” For text, see Muni Jambuvijaya, Āyāraṅga-suttam (Bombay: Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, 1977), 294. For translation Hermann Jacobi, Jaina Sutras (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1884), 211, (“Hearing this supreme truth… one should meditate on it”).
under the influence of a labial consonant. This might account for the PDhp understanding of the latter form as derived from < śru and its “restoration” to the guṇa grade śocca, as well as the UV/Mvu interpretation. The G scribe evidently had a different exemplar in front of him, without the palatal glide, probably *s(ś)uta or *s(ś)ruta which he rendered as -soka or -ṣuda. A derivation from S < śmr also better suits the context, where the meaning “much learning” does not seem to be appropriate. In these two gāthās the Buddha is making the point that practice without the destruction of the āsavas will not lead to liberation. All four compounds that he uses are about practice, not abstract study - sīlabatta is virtuous behaviour, samādhi, meditation, vivittasayana, living alone and secluded; bāhusacca, as “much learning” does not go with this group, but bāhusacca as “much mindfulness,” a core Buddhist practice, certainly does. Nowhere in the P canon does the Buddha suggest that learning alone (without practice) can lead to liberation and the emphatic vā pana (“not even…”) makes no sense in the context; therefore its appearance here, as something to be gainsaid, is not appropriate. I would therefore translate this gāthā as, “Not with virtuous behaviour, not even with much mindfulness, nor with the acquisition of concentration, nor living alone and secluded, will I experience the joy of emancipation…” What exactly happened in the transmission is impossible to figure out, but it seems that -sacca was not understood in this meaning of “mindfulness” by the other traditions and it clearly did not mean “truth” - so was changed to a nominal form based on suṇāti, as bahussuta (“very learned”) was a common MI compound.

847 Pischel §48-51.
I briefly discussed this passage above (page 107) as an example of phonological confusion.

The P version in the Sn reads,

\[
\text{Uccāvacā hi paṭipadā samāṇena pakāsitā:}
\]
\[
\text{na pāram digunām yanti, na idaṃ ekagunām mutaṃ. 714}
\]

“For high and low are the paths proclaimed by the ascetic. They do not go to the far shore twice; this is not experienced once.”\(^{848}\) Norman calls it a “difficult verse,” and his explication is complex, as is the commentary which says:

“This is the structure of the verse \text{uccāvāca...}’ (a monk), even though he is dutiful in going about for alms, if he does not meet with pleasure during that time, it might obstruct his progress. For the essence of religious practice is the teaching. And this is the meaning of \text{uccavāca ... pe ... mutaṃ}: this mode of progress on the path, because of its division into the highest and the low, has been declared by the recluse as high and low (\text{uccāvacā buddhasamaṇena pakāsitā}). For pleasant practice and quick intuition is high; painful practice and sluggish intuition is low. The second two are high by one consideration, low by another (consideration); or just the first is high and the other three are low. With this exertion, with this high or low mode of progress, they do not go to the far shore twice (\text{na pāram digunām yanti}). Or there is another reading ‘twice’ (\text{dugunāṃ}) which has the meaning. ‘They do not go to \text{nibbāna} twice by a single path.’

\(^{848}\) Norman, \textit{Group of Discourses}, 88.
Why is that? The afflictions which were abandoned by means of this path, they do not have to abandon again; by this, he is explaining the absence of phenomena which have been abandoned.

‘This is not experienced once’ (nayidaṃ ekaguṇaṃ mutaṃ). There is no arahant who attains the far shore only once. Why? Because one cannot abandon all the afflictions by means of the one path; therefore he explains the non-existence of the state of an arahant by means of just the one path.”

Norman explains that nibbāna is experienced four times by the practitioner (as sotāpanna, sakidāgāmin, anāgāmin and arahaṭṭ) and each experience is unique, so that “he does not go to the far shore twice;” but this explanation seems to be contradicted by Jones’ interpretation (after Horner) of the corresponding Mvu passage, that the Beyond (pāra) is not once or twice-repeated because each experience of enlightenment is completely identical with the first.

---


The Mvu version reads:

\[ na \ pāraṃ \ dviguṇāyati \ nāpi \ caivaṃ \ guṇāyati / \]
\[ uccāvacā \ pratipadā \ śrāmanyena \ prakāśītā (3.389^2-3) \]

which Jones translates as “The Beyond is not a future twice-repeated, nor is it merely a future once-repeated. Various are the courses of conduct revealed by the state of a recluse.”\(^{851}\) Both the P and Mvu verses and the commentary are confusing and the phonological ambiguity of the P \( na \ pāra \) \( ṭ\) and Mvu \( na \ pāra \) \( ṭ\) is symptomatic of the semantic problem: In P, \( pāra\) is in the accusative (“they do not got to the far shore”); in the Mvu, it is in the nominative, (“The other shore does not appear as a twofold quality…”). In one case \( dviguṇa\) is an adjective (“double” or “of two kinds”) or adverb (“twice”); in the other \( dviguṇāyati\) is a denominative verb (“to become double, to appear of two kinds”). Although the phonology is similar, the transmission has been jumbled, and the two or three interpretations show that the commentarial tradition was itself unsure of the meaning.\(^{852}\) Nevertheless both verses seem to make sense with a much simpler explanation than that suggested by the commentary, if one takes into account the context. Here the Buddha is describing the supreme state of sagehood, characterizing it as beyond opposites, “not opposed and not attached to living creatures,” “(a person who) has given up what is to be done and not to be done,” “(a sage) who neither has an

---

851 Ibid, 388.
852 This uncertainty is also reflected in the inconsistent \( anuṣṭubh\) metre of the \( gāthās\). The P metre is discussed by Norman, \( Group \ of \ Discourses\), 298; the Mvu has an incorrect pattern in syllables 5-7 of the first \( pāda\) (which should be s-l-I, but has s-l-s).
inactive mind, nor thinks too much,” etc.\(^{853}\) This I think is also the point the Buddha is making in v. 714. Although the ascetic might think in opposites, the far shore (nibbāna) is not of two qualities, neither “high” or “low,” easy or difficult (taking diguṇam as an adjective meaning “of two kinds” modifying pāram), and it is also not correct to think of it as of one (i.e. any) quality it goes beyond all dualities and qualities. I would therefore translate Mvu as, “The other shore does not appear as a quality of two, nor does it appear as a quality at all in any way, (though) the path is proclaimed as high and low by those practicing religious austerity.” The P version, though different, can also be translated in a similar vein: “High and low are the paths proclaimed by the recluse, (but) they do not go to a far shore of two kinds, nor is that (far shore) thought of as having (even) one quality.”

Another example of phonological confusion may be found in Sn v. 40-a (Khaggavisāna or Rhinoceros sutta) where the P has sahāyamajjhe (“in the middle of friends”), and the corresponding verse in the G version of the sutta reads mahayanasa (“of, or from the multitude”).\(^{854}\) Brough argues that the -s- character is either a phonetic [z] or -syä- and he favours the latter explanation (GDhp §13), but this particular instance seems to argue for a sound similar to a voiced, palatal fricative (j), mirroring the -jjh- sound. It is easy to see how sahāyamajjhe ≾ mahayanasa, with a confusion over the initial consonant and final vowel, and the other sounds identical or very close to each other.

\(^{853}\) Norman, *Group of Discourses*, v. 704, 715, 717.

\(^{854}\) Salomon, *Gāndhāri Rhinoceros Sūtra*, 127.
In this same *Nālaka*sutta, in verse 717-c the word *nirāmagandho* occurs as an epithet of the sage, which Norman translates “without taints.”

\[alinacitto ca siyā, na căpi bahu cintaye, \]

\[nirāmagandho asito brahmacariyaparāyano. \]

"He should neither have an inactive mind, nor think too much. He should be without taints, not dependent, having holy living as his aim."\(^{855}\)

The PED defines *nirāmagandho* as “healthy, undepraved, without sin, virtuous,” and DP as “free from corruption, free from taint.” This translation however only captures the secondary meaning of the word; its primary meaning is *nir + āma* (“raw, uncooked” < S *idem*) + *gandha* (smell, < S *idem*), viz., “smell of raw flesh, verminous odour, a smell attributed in particular to rotting corpses (PED).” BHSD notes that, although the Tibetans define it as “free from foul odours” in the *Mahāvyutpatti*, it is otherwise recorded only in the figurative sense of “free from vice, saintly, virtuous,” applied to holy men; however, often both meanings of the word seem to be present as even a cursory examination of the literature shows. In the *Mahāgovindasutta*, for example, the story of the steward who renounces wealth and power to pursue the homeless life, there is an interplay between *āmagandha* (translated as “stench,” “reeking odours” DN 2, 242\(^{15}\)) and *nirāmagandha* (DN 2, 241\(^{14}\)) “aloof from stench,” “free from reeking odours”) which at least

in part captures some of the underlying significance of the compound. The commentary glosses nirāmagandha as vissa-gandha-virahito (“free from the smell of raw meat”). The locus classicus for the compound is the Sn’s Āmagandhasutta which plays on both the natural implication of the word (in the refrain 242-d to 248-d maṃsabhojanam, “the eating of flesh”) and its metaphorical meaning (pāpasītā, “immoral behaviour”), in aphorisms anticipating Jesus’ teaching of Matthew 15:11, “What goes into a man’s mouth does not make him unclean, but what comes out of his mouth, that is what makes him unclean.” In a repeated refrain (esāmagandho na hi maṃsabhojanam, “This is tainted fare, not the eating of flesh”) the Buddha contrasts harmful behaviour, craving, greed, etc., as true moral turpitude, with eating “the well dressed flesh of birds” (sakuntamaṃsehi susaṅkhatehi) which is not. The opposition is elegantly highlighted in the opening story of Tissa and Buddha Kassapa who lived in Varāṇasi in the distant past. Tissa leaves home and becomes a recluse, feeding only on roots and seeds; he does not eat macchamaṃsa (“fish and meat”). When he hears about the coming of Buddha Kassapa he learns that the Buddha eats fish and meat, and disappointed, goes to him to question him directly about it. Tissa asks Kassapa if he eats āmagandha and Kassapa answers in the negative, but says that he will talk about it further the following day, when he is to dine on food provided by King Kikī of Kāsi. Tissa sees Kassapa eating meat at

856 So translasted by Walshe, Long Discourses, 308-309 and Jones in the Mvu version of the story (vol 3., 208-209).
857 Sv 2, 665.  
858 Āmagandha, the ascetic who is displaced by Buddha in the story leading up to the Āmagandhasutta defines āmagandha as āmagandho nāma macchamaṃsaṃ, (“fish and flesh”). The Buddha answers na, brāhmaṇa, macchamaṃsaṃ āmagandho, apica kho āmagandho nāma sabbe kilesā pāpakā akusalā dhammā. “Brahman, āmagandho is not fish and flesh, āmagandho is all afflictions, evil deeds and unwholesome dharmas.” Pj 2, 280.  
859 Sn, verse 241-d; all quotes are from Norman, Group of Discourses, 29.
this meal and accuses him of telling an untruth, which is where the *sutta* beings, the first three verses being Tissa’s criticism of Kassapa, while the latter then speaks the next eight verses, explicating what *āmagandha* really is, and contrasting the eating of flesh with true unvirtuous behaviour, like harming others, speaking falsely or unrestrainedly, being angry, arrogant or envious, etc., Tissa is convinced and becomes Kassapa’s disciple. So while the word *nirāmagandha* translated as “virtuous” is accurate enough on one level, it does not capture the subtle paradox between raw flesh as permitted food and raw flesh as prohibited affictions which this *sutta* illustrates, no doubt alluding to an ancient (and still modern) debate on vegetarianism. In this respect it dovetails nicely with the Buddha’s injunction in the *Jīvakasutta* that monks were allowed to accept meat when given by a householder, so as not to jeopardize the householder’s accumulation of merit through alms-giving. It is not unreasonable to assume therefore, that when a native MI speaker heard the word *nirāmagandha* as an epithet of a sage (as in the *Nālaksutta*), he/she did not just understand “virtuous,” but at some level was aware of the paradox of someone who was “without the smell of raw meat” (*nir-āma-gandha*) on a moral level, while quite possibly, as with the Buddha’s followers, eating fish and meat given to him/her on a practical everyday basis.

---

860 MN 55. "Jivaka, I say that there are three instances in which meat should not be eaten: when it is seen, heard, or suspected [that the living being has been slaughtered for oneself]." *Thī kho ahaṃ Jīvaka thānehi maṃsaṃ aparibhogan ti vadāmi: diṭṭham sutam parisaṅkitaṃ...* MN 1, 369. Translation by Nāṇamoli and Bodhi, *Middle Length Discourses*, 474.
This pair of words (*accasāri/paccasāri*) from *pāda* a of Sn’s *Uragasutta* (vs. 8-13) has generated a lot of discussion as to their exact meaning. A typical *gāthā* (verse 8) reads:

\[
Yo nāccasārī na paccasārī
\]

\[
sabbam accagamā imam papañcaṁ,
\]

\[
so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṁ
\]

\[
urago jiññam iva tacam purānaṁ
\]

"That bhikkhu who has not transgressed nor even caused [another] to transgress, [and] has gone beyond all this diversified world, leaves this shore and the far shore as a snake leaves its old worn-out skin."

We are fortunate enough to have some eight witnesses of verse 9 for this transmission which I summarize below together with suggested translations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Witness</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Translation</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) <em>Sutta Nipāta</em>, v. 9</td>
<td><em>Yo nāccasārī na paccasārī</em></td>
<td>“who has not transgressed nor even caused”</td>
<td>A more conventional translation is “He who neither goes too far”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[another] to transgress.&quot;⁸⁶¹</td>
<td>nor lags behind…” following the commentary.⁸⁶²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2)</td>
<td>Pj 2, 2¹¹⁴-¹⁵</td>
<td>*ettha yo nāccasārī ti yō nātidhāvi, na paccasārī ti na ohiyyi.</td>
<td>“who has not passed over the limits, nor stayed behind.” Buddhaghosa’s gloss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3)</td>
<td>GDhp 87-a</td>
<td>yo necasari na precasari</td>
<td>“who has neither transcended (the world) nor regarded it.”⁸⁶³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4)</td>
<td>GDhpL 8-a</td>
<td>(*yo ṇa a-) ///[ca]hari ṇa pracahari</td>
<td>“who has (*neither) gone beyond [this world] nor moved toward [it].”⁸⁶⁴</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5)</td>
<td>PDhp 412-a</td>
<td>yo nāccassari na precassārī</td>
<td>“who has neither gone beyond [the world] or returned to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁸⁶¹ Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 2 with a footnote by the author indicating that he is reading yo nāccasārī na p’accasārī.


⁸⁶³ Brough, GDhp, 203.

⁸⁶⁴ Lenz, *Gāndhārī Dharmapada*, 68. asterisk(*) = lost or illegible akṣara conjecturally restored. Brackets([]) = unclear or partially preserved akṣara whose reading is uncertain. Forward slashes (///) represent the beginning or end of an incomplete line.
All the above except for #4 were discussed by Brough who identified the pair as expressing an antithesis, which he called an early example of the “pseudo-profundity so richly developed in later Mahāyāna literature;” he gives an array of different interpretations, including one that fits the context very well, “who has neither transcended (the world) nor regarded it” (GDhp 201-04).

Norman chose to read P paccasārī as p’accasārī, with the latter form representing the causative form of the verb with the -ā- (< S stem atisāraya), “transgress or cause to

---

865 H. Nakatani, *Udānavarga de Subaši*, vol. 1, 100.
866 Negi, *Dictionary*, 184, 878.
transgress”); however the pr-forms point to a source with prati- and pratisarati as a verb form is well attested in BHS with the meaning, “attend to, return to, look at, pay attention or heed to” (which seems to be influenced by prati + √smṛ, “remember, recollect, think back upon,” which would have been identical Pkt forms, i.e. pratisarati). The first verb accasaśī can only derive from S ati + √śr (“go too far, transgress, go beyond or exceed, overstep, exert oneself, extend”) with an a-augment in the aorist form and the -ty- > -cc- which is standard in MI. The second derives from prati + √śr (“to go against, attack, stay back, lag behind”) or prati + √smṛ (“remember, recollect, think back upon”). So the simple meaning of the two verbs is “who neither goes beyond or attends to [this world], or “who neither ignores the world or pays attention to it.” This fits in well with the refrain in pāda c so bhikkhu jahāti orāpāram (“the monk leaves this shore and the far shore...”), echoing many other parts of the Sn and Dhp where the virtuous person transcends dualistic thinking and achieves equanimity. As the commentator says in the previous verse 8, glossing sabbaṃ accagamā imam papañcaṃ (“gone beyond all this diversified world”): “Because of that middle way, the perfection of the path to emancipation,

867 One of the reasons Norman chose the reading yo nāccasāri na p’accasāri (with the alternation of -ā- and -ā-) is to give the correct metrical length (16 mattās) for this oppacchandasaka verse, which was also supported by the PDhp reading (yo naccasarī na preccasāri); however the fact that GDhp, GDhpL and PDhp all have the pr-conjunct argues for treating the second verb as < prati + √śr, not as a causative of the first verb, and one of the Burmese editions has an alternate reading with a short -i- in naccasāri and paccasāri which would give the correct metre or 16 mattas.

868 For example, Dhp 385: yassa pāraṃ apāraṃ vā pārāpāra na vijjati, viḷaddaraṃ visamyuttaṃ, tam ahaṃ brūmi brāhmaṇaṃ.”For whom there is neither the far shore nor the near shore nor both, free from distress and without connections, him I call a brahman.” Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 56.
he overcame the threefold illusion called craving, views, and pride, that source of thought, perception and feeling; he went beyond it, ‘he transcended’ (*samatikkanto ti*) is the meaning.”

Except for minor phonological changes (-a- > -ā-; palatalization of -a- > -e- in PDhp and Gdhp; -s- > -h- in GDhpL), all but one of the MI versions are virtually identical; Buddhaghosa understood the two verbs as derived from *ati* + ēṣ and *prati* + ēṣ; the gloss *atidhāvi* (“he ran past, passed over the limits”) is not too far from the meaning of *accasārī*, and *ohiyyi*, (< *ohīyati*, passive “he stayed behind,” < S *ava* + *vāhā*, pass. *avahiyyate*) is close to the meaning of *paccasāri* (aor. of *pratisarati*, “to run back, stay back, lag behind”). Yet the divergent UV and Tib versions show that there were either problems with understanding the verb forms or separate traditions from very early on. In the UV the first verb *atyasarāṃ* is a Sanskritization of *accasārī*, but *atilīyate* (“he over-relires, clings too much”) has nothing to do with the second MI verb. For the Tib there is no resemblance to either of the MI verbs: *skur pa mi ’debs sgro ’dogs mi byed*, “to denigrate, to exaggerate” (to find fault or attribute bad or good qualities where there are none) usually translates forms of S *apavāda* (“criticize, blame”) and *samāropa* (“false attribution”) neither of which are found here. The Ch, as is often the case, is very general, using a plastic verb *niàn*, “to think”) which could translate many MI forms, but not *atisarati*. While the Ch seems to preserve the MI *orapāraṃ* structure (*苾芻勝彼此*, *bíchù shèng bīcī*, “the monk conquers that and this,” probably referring to this existence and the future existence 今世彼世

---

869 *Pj 2, 214*: **sabbaṃ accagamā imam papañcan ti tāya ca pana arahattamaggavosānyāya majjhimaṃya patipadāya sabbaṃ imam vedanāsaññāvitakkappabhavaṃ taṇhādiṭṭhimānadiṭṭhisamkhātaṃ tividhaṃ papañaṃ accagamā, atikkanto samatikkanto ti attho.** In the preceding section *Pj 2, 2114-22* the commentator lists five pairs of flaws for the monk who is caught in the extremes of *accāsarati/paccāsarati*: over-exertion and falling into a flurry vs. idleness; self mortification vs. self indulgence; eternalism vs. nihilism; bemoaning the past vs. longing for the future; and theories about beginnings vs. theories about ends.
(jīnshī bī shī), the UV and Tib version have apāraṃ, which has a variety of meanings including “not having an opposite shore, shoreless, boundless, the bank on this side of the river.” Exactly what this means in the context is not clear; the Tibetans tried to explicate by translating pha rol min pa’i pha rol po spong ste (“abandoning the far shore, which is not a far shore”). The commentary explains the bank of the far shore (pha rol gyi ‘gram) as “tranquility, the field of bliss, a word designation for Nirvāṇa with remainder,” and the bank which is not the far shore (pha rol ma yin pa’i ‘gram) as a word designation for the aggregates. So the Tibetans appear to be saying that one abandons the aggregates in order to attain Nirvāṇa, which is not what the MI versions are about. Here pāram (a synonym for nibbāna) is to be abandoned along with orāṃ, which represents saṁsāra. The Tib exegesis is similar to that of the P commentary, who, as Brough has pointed out, seem to have been embarrassed by orapāram and who invent several different interpretations in order to get around the plain meaning of the words. This tension within the teaching - on the one hand the Buddha’s

870 Brough, GDhp, 204.
871 pha rol gyi ‘gram ni bde zhi gng ba ste/ phun po lhag ma dang bcas pa’i mya ngan las ‘das pa de’ tshig bla dvags so and pha rol ma yin pa’i ‘gram ni …’jig tshog de’ tshig bla dvags so. See Balk, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavivaraṇa, 97813-15 and 97811-12.
872 See Brough, GDhp, 202 and Pj 2, 1230-1318: “The monk abandons this shore and the far shore: in this way the monk gives up anger; since anger vanishes altogether with the third path, therefore he gives up the so-called orapāra which are the five fetters belonging to the lower world” - this is to be understood. For generally pāra is the name for a shore, and therefore these near shores (orāṇī) of the ocean of saṁsāra have become pāra and are called orapāram. Or, he who puts away anger that has arisen with medicines, and spread like a snake’s poison, that person with the third path has removed anger altogether and, established in the fruit of the non-returner, abandons the orapāram. There, orāṃ means one’s own personality and pāra the personality of others. Or orāṃ is the six internal sense spheres and pāraṃ is the six external spheres. So orāṃ is the world of men and pāraṃ the world of the gods. Orāṃ is the realm of desire and pāraṃ is the realm of form and formlessness. Orāṃ is the desire and form mode of being and pāraṃ is the formless mode of being. Orāṃ is the personality and pāraṃ is the pleasant...
teachings designate current and future states as opposites and lays out the path of liberation from one to the other; on the other hand, it enjoins his followers to transcend all dualistic states of being and all views, including orapāraṃ - has existed from the earliest times and is well represented in the Sutta Nipāta itself. In the early MI versions of the Uragasutta the meaning of accasārī/paccasārī and orapāraṃ clearly belong to this latter category of samatikkama (“passing beyond”), including the very transcendence of going beyond samsāra (accasārī) and the transcendence of its opposite (paccasārī), to return to or pay heed to it.

supports for the personality. Thus with respect to this orapāraṃ, with the fourth path, abandoning lust and desire, it is said that “he abandons orapāraṃ.” And here the non-returner, because of his/her state of abandoning sensual pleasure, possesses nothing whatsoever, not even sensual pleasure in the personality, this world, etc. Moreover, having collected all these different kinds of orapāraṃ as an explanation of how it appears, like on the third path, etc., with the abandonment of sensual desire, they say “He abandons orapāraṃ.” so bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ so evaṃ kodhaṃ vinento bhikkhu yasmā kodho tatiyamaggena sabbaso pahiyaṭi, tasma orapārasaṇīṭi pañc’ orambhāgiyasāmyojanaṇī jahāti ti veditabbo, avisesena hi pāraṇ ti tīraṣsa nāmaṃ, tasma orāṇi ca tāni saṃsārasāgarassa pārabhūtāni cā ti katvā orapāraṇ ti viucati; atha vā, yo uppatitaṃ vineti kodhaṃ visaṭaṃ sappavisaṃ va osadhehi, so tatiyamaggena sabbaso kodhaṃ vinetvā anāgāmiyaphale tito bhikkhu jahāti orapāraṃ. Tattha oran ti sakattabhāvo, pāraṇ ti parattabhāvo; orāṃ vā cha aijhatikāni ayatanāni, pāraṃ cha bāhīrayatanāni; tathā orāṃ manussaloko, pāraṃ devaloko, orāṃ kāmadhātu pāraṃ rūpārūpadhātu, orāṃ kāmarūpabhavo pāraṃ arūpabhavo, orāṃ attabhāvo, pāraṃ attabhāvasukhārūpabhavo,- evametasmiṃ orapāre catutthamaggena chandarāgaṃ pajaḥanto jahāti orapāraṇ ti viucati. Ettha ca, kiṅcāpi anāgāmino kāmarūpāngena pahiṇāṭa id’i’ attabhāvādīsu chandarāgo eva n’ atthi, api ca kho pan’ assa tatiyamaggādīnaṃ viya vanṇappakāsanatthathaṃ sabbham etama orapārabhedam saṅghāteva tathā chandarāgappahānena jahāti orapāraṇ ti tuvattā. See also a discussion by Norman, “Buddhism and the Commentarial Tradition,” 215, who believes that oraparam refers to “this world and the next,” (i.e. this world and the afterlife), and not to saṃsāra and nibbāna.
This word is a well known crux in MI studies. What does the word *sammuti* mean? Typically it is contrasted with *paramattha* and defined as conventional vs. absolute truth in the compounds *sammuti-sacca* and *paramattha-sacca*, but this usage is quite late; the first reference we have to such (but without -sacca) is in the *Milindapañha* (c. 100 BCE) where Nāgasena tells the king:

*Sammuti mahārāja esā ahaṅti, mamāti, na paramattho eso* (“It is a mere commonly received opinion, O king, that ‘This is I,’ or ‘This is mine,’ it is not a transcendental truth”).

The duality *samvṛti- paramārtha-satya* becomes quite common in Mahāyāna literature of the common era. Apparently it was not an early Theravādin concept, at least as reflected in the *Tipiṭaka*; in the DN we find a reference to *sammuti-ñāṇa* (“common knowledge”) as one of four different types of knowledges, but the first actual reference to *sammuti* as an antithesis to *paramatha* is not found until the commentary to the *Anāṅgaṇasutta* (approx. 5th century), where Buddhaghosa quotes some verses from an unknown source:


875 See the *Sangītisutta*, DN 3, 22634-35: *cattāri ñāṇāni, dhamme ñāṇam, anvaye ñāṇam, paricchede [var. paricce] ñāṇam, sammutiyā ñāṇam*, “Four knowledges, knowledge of Dhamma, of what is consonant with it, knowledge of others’ minds, conventional knowledge,” in Walshe, *Long Discourses*, 490. The commentary (Sv 3, 102014-17) reads “*Tattha katamaṃ sammuti-ñāṇam? Ṭhapetvā dhamme-ñāṇam, thapetvā aṅvaye-ñāṇam, ṭhapetvā paricce-ñāṇam avasesam sammuti-ñāṇan*” ti. “What is conventional knowledge? It is what remains after the other types of knowledge have been excluded.”
“Duve saccāni akkhāsi Sambuddho vadatāṃ varo.

sammaṭīṃ paramatthaṅ ca tatiyāṃ nūpalabbhati.

Sāṅketavacanaṃ saccāṃ, lokasammutikāraṇā

paramatthavacanaṃ saccāṃ, dhammānaṃ bhūlakāraṇā.

Tasmā vohārakusalassa, lokenāthassa Satthuno

sammaṭīṃ voharantassa, musāvādo na jāyati” ti.876

“Two truths he declared, the Buddha, most excellent of teachers, conventional and ultimate, there is no third. Words are agreed as true because of common consent of the world; absolute words are true because of the truth of the Dhamma. Thus the teacher, the world-leader, whose expressions are skilful, when speaking in conventional terms, does not lie.” In the gloss on saccanaṃ caturo padā in Dhp 273-b (“of truths, the four sayings [are the best]”) the commentary outlines four types of truths, vacīsaccāṃ, “truth of a statement,” sammutisaccāṃ, “conventional truth,” diṭṭhisaccāṃ, “truth of a view,” and paramatthasaccāṃ, “absolute truth.”877

The P tradition derived sammuti from S saṃmati (< sam + vīman, “to agree” with the change of -a- > -u- after a labial consonant; AMg sammuit878 - words were simply what we agreed to call something, mere designations which the Buddha used without misapprehending their

876 Ps 1, 13811-16.

877 Dhp-a 3, 40216-40311. The example given for sammutisaccāṃ is “sacco brāhmaṇo sacco khattiyo” tiādhibhedā sammutisaccāṃ vā, “The true brahman, the true warrior, etc.”

878 There is also an additional Pkt tradition which derives sammuit < S svamati = sakīya buddhi, “one’s own understanding,” which usage is found in the Āyārāṅgasutta, per Sheth, Prakrit Dictionary, 877. For an example of sammuti/sammati variation see Vajirāsutta, SN 1, 13521 where the Burmese and PTS editions have sammuti and the Thai and Cambodian recension sammati.
significance, i.e. without thinking that they had their own intrinsic nature (see discussion supra, page 234). But words also create the illusion of existence and permanency and cover up the true nature of reality; i.e. they are also samvṛti (< S sam + vṛ, “to cover up, hide, conceal”).

The MI word sammuti can derive from either of these roots (with, in the case of samvṛti; assimilation of -mv- > -mm, and change of -r- > -u-) and each adds a different dimension to the meaning of “conventional” - conventional because of agreement and common consent, and conventional in the sense of covering, concealing, dissimulation, i.e. causing us to misperceive what is out there, the vipallāsa (“inversion”) of seeing something that is impermanent and thinking it permanent. The BHS tradition back-translated sammuti to samvṛti and the Tibetans also took it this way, translating kun rdzob (< verb rdzob pa, “to dress up, add, conceal, obscure,” lit. “all-concealing”) which Prajñāvarman glossed as las dang nyon mongs pa dang rnam par smin pa'i sgrib pa de'i bdag nyid = S karma-kleśa-vipāka-āvaraṇa tanmaya (“having the nature of concealing the ripening of karma and the afflictions”). The Ch had two translations, one with the sense of convention (俗諦, sú dì,”common meaning”) and the other highlighting the contrast with the true or real (假觀, jiā guān, “false view” vs. 真實 zhēn shí, “true, real”). Which of these two derivations are correct? Or are they mutually exclusive?

---

879 AN 2, 52-3-4: Anicce bhikkhave niccan ti saññāvipallāso cittavipallāso diśṭhivipallāso; “With regard to the impermanent, monks, thinking it is permanent is an inversion of perception, an inversion of the mind, an inversion of views.” The word “conventional” in English also has this dual sense of “established by convention” and “artificial, not natural, original or spontaneous” per OED.

880 Balk, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivaraṇa, 1050-4-5.
The earliest recorded usage we have of sammuti occurs in the Sutta Nipāta’s Vāseṭṭhasutta, verse 648-c, where it occurs in its instrumental form (samutyā > samuccā or with epenthetic vowel samutiyā) and where the word is clearly taken in its sense of “common assent”:

Samaññā h’ esā lokasmiṃ nāmagottaṃ pakappitaṃ,
sammuccā samudāgataṃ tattha tattha pakappitaṃ,

“For what has been designated name and clan in the world is indeed a [mere] name. What has been designated here and there has arisen by common consent.” The commentary says “A brahman or a man of the warrior caste who is called Bhāradvāja or Vāseṭṭha is a [mere] name and clan, something made, fabricated and [mere] designation in the world, merely a usage (vohāramattan ti), is the meaning. Why? because it has arisen by common agreement.” It is also a latency dormant for a long time (dīgha-rattam anusayitāṃ), that is, a bad habit. While there are no known MI, Tib or Ch parallels of the Vaseṭṭhasutta, there is another early reference to sammuti/sammati in the Dhp 390-d which does have correspondences.

na brāhmaṇass’ etad akiñci seyyo
yadā nisedho manaso piyehi,

881 Norman, Group of Discourses, 79.
882 Pj 2, 470–471: yad idaṃ ‘brāhmaṇo, khattiyo, Bhāradvājo, Vāseṭṭho’ ti nāmagottaṃ pakappitaṃ,
samaññā h’ esā lokasmiṃ paññatti vohāramattan ti veditabban, kasmā: yasmā sammuccā
samudāgataṃ samanuññāya āgataṃ... p. 471–4: dīgha-rattam anusayitāṃ
yato yato hiṃsamano nivattati

tato tato sammati-m-eva dukkham

"There is no advantage for a brahman, when there is restraint of the mind from pleasant things. The more his mind turns away [from such things], the more suffering is calmed indeed."^883

Here Norman translates *sammati* as a verb < S \(\text{svaṃ} = \text{śamyate}\) "is calmed," P *sammati*, but none of the other witnesses take it this way. Brough feels that the G verse (which contains *samudim*) is less corrupt than the P which manifests "corruption on a grand scale."^884 It is actually a good example of the vagaries of the transmission process where four different interpretations have been given of a source verse, now long lost and impossible to reconstruct. The overall sense of the verse appears to be an admonition that a brahman must restrain his mind from pleasant or unpleasant things, and when he does so, he understands these *dharmas* are only conventional truth, i.e. that it is suffering. Of all the extant versions - and there are five, three MI, one Tib and one Ch, - the last seems to be the simplest: "A *brahmaṇa* does not have this, whether sorrowful or sorrowless thoughts. Whatever is pondered in the mind, he

^883 Word of the Doctrine, 56.

^884 Norman’s interpretation is consistent with the commentary (Dhp-a 4, 1491-2; tato tato ti tato tato vatthuto sakalam pi vaṭṭadukkham nivattati yevā ti attho. "On those very grounds the entire suffering of the whirl ceases to be. That is the meaning" in Carter and Palihawadana, Dhammapada, 397), but Brough believes that "most of the errors in the Dhp were already fossilized in this form at the time when the Pali commentary was composed." GDhp 180.
extinguishes all doubts." A commentary on this verse, completed 399 CE by Zhu Fonian (竺佛念) notes, "He sees pleasure but doesn’t consider it happiness; he sees suffering, but doesn’t consider it sad. Whatever is pondered in his mind is constantly turned to the good. He extinguishes evil; he attains the true meaning of the holy practice and separates from all afflictions." This seems a long way from the MI versions.

Brough has written on some of the difficulties of the MI and Tib forms (GDhp, 180-183) which I will not repeat here. If the first line is taken in relation to the previous verse, then it makes sense as it is without having to add in the word “advantage” as all translators seems to do (lit: “For such a brahman this is not a little bit better” or “A brahman is not like that” in GDhp-a); pāda b has two witnesses saying one thing (Dhp and UV “who restrains his mind from pleasant things”), a third saying the opposite (G. "Who does not restrain his mind from pleasant things"), with the Tib saying another form of the opposite ("Who turns his mind away from the unpleasant"). The Ch version may point to the “original” form of this verse, viz., a true
The last two lines show a lot of corruption (e.g. P hiṃsamaṇo = hi’ssa mano, Brough, 181), but the general sense of it seems to be that the more he restrains his mind, the more he realizes that this (pleasant or unpleasant things, or suffering) is all conventional, i.e. not ultimate reality. It is most clearly expressed in the Tib: *ji lta ji ltar de yi yid ldog pał de lta de ltar kun rdzob bden par zed*, (33, 87-c & d: “the more he turns his mind away (from unpleasant things, in this case), the more (he realizes) it is nothing more than conventional reality”). G says virtually the same thing (*yado yado yasa maṇo nivartadi tado tado samudim aha saca, “… the more he comes to say that *saṃvṛti* is ‘truth’”*) and the UV makes the equation of conventional reality = suffering explicit: *yathā yathā hy asya mano nivartate tathā tathā saṃvṛtam eti duḥkham* (“the more he turns his mind away, the more (he realizes) that suffering is conventional reality”). A loose, composite translation then is something like this: “A true brahman does not behave this way; he turns his mind from both the pleasant and the unpleasant. The more he restrains his mind, the more he realizes that all these pleasant and unpleasant *dharmaś* are merely *samudi*.”

Which brings us back to our starting point. What does *sammati/samudi* mean in this context? Again, the Ch version seems to offer some insight: the brahman turns his thoughts to the good,

---

891 This thought is also in the Tib commentary. See Balk *Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivarana*,105019-20: ‘*di lta ‘dod chags dang bral ba mams ni sduŋ pa dang mi sduŋ pa med de*.”In this way they are free from desire and are without the pleasant or the unpleasant.”

892 He realizes this because of the absence of conceptuality: Balk, *Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivarana*, 104932: *dang po nyid du de rtog pa med pa’i phyir ro*,”above all because of the absence of conceptualizing” (which is the root of conventional reality).

893 Brough, GDhp, 181.

894 Taking *saṃvṛtam* as a masc. accus. form of *saṃvṛtim*
extinguishes evil and realizes that the “this and that” (彼彼. ｂ$i ｂ$i) of conventional reality, however it manifests, is not to be relied on, as it covers up the true nature of reality. One turns one’s mind away (nir + \textit{vṛt}) from conventional reality which covers up and wards off (saṃ + \textit{vṛ}) ultimate reality. Although the P version takes \textit{sammati} as derived from the verb \textit{śam}, all the other extant versions agree that it refers to conventional reality and in this context a derivation from $sa$m + \textit{vṛ} seem more cogent than one from $sa$m + \textit{man}, although neither mutually excludes the other. Here then is another example of a key Buddhist term with two complementary meanings: conventional reality is fabricated by social convention and because of its artificial, created nature, it also obscures the true nature of reality. Both derivations are therefore implicit in the word, perhaps from its first usage.

41) \textit{osāpayissāmi/ oyāyissāmi/ ohayissāmi/osārissāmi/otarissāmi} A1

There are two (almost identical except for the final verses) recensions of the \textit{Sattajātilasutta} in the canon, one in the \textit{Udāna Jaccandhavaggo} (6.2, 6432-6613) and one in the \textit{Samyutta Nikāya Sagāthāvaggo} (SN 1, 7725-7923). The seven \textit{jaṭilas} (matted hair ascetic) were pseudo ascetics that King Pasenadi of Kosala used as spies; when he tried to pass them off as arahants to the Buddha, the latter expressed his doubts, at which point the king admitted that they “are my spies, undercover agents, coming back after spying out the country. First information is gathered by them and afterwards I will make them disclose it.” The last verb, \textit{osāpayissāmi} in

---

895 SN 1, 798-10: \textit{mama purisā carā ocarakā janapadam ocaritvā āgacchanti. tehi pathamaṃ ociṇṇaṃ aham pacchā osāpayissāmi} [var. oyāyissami, ohāyissami]. Translation by Bodhi, \textit{Connected Discourses,}
the PTS and Burmese edition is not clear as to meaning or etymology. The large number of
variants recorded - oyāyissāmi in the Singhalese; ohāyissāmi in the Thai and Cambodian;
osārissāmi in the Burmese Ud; otarissāmi in the Singhalese, Thai and PTS Ud and others; -
indicates that this has been a longstanding problem. While it is common knowledge that Indian
kings employed spies\(^{896}\) disguised as ascetics, the translation of osāpayissāmi as a causative
of the verb “disclose” does not make sense. Why would the king have to make them disclose
the information he is paying for? Surely this is simply part of their job to report and the verb can
not mean “make them disclose” in this context. The PED, DP and CPD treat the verb as the
causative of ava + ṣo, (caus. -sāyayati or -sāpayayati = -sāpeti) with the meaning “bring to an
end, finish, ascertain;” only the last meaning would be suitable in this context. The P
grammarians take it as a causative of ava + śṛ (“deposit, put away; expound, propound,” in
caus. avasārayati or sārapayati = -sāpeti contracted to -sāpeti or -sāreti, homonymic with the
previous). Translation of the verb as “deposit” comes from Norman’s suggestion that the verb is
a causative form of oseti, “to deposit” which he derives from S *ava+ śṛ, *avaśrāpayati in
caus.;\(^{897}\) but deposit does not make much sense in the context. The commentary does not help
much with the meaning, glossing the Ud’s osārissāmi\[var. otarissāmi, ossārissāmi, oyāsissāmi,
osāyissami osādissāmi\] as paṭipajjissāmi, karissāmīti attho (“I will enter upon it, I will act”).\(^{898}\)

So we now have, inter alia, the following possibilities:

---

174. In Ud, 66\(^6\), the verb is otarissāmi and a footnote gives additional variants obhāyissāmi, otāyissāmi
and osāyissāmi.

896 From at least the time of the Arthaśastra, which P. V. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, vol. 1, 233,
assigns to about 300 BCE.

897 Norman, Elders’ Verses 1, 149 (ad verse 119).

898 Ud-a 333\(^25\). Translation from Bodhi, Connected Discourses, 404, footnote 223.
osārissāmi, derived either from ava + ṷśṛ (“to deposit) or the BHS form from ava + ṷśṛ (“clear away, send off, send forth, throw down, let loose, release, let go, abandon”).

osāpayissāmi, caus. of ava + ṷso (“bring to an end, finish, ascertain”) or caus. of ava+ ṷśṛ (“to deposit”)

ota(ā)rissāmi < ava + ṷṝ, (“to cause to descend, remove, bring downwards, introduce, make current, begin”)

oyāyissāmi < P yāyatī < S ava + ṷyā (“to go away”)

ohāyissāmi < Skt, ava + ṷḥṛ (“to steal, take away,” and change of -ｒ- > -ｙ-).

There is in fact only one of these that makes perfect sense in the context, osārissāmi in the second derivation from ava + ṷśṛ, “I will release them/let them go” back to the household life; for that is exactly what happens in the next sentence - the king returns them to “civilian” life:

“When they have washed off the dust and dirt and are freshly bathed and groomed, with their hair and beards trimmed, clad in white garments, they will enjoy themselves supplied and endowed with the five cords of sensual pleasure.”

If this reconstruction is correct and the

899 BHSD 75 s.v. avaśirati, with var ośirati, oṣaratī, osarati.
original form was *osārissāmi, how did all the other variants arise? There are two possibilities. Either the verb transmitted in the oral tradition lacked the initial consonant (after the prefix *ava- = o-), as often happens in such forms as AMg. oāra = avatāra (“descent”) or AMg. oïṇṇa = avatīma (“descended, reincarnated”), giving a possible underlying form *o(Ø/y)āCissāmi, which is flexible enough to account for some or all of the variants we actually encounter; or the word *osārissāmi, no longer understood by the redactors, was converted into various hyper-forms in order to make sense of it. Since I am aware of only a few instances where intervocalic -s- > -y- or > Ø, the second possibility is more likely.901 osārissāmi > osāpayissāmi converted the unknown form to a caus. of ava + ɐs or ava + ɐs with the change of -r- > -pāy-; since intervocalic -s- > -h- in some MI dialects (like Mg, where gen. sing. -asya > -*āsa > -āha), the form ohāyissāmi may have resulted from such a dialect change, i.e. a Māgadhism or a Gāndhārism where such a change is also attested;902 Consonant -h- is also a hiatus-bridger in G, so the -y- of oyāyissāmi, may have resulted in that fashion, although the change of -r- > -y- in both these latter forms suggests another pathway;903 the change of a dental to a sibilant is normal in G, so it is also not surprising that a scribe, not understanding *osārissāmi, assumed a change of -t- > -s- and back-formed it to ota(ā)rissāmi < ava + ɐt, which he did understand

901 See Jātaka 271 where S avāhadi (“evacuated”) > avāhasi > avāhayi or> avāhai. Lüders, Beobachtungen §109.
902 Pischel §264. This is especially applicable to the future tense (see #9 on page 68 above), but also ordinary nominal and verbal forms like S divasa beside JS divaha. Change of -s- > -h- is also a G dialect change as per Lenz, Gāndhārī Dharmapada, 67. GDhp precasari > GDhpL pracahari. This does not account for the change of -r- > -y- which we also see.
903 Note also the alternation of -y/-s- in MI which arises per K. R. Norman, “The nasalisation of vowels,” 332; also available in Collected Papers 5, 109: “because of the similarity in appearance of these two akṣaras in the Sinhalese script.”
(even if not meaningful in the context). Since it also occurs in the Burmese version of the Udāna, and can be derived from and/or account for the other forms, osārissāmi ("I will release them") is a reasonable suggestion for the root form. Note also the similarity to section 13 above (page 250) where ohārayitvā/otārayitvā and ośadaīta all share the same interchange between -h- -t- and -ś- consonants.

42) nimiyam, nimisam, nimissam, nirāmisam, nimineyam A6

As is now well known, P is an artificial language of monks, a translation of an earlier, now lost language (BMI); P was probably never actually spoken as a popular vernacular, but normalized as a transmission language for the buddhadharma of the early saṅgha. We have a lot of evidence which proves this, including hyperforms, Sanskritizations, etc., which we have discussed above. The usage of the verb nimināti, "to barter, change, exchange for" (related to S ni + vāmā, "to measure" and ni +vimī, "to fix") also proves this point, because its use is not consistent in P; according to the PED and DP dictionaries, the thing exchanged for is to go in the instrumental case, and that which one is giving for it goes in the accusative. But the usage in P is sometimes the exact opposite, proving once again that this is not a language of native speakers, but a language of scribes and scholars, and these make mistakes that a native speaker would never make. In the Theragāthā verse 32-c there are five different variant

904 Gdhp §43a and footnote 519.
905 See footnote 103.
906 S also has a verb ni + vime with a similar structure, "exchange for" + instrumental (MW), glossed as pratidāna ("exchange, barter") in the Dhātupāṭha. See O. Böhtlingk, Pāñini's Grammatik. (Leipzig: Verlag von H. Haessel, 1887), 69 (1, 1010).
forms for the verb - in the Thai, Burmese, Singhalese and European (PTS) editions. The verse reads:

\[ ajaraṃ jīramānena tappamānena nibbutiṃ \]
\[ nimissam [var. nimisaṃ, nimiyaṃ, nirāmisam, nimineyyaṃ] paramaṃ santim yogakkheman anuttaran ti. \]

which Norman translates, “I shall exchange the ageing for agelessness, the burning for quenching, for the highest peace, for unsurpassed rest-from-exertion.” Notice that if we follow the grammar, what is actually being said is that “I shall exchange agelessness (accus.) for ageing (instrumental)…” etc., which of course is clearly not intended. In examining the usages of this verb, we find some used “correctly” and some not; starting with the former:

In Jātaka 513 (Jā. 5, 2722-25) the son of King Jayaddisa vows to save his father from a man-eating ogre in the following gāthā:

\[ Pāṇena te pāṇam ahaṃ nimissaṃ, mā tvam āgā porisādassa ātte, evaṃ ca te pāṇam ahaṃ nimissaṃ, tasmā mataṃ jīvitassa varemi \]

“I will exchange (my) life for your life, do not go to the man-eating ogre; in this way I will exchange my life for yours, therefore preventing your death.”

In *Jātaka* 276 (Jā. 2, 369-16-17) King Kāliṅga sends some brahmans to Dhanañjaya to ask to fetch his state elephant in order to cure a drought in the kingdom. When they meet the king they say:

*Tava saddhañ ca sílañ ca viditvāna janādhipa.*

*vanṇam aṇjanavaṇṇena kāliṅgasmiṃ nimimhase ti.*

“Knowing your faith and your morality, O king, in Kaliṅga we have exchanged our gold for [your] black [elephant].” The commentary glosses *nimimhase* as *vinimayavasena ganhimha paribhogavasena vā udare pakkhipimhā ti attho,* “We have taken on account of the exchange or on account of the food we have put in our stomach, - that is the meaning,” i.e. we spent all our money on food, trusting that you would give us the elephant when asked for.

Some examples of the “incorrect” usage: In *Jātaka* 318 (Jā. 3, 63-8-11), very similar to the story of the wife of Dhanuggaha in Dhp-a 4, 65-11-69, ad Dhp 349), a robber who has been saved from death by Sāmā, a famous Benares courtezan, deserts her because he is afraid she will betray him:

908 The commentary (Jā. 5, 27) reads *nimissan ti ahaṃ idh’ eva tava pāṇena mama pāṇam parivattessan.* “I will exchange my life for your life.”

Asanthutaṃ maṃ cirasanthutena nimīni Sāmā adhuvāṃ dhuvena,
mayāpi Sāmā nimineyya aṇṇaṃ, ito ahaṃ dūrataraṃ gamissan ti.

“O Sāmā, you have exchanged a person you knew for a long time for me whom you are not familiar with, one who was permanent, for one who is inconstant. Sāmā, you may exchange me for another, therefore I will go far away.”910 Notice that the person who is exchanged for is in the accusative, the person being exchanged in the instrumental. One last example of an incorrect usage is the Kuṇālajātaka 536 (Jā. 5, 45319-22):

Ossajitva kusalaṃ tapogunaṃ yo anariyacaritāni-m-ācari
devatāhi nirayaṃ nimissati chedagāmimāṇiyaṃ va vāṇijo.

“Having abandoned the merit of virtue and asceticism, practicing ignoble deeds, you will exchange the gods for hell, like a merchant (exchanging a perfect jewel) for a flawed jewel.” The commentary glosses so devalokena parivattitvā nirayaṃ gaṇhissati, “having exchanged the world of the gods, he will gain hell.”911 Once again, that which is exchanged for is in the accusative, and that which is being given up is in the instrumental.

This list is not exhaustive and there are other examples of both kinds of usage. What is clear is the lack of consistency; sometimes that which is being given up is in the accusative, sometimes

910 The commentary glosses nimineyya with Sāmā mayāpi aṇṇaṃ sāmikaṃ parivattetvā gaṇheyya, “Sāmā, having changed me for another husband, you may hold onto (him).” Jā. 3, 6315-16.
911 Jā. 5, 45515-16.
the instrumental, and vice versa for that for which it is being exchanged. These are in fact opposite usages and mutually exclusive; to return to our first example, “I shall exchange ageing for agelessness,” and “I shall exchange agelessness for ageing” mean the opposite. How is this possible? It is clear that this could not happen if P was a normal, spoken language and the literature was composed by native speakers. Native speakers do not normally make such mistakes. But as an artificial, scholastic language of monks, these crossed wires are possible.

An expression like “I shall exchange my life for yours,” and “I shall exchange your life for mine,” are very similar; one must think them through carefully in order to understand what exactly they mean. In P the former would translate \( tava jīvitena mama jīvaṃ nimissaṃ \), the latter \( tava jīvaṃ mama jīvitena nimissaṃ \). It is simply a matter, as in English, of transposing two words to reverse the meaning. How did this happen? since Pāli was not naturally spoken it lacked the normal oral and auditory cognitive immediacies and checks present in a spoken language. So it would have been easy for a \( bhāṇaka \) to transpose these two cases (accusative and instrumental) without anyone noticing, as many of the tradents would not be experts in the language, and the meaning would still be clear from the context. In English we have the preposition "for" (exchange A \( \text{for} \) B) to clarify the thing exchanged for as opposed to the object that one is giving for it. In OI and MI the instrumental case represents "for"; perhaps also this laxity with cases signals the evolution of MI from primarily an inflection based language to a postposition language (where most of the inflections are lost), as it later became in New Indo-Aryan.\(^9\)

---

\(^9\) In Hindi this sentence becomes \( maim apnī zindagī tumbhārī zindagī se badalnā cāhtā hūm \), where the postposition \( se \) represents the word "for." Thanks to Prof. Stella Sandahl for this translation.
43) asayhasāhino/ asahyatāyino A1, A3, A5 (metathesis -hy- > -yh-)

In Therāgāthā, v. 536-a we find the word asayhasāhino which the PED translates as “conquering the unconquerable, doing the impossible, achieving what has not been achieved before”:

buddhassā putto 'mhi asayhasāyino Aṅgīrasass' appātimassa tādino,
pitu pitā mayhaṁ tuvaṁ 'si Sakka, dhammena me Gotama ayyako 'sīli.

“I am the son of the Buddha, who endures what is beyond endurance, the son of the incomparable venerable Aṅgīrasa. You, Sakiya, are my father’s father; truly you are my grandfather, Gotama.”

The corresponding Mvu version of this verse reads:

putrasya buddhasya asahyatāyino aṅgīrasasyāpratimasā tāyino /
pītāḥ pitā harṣita eṣa śākya dharmeṇa tvam gautama āryako si 3.109\textsuperscript{19-22}

which Jones translates as “The father is pleased with his son, the Buddha, the invincible, the mighty peerless scion of Aṅgīrasa, and he exults. Śakyan Gotama, rightly art thou nobly born.” Notice that there are several anomalies which seem to be transmisssional issues:

\textsuperscript{913} Norman, Elders’ Verses, 54.
\textsuperscript{914} Jones, Mvu, vol. 3, 108.
asayhasāhino/asahyatāyino; tādino/tāyino; pitu pitā/prītaḥ pitā; ayyako/āryako; omitting Mvu harṣita which has no parallel in P. We have already dealt with tādino/tāyino which has a fluid semantic field with many possible overlapping meanings (see section #10 above, page 231, “such a one, protector, benefactor, renouncer, seer”). The word āryaka and ayyaka are essentially the same, except the meaning of the word has narrowed in P to “grandfather” whereas in S it has the additional meanings of “honourable or respectable man.” The words pitu pitā (“father’s father”) in P is mirrored by prītaḥ pitā (“dear father or “pleased father”) in Mvu; if pitu pitā was the “original” MI form, it is easy to see how the Mvu redactor took the -u- as a labialization of -a- because of the following -p- consonant and the pi- as representing prī- (since long vowels were not represented in early writing). Which is earlier can not be determined. This leaves P asayhasāhino vs. Mvu asahyatāyino. The forms asayha and asahya have the same meaning “unbearable, impossible, insuperable”), with the interchange of -hy- > -yh- being apparently merely a pronunciation issue. Of the two compounds (P asayhasāhino vs. Mvu asahyatāyino), the translation of the former (“doing the impossible”) seems less cogent than the latter (“insuperable protector” or “such a one who is insuperable”); because what the Buddha did - i.e. achieve enlightenment - is not in fact impossible, unconquerable or unbearable, but open to all. However, this is not what the commentary says, continuing the motif of impossibility and unbearability: “asayhasāhino means, awakened to the highest wisdom, excepting the former great bodhisatta,- because of the impossibility of it being borne or endured by others, because of the endurance of the one who possesses the aspiration for great compassion and

915 See footnote 1417. The Aśokan edicts did not show long vowels and they were also not shown in the early G writings (e.g. GDhp §1). See also Falk, “The ‘Split’ Collection”; Strauch, “The Bajaur Collection”; and Salomon "The Senior Manuscripts,” none of which show long vowels in a consistent fashion.
all the unbearable conditions necessary for the attainment of bodhi; moreover, because of the impossibility of others mastering or being able to endure, because of overcoming and enduring the five unbearable evil ones (Māras), and because of the insuperable Buddha service for others and because of the instruction, using the ultimate truths belonging to this world and the next, for those ready to receive his instruction which is fit and proper instruction classifying the intentions, proclivities and inclinations.”

Edgerton defines the compound (asahya-sāhin) as “enduring (or sustaining, accomplishing) what cannot be endured (accomplished, scilicet by others)” which continues this theme, and since the compound occurs twice at Mvu 1, 255-256 (which Jones translates as “who bearest what others cannot bear” with an alternate translation in a footnote, “who triumphs over the invincible”), he suggests that we should read asahyasāhino in the Mvu 3, 109 for asahyatāyino; however, this cannot be simply two typos - either we are dealing with two separate traditions or a phonological transformation from a common root. If the latter, the change from a dental to a sibilant is quite common in language typology while the reverse almost never happens. This would assume an original transmission through a dialect which changed intervocalic -t- > -s- and -y- > -h- (or where -y-
and -h- are interchangeable syllable dividers), which conditions are (sometimes) met in the G dialect. In this scenario G -tāyin or -tādin was transmitted as -sāyin or -sāhin, and so interpreted by the P redactor without evaluating the potential for phonological changes, which may have made the meaning more germane. Or alternately the word was transmitted as we have it in P, and Sanskritized by the G redactor. Although we cannot reconstruct the exact relationship between the two compounds, - and both may be valid separate traditions, - phonological directionality and semantic cogency argue for the priority of the -tāyino compound.

44) Lexical Variants of the word brāhmaṇa A3, A5 (metathesis -hm- > -mh-).

It is surprising how little of Aśoka’s lexical inventory finds its way into the P canon. Even in the famous Bhabhra edict where Aśoka describes the dhammapaliyāṇi (sermons on the law; P dhammapariyāya), much of the language is foreign to the P writings and it is not clear what teachings the king is referring to, although it has been the subject of much speculation. One of the phrases which is common to both the inscriptions and P Tipiṭaka is samaṇabrāhmaṇa - it is an oppositional compound which summed up the two major classes of religionists in ancient India: the brāhmaṇas representing the Aryan vaidika priests and the samaṇas, the religious mendicants - whether Buddhist, Jaina, Ājīvikas or others - who did not subscribe to the Vedic traditions. In various forms, the compound occurs in RE 3, section D, RE 4, Section A, C, RE 8, Brough, GDhp §37-39; §43, 43a. The word tadi-, however, is attested in the GDhp 286 where the initial t- does not change to s-. There are also examples of the change -y- > -h- in P. Norman (Group of Discourses, 286) suggests that the -h- in nahuta ("myriad," Sn 677) may be a glide consonant, replacing Skt -y- nayuta (idem). See also P pihālu ("covetous") < Vedic piyāru ("malevolent") and P paṭṭhayati for paṭṭthahati ("put down, set down, provide"), where -h- > -y-. See also Norman's notes to Sn 143 (op. cit., page 186) where sūjū ("very upright") has a variant su-h-ujju in the Burmese edition.
E, RE 9, G and RE 11 C and PE 7, HH. Here I am interested in the different reflexes of the word brāhmaṇa in the Rock Edicts, whether in the compound or as a single word; I list them all in the following:

Gir: bāmhaṇa (3D), brāmhaṇa (4A), brāmhaṇa (4C), bāmhaṇa (8E), bāmhaṇa (9G), bāmhaṇa (11C), bāmhaṇā (13G),

Kālsī: bambhānaṃ (3D), bāmbhānaṃ (4A), bāmbhana (4C), bāmbhanibhēsu (5K), bāmbhanānaṃ (8E), bāmbhanānaṃ (9G), bāmbhanānaṃ (11C), bābhana (13G), baṃhmane (13J),

Dhau-li: bāmbhana (3D), bābhanesu (4A), bābhanesu (4C), bābhānibhēsu (5K), bābhanānaṃ (8E), bābhanānaṃ (9G),

Shāhβázgarhī: bramaṇa (3D), bramaṇanama (4A), bramaṇa (4C), bramaṇibhēsu (5K), bramaṇanama (8E), bramaṇana (9G), bramaṇana (11C), bramaṇa (13G),

Mānsehrā: bramaṇa (3D), bramaṇana (4A), bamaṇa (4C), bramaṇibhēsu (5K), bramaṇana (8E), bramaṇana (9G), bramaṇana (11C), bramaṇe (13J),

Erṛagudī: bāmbhanānaṃ (3D) bāmbhan[ā]na[m] (4A), bāmbhanānaṃ (4C), bāmbhan[i]bhiyesu (5K), bāmbhanānaṃ (8E), [bāmβha]nana[m] (9G), bāmbhanāna[m] (11C), bā[bbha]nā (13G), [bāj]bhane (13J).

Delhi-Topra: bābhanesu (7th Pillar Edict Z), bābhana (7th PE HH)

We note the following phonological changes. All locales except Sh and M (and five out of seven times in Gir), change brāḥ- > bā/βa. This is a normal MIA conjunct simplification at the
brāhmaṇa is traditionally derived from the Vedic root \( \sqrt{brh} \) or \( \sqrt{brmh} \) (to grow great or strong, to increase), although in P it is also traced back to the verb bāheti (“to remove” a denominative verb < S bahis, “outwards, outside, apart from” per PED, but more likely from S \( \sqrt{brh} \) “to tear, pluck, root out”), because in most forms of MI, the initial br- conjunct was lost. The -h- is usually not retained, but is often progressively assimilated to the second consonant with the formation of the bilabial aspirated stop -bh-, so brāh- > bābh-. Sometimes, as in the northwest Sh and M it is simply dropped (-h- > Ø). In the latter case, the second syllable -ma- is preserved (brāhma- > bamaṇa or bramaṇa); however with the change to bābh-, the second syllable loses its initial m-: brāhma- > bābha-, sometimes with an anusvāra after the -ā-: brāhma- > bāmbha-, which is presumably a retention from the Vedic root \( \sqrt{brmh} \) or a metathesis from the second syllable. Peculiar to Gir is the reversal of -hm- > -mh-, brāhma- > b(r)āmha-, and there is one case in K 13J where (brāhmaṇa > bāmhane) where- hm- is retained but the preceding vowel nasalized. The normal MI reflex of brāhmaṇa is bambhaṇa (in AMg and JM) or baṁhana (AMg) and for other dialects the reflex is bamaṇa, (in Mg and Š). In G it occurs as bramaṇa or brammaṇa.

The question then arises, since the “normal” Pkt form for brāhmaṇa is either ba(m)bhaṇa (prevalent at Kālsī in the north central area, Dhauli in the east, Eṛṛaguḍi in the south and Delhi in the centre) or bamhaṇa (used at Gir in the west) or b(r)amana (in the two north west sites, Sh and M): why did the authors of the P recension choose the S version? i.e. why did they

920 Pischel §268.
921 See MW s.v. Brahman
922 See page 243 above.
923 Pischel §250, 287. Also Mylius, Wörterbuch, 468.
Sanskritize the word, which, they must have understood was not the word the Buddha would have used (either the Māgadhī reflex bamhaṇa or the Ardha Māgadhī version bam(b)haṇa would have been the likely forms known to the Buddha). The form picked is actually closest to Sh and M (with the -h- missing) which are yet the geographically furthest from the Buddha’s teaching milieu. It is also close to the Gir form brāmhaṇa - with the original hm- reversed, but probably not derived from Gir, although Gir is believed by many to be the dialect closest to the P writings.\(^{924}\) That “bāhaṇa did originally exist in P has been shown by Lüders through metrical restoration and Dhp 388-a’s etymology (bāhitapāpo ti brāhmaṇo, “a brahman is one who has removed sin”) also demonstrates the existence of a form the same or similar to “bāhaṇa which was popularly derived from the verb bāheti, but was more likely a pun on the two S verbs \(\text{bhṛh}\) “to grow strong” and \(\text{bhṛh}\) “to root up” whose MI form was in both cases bhāti (or bāhati in caus. form).\(^{925}\) With the Sanskritization of “bāhaṇa > brāhmaṇa, the pun - either with bāheti or bhāti - was obscured. The conjunct br- in brāhmaṇa also did not make position (make a preceding vowel long, another indication that it was not the original form).\(^{926}\)

What did the P redactors change the MI from to brāhmaṇa? Perhaps it was the very proliferation of so many variations that led the P editors back to the “standard” S “original.”

More likely they chose the northwestern version, - the sociolinguistically most prestigious

\(^{924}\) See discussion above, page 50.

\(^{925}\) Lüders, Beobachtungen, 148 for metrical discussion. For discussion on bhṛh see Norman, “Buddhism and Sanskritisation,” 134.

\(^{926}\) See Norman, Elders’ Verses, lxii and Elders’ Verses 2, xc. In Dhp 285, for example, the br- in brūhaya ("increase!") - one of the verbs from which the etymology of brāhmaṇa is derived - does not make position, as the -a in the preceding word eva must be short for a correct vetāliya ending. As Norman says in Word of the Doctrine, 84, this suggests that the spellings with br- are a later Sanskritization.
form\textsuperscript{927} - and later, since it was so close to the S original, they completed the transformation. What it does conclusively demonstrate is the post-Ašokan, composite nature of the P language; P was a language which was probably never spoken anywhere, a "Hoch- und Gebildetensprache" ("high and scholarly language"), formed by monks in "conscious interference with the natural development of this language."\textsuperscript{928} Norman suggests that the change was made for specific religious reasons, "because of the strongly anti-brahmanical flavour of the Buddha’s teaching," to ensure that the members of the brahmanical caste who were addressed in the P scriptures recognized their name, which they may not have recognized in its MI form.\textsuperscript{929}

45) $\text{sa}ma\text{n}a/\text{śrama}n\text{a}$ A3, A4 ($\text{s} \rightarrow \text{s}$)

What does the word $\text{sa}ma\text{n}a$ mean? PED defines it as "a wanderer, recluse, religieux," but etymologically does the word derive from S $\text{v}\text{śam}$ (in caus., "to appease, allay, alleviate, pacify, calm, soothe, settle," or S $\text{v}\text{śram}$ ("to make effort, exert oneself, overcome, conquer"), both or from some other word? BHS Sanskritized it as $\text{śrama}n\text{a}$ which specifically refers to one who performs acts of mortification or austerity (MW), while the P tradition understood the word as coming from S $\text{v}\text{śam}$; the locus classicus for this etymology is Dhp 265:

\begin{tabular}{l}
927 See discussion above, page 53. As Prof. Max Deeg has suggested to me (private communication), the Pāli tradition may just have taken over the Sanskrit, as a form of lectio facilior.
\end{tabular}
"But he who quietens evils, small or large, in every way, because of the quieting of evils, is called an ascetic."\textsuperscript{930} Here \textit{sameti} is the P form of the caus. \textit{śamayati} ("he pacifies") and \textit{samita} ("tranquilized, quenched") is the p.p. of this verb.\textsuperscript{931} The G version has \textit{śramano} which it usually represents as \textit{śamaṇo} (śr- > ś-) which derives from \textit{śram}, although \textit{śamadhare} in \textit{pāda} = S \textit{śamitr} ("one who keeps his mind calm").\textsuperscript{932} There is also a UV version of this verse which contains both verbal forms:

\begin{verbatim}
na muṇḍabhāvāc chramaṇo
hy avṛtas tv aṁtāṁ vadan
śamitaṁ yena pāpam syād
aṅusthūlaṁ hi sarvaśaḥ
śamitavāt tu pāpānāṁ
śramaṇo nirucyate (11.14)
\end{verbatim}

"Not because of tonsure or restrained behaviour or not speaking lies is one a \textit{śramaṇa}, but he whose sins have been tranquilized completely whether large or small, because of the tranquilization of his sins, he is called a \textit{śramaṇa}.", The Tib version translates \textit{śramaṇa} as \textit{dge}

\textsuperscript{930} Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 39.
\textsuperscript{931} Dhp-a 3, 83 (ad Dhp 142) glosses \textit{samam careyya}, rāgādivūpasamena ("He practices equanimity = by the pacification of the passions, etc.").
\textsuperscript{932} Brough, GDhp, §43a.
sbyong (11.15-b, “training in virtue”) which sidesteps the whole etymology issue; in pāda d it translates UV’s pāda c śamitāṁ (“pacified”) as brtags nas (“having investigated”) which appears to be translating samitāṁ (not śamitāṁ) as a p.p. of S sam + vě (where at least in P, samati has the additional meaning of “learn” or “know”). It then uses sdig pa zhi ba (“pacifies sins”) to translate UV pada e śamitatvat tu pāpānāṁ. The commentary states “having seen the sins, he abandons them” (sdig pa brtags nas spangs pa) and glosses brtags pa as nges par brtags pa (= Skt. ni + vrūp, “to perceive, investigate, examine, search”). The Ch translation of the UV uses 沙門 (shāmén, PB: ʂaɨ/sɛ:-man) to translate śamaṇa, the phonetic symbol ‘ʂ’ representing a retroflex fricative, indicating a translation from a Pkt which pronounced śramaṇa as ʂamaṇa; this is indeed the common usage in G, suggesting a transmission from that source. In Pkt also samaṇa has the additional meanings of “hearer” (= S śravaṇa with the characteristic MI interchange of -v- and -m-) and “dispassionate, well-balanced” (in AMg. < S samanas, “endowed with understanding”).

933 Per Negi, Dictionary, the normal Skt word that brtags nas represents is parīkṣya, “having investigated.”
934 Tib UV 11.15: brtul zhugs med cing brdzun smra na /
go bo bregs tsam dge sbyong min/
gang dag sdig pa che phra dag/
kun la brtags nas byed pa dang/
 sdig pa zhi ba de dag ni/
dge sbyong nyid ces brjod par bya/

“Not by virtuous behaviour, or by not telling lies or by tonsure is one a dge sbyong. Whoever completely investigates sins small or large and pacifies those sins, he should be described as a dge sbyong.”
935 Balk, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavivarana, 429⁶ and 428¹⁹. See Negi, Dictionary, 961 for nges par brtags pa.
936 In G śr- > ş as per Brough GDhp §57. For Ch see T04n0213_p0782c26 - 783-a06. There is nothing in the Ch which helps with the etymology of the word ʂamaṇa itself.
937 Sheth, Prakrit Dictionary, 865. For ʂamaṇa written for śravana (“monk”) see BHS s.v., p. 534. For AMg see Mylius, Wörterbuch, 609, s.v. samaṇa.
We may be fairly certain that whatever the original sense of the word intended (i.e. whether derived from śam or śram), it was originally transmitted as śamaṇa (its form in Mg where all sibilants changed to palatal ś-) or samaṇa (its form in AMg where all sibilants > dental s-), for the Buddha it is generally believed to have spoken one or both of these dialects. The following chart illustrates the word’s orthography in the different Aśokan edict locales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rock Edict</th>
<th>Gir (West)</th>
<th>Shāśbāzgarhī</th>
<th>Mānsehrā</th>
<th>Kālsī</th>
<th>Dhauli</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 A</td>
<td>sramanānaṃ</td>
<td>śramaṇa</td>
<td>śramaṇa</td>
<td>samana</td>
<td>samana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 C</td>
<td>samaṇānaṃ</td>
<td>śramanana</td>
<td>śramaṇana</td>
<td>samanānaṃ</td>
<td>samana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 E</td>
<td>samaṇānaṃ</td>
<td>śramaṇa</td>
<td>śamaṇa</td>
<td>samana</td>
<td>samana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 G</td>
<td>samanānaṃ</td>
<td>śamaṇa</td>
<td>śramaṇa</td>
<td>samana</td>
<td>samana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 C</td>
<td>sramanānaṃ</td>
<td>śramana</td>
<td>śramaṇa</td>
<td>samanā</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 G</td>
<td>samaṇā</td>
<td>śramana</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>śama</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 I</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>śramaṇe</td>
<td>šamane</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The easternmost dialect at Dhauli consistently rendered samaṇa with a dental s-, as did Kālsī in the north-central part of India, except in the one case of RE 13 where it used a retroflex ş-. No eastern dialect used the palatal ś- suggesting that the area where the palatal ś- was spoken

938 See discussion above, page 26f. In all the eastern Pkts conjunct consonants at the beginning of a word were restricted to a single consonant per Pischel §268.
(in Magadha) was very restricted; however, we have no copy of an Aśokan inscription from Pāṭaliputra, the capital, so we don’t know.\footnote{See K. R. Norman, "The Languages of the Composition and Transmission of the Aśokan Inscriptions," in Patrick Olivelle, Janice Leoshko and Himanshu Prabha Ray, eds., \textit{Reimagining Aśoka: Memory and History} (New Delhi: Oxford University Press, 2012), 53.} Regarding \emph{sr-}/s- and \emph{śr-}/ś-, none of the west or north-western sites are consistent: Gir has two cases of \emph{sr-} and four of \emph{s-}, while Sh and M have five \emph{śr-} and one \emph{ś-}. It therefore appears that as the teachings spread westwards on the trade routes, an original \emph{ś(s)amaṇa} was either retained in Sh and M or re-palatalized according to the local dialect (which retained the palatal-retroflex-dental sibilant differentiation) and in some, but not all cases, interpreted the word as derived from S \emph{vśram} with the \emph{-r-} added back in. Gir which is sometimes considered closest to P, and usually assimilates its \emph{sr-} conjuncts (e.g. Gir \emph{seseṭe} < S \emph{śreṣṭha}, "best" in RE 4 G), in two cases did not, perhaps because of a local scribal interpretation of the word’s etymology. In the P and other usages discussed above, this mixing of the two derivations continued, and even in those cases where \emph{śramaṇa} was determined as the “correct” word, various forms of the root \emph{vśam} (G \emph{śamadhare}, UV \emph{śamita}) were employed for explication. Despite the orthographic changes, in P and the other dialects, the primary meaning of \emph{samana} seems to be “tranquilizing (< \emph{vśam}) and other potential overtones of \emph{śravana} ("hearer") and \emph{samanas} ("dispassionate") may also have been present. This is another case where the Sanskritization of the MI word \emph{(ś(s)amaṇa)} acted to limit the much broader, polyvocal semantic field of the original MI form.
As early as Vedic times aspirates stops changed to aspirates only. Generally P Sanskritized these forms (see page 60 supra), but there are some cases where the historical forms were retained (as lahu, “light”). Here is a case from the Upālisutta (MN 1, 386) where P has pabhinnakhiṇaṇaka and the parallel Sanskritized version has prahīṇakaḥilasya. The poem is a stotra where a disciple Upāli praises the Buddha with a long series of epithetis; it is in the āryā metre, which has been shown by Alsdorf to contain some of the oldest gāthās in the canon. Ñāṇamoli & Bodhi translate the P as “abandoned the heart’s wilderness,” (khila = “a piece of waste or uncultivated land situated between cultivated fields, desert, bare soil”) and pabhinna (< S pra + ṛḥīd, “to break, pierce, be dissolved”) in the sense of “abandon” which is not one of its meanings (P: “burst open, broken”). In fact, as von Hinüber has demonstrated, the true meaning of this phrase is “who has broken up the fallow spiritual wasteland,” hearkening back to an old Vedic expression which the S redactor had apparently forgotten. In P the expression is used in the positive sense of “break up the barrenness of mind.” Von Hinüber

940 See footnote 78.
941 See Waldschmidt, Varṇaśataṃ, 5, epithet #3.
942 Alsdorf, Āryā-Strophen, 15-22.
943 von Hinüber, “Sanskrit und Gāndhārī,” 28-29. See footnote 7 for the Vedic expression which is found in the Śatapathabrāhmaṇa 8,3,4,1 yad vā urvarayor āsambhinnaṃ bhāvati khila iti vai tad ācākṣate, “That which is not broken up between two pieces of cultivated land is called `khila.’”
944 See Sn verse 973-b, khilaṃ pabhinde, so translated by Norman, Group of Discourses, 119, with commentary Nidd 1, 503-502: Sabrahmacārīsu khilaṃ pabhinde ti, sabrahmacaṅgissu āhatacittataṃ khilajatataṃ pabhindeyya pañcacokhilam pabhindeyya tayo pi cetokhile pabhindeyya rāgakhilam dosakhilaṃ mohakhilam bhindeyya pabhindeyya sambhindeyya ti, sabrahmacaṅgissu khilaṃ pabhinde. “He should break up barrenness of mind towards fellow livers of the holy life - He should break up the
suggests that the word was originally transmitted in G where long vowels and double consonants were not notated; therefore he suggests that the S redactor had *p(r)ahiṇa for his exemplar, which, however does not explain the retroflex -ṇ-, for in G the -nn- of pra(b)hinna should have manifested as *pahina. This is more likely to have been the root form, with the normal -bh- > -h- and -nn- > -n- changes; the S redactor, not understanding the form *pahina, assumed it stood for prahīṇa, the p.p. of S pra + āhā ("to abandon, forsake," AMg pahiṇa), with the -n- > -n- change due to the -r- of the prefix, or the normal retroflexion of hīṇa > hīna which occurs in all MI dialects. The result was the expression prahīṇakhilasya with the meaning "he whose uncultivated field has been abandoned or deserted," which does not make much sense. Strangely, this is how Nāṇamoli and Bodhi have translated it ("abandoned the heart's wilderness"), even though the verb clearly means "broken"; the sense of the compound is clearly someone who has broken through fallow soil and made it into fertile soil by removing the stumps and stones of the passions (cittakhāṇukā, "stumps of the mind," as the commentary has it) and by implication planting the seeds of virtue, which are then allowed to flourish. The Ch translate in the same fashion; the first line of the stotra reads: 雄猛離愚癡 斷穢整降伏 (xióng měng lí yú chī duàn huízhēng xiángfù, ("valiant hero, free from foolishness, who has

afflicted state of mind, born as a wasteland, he should break up both the five wastelands of the mind as well as the three wastelands of the mind, he should break up, destroy, completely destroy the wastelands of passion, anger and delusion." See also Jātaka 534 (Jā. 5, 37924): khilam pabhindasi pakkhi, "O bird, you have broken up the wasteland (of my mind)," with commentary (37926): khilan ti cittakhilam cittakhāṇukām, "wasteland of the mind, stumps of the mind." (cittakhilam in Burmese recension only).

945 Pischel §120.
946 See footnote 944.
eliminated defilements, and who has vanquished all”). The characters 斷穢 (lit: “cut off impurities”) presumably translates “pahinakhilasa.

Later in the stotra the word *appahīnassa* (MN 1, 386, “not renounced, not abandoned”) occurs which has caused some difficulty as ṇāṇāmoli and Bodhi feel its meaning is not germane to the context. There is a Siamese variant *aprabhītasya* (“unafraid, fearless”), which also matches the form found in the BHS *Varṇaśatam sūtra*. ṇāṇāmoli and Bodhi therefore translate “fearless” based on this evidence, and von Hinüber concludes that the Siamese and the BHS are the original version. Why this is the case is not immediately clear, as the phrase *asitassa appahīnassa* could well mean “neither depending on nor abandoning (anything),” that is, an oppositional doublet expressing equanimity, although *appahīna* applied to the Buddha in this context is a unique occurrence. The commentary is silent on the matter. As Norman opines, “it is not at all obvious why a reading in a S or Pkt manuscript from Chinese Turkestan should sometimes be closer to a reading in a P manuscript from Burma or Thailand than to a reading in a Sinhalese manuscript” (referring to the Dhp verse 275-d which contains the word *santhana* (Sinhalese), while the Burmese recension has *kantana* and the UV *kṛntana*; similarly; the same of course can be said of the Siamese and *Varṇaśatam* connection (*aprabhītassa*) compared to the Burmese and Sinhalese *appahīnassa*. The simplest explanation is that we are witnessing two different traditions, which, however is counter-intuitive considering the phonological similarity between the words, suggesting a common source, which under the circumstances

---

947 T01n0026_p0632b06. Pāli = Dhīrassa vigatamohassa pabhinnakhilassa vijitavijayassa (MN 1, 386). 斷穢 might also translate *pahinaklešasya.


949 Norman, “Pāli philology,” 35; also in Collected Papers 4, 85.
might be *appahiyyassa (< S p.p. of pra + ṭhi, “to forsake” prahita > prahiya), interpreted as appabhiṭassa (because of the common MI loss of stops in aspirated stops and the tendency not to notate long vowels) by two redactors and as appahīnassa (< S p.p. of pra + ṭhā, a more common synonym for pra + ṭhi in the meaning of “abandon”) by two others. In fact the word pahiya (= S prahita) is attested in AMg. Nevertheless, this is merely guesswork and does not solve the problem which, for the time being, is intractable.

Two other words which are clarified by comparison to the S version of this gāthā are purindadassa sakkassa (MN 1, 386, translated by Ńāṇamoli & Bodhi as “first of all givers, he is ever capable,” but which occur in S as purantarasya śakrasya, which certainly seems to be a dialect form of puramdara (“destroyer of strongholds”), an ancient epithet of Śakra (e.g. RV 1.102.7d). The compound has been misinterpreted by the Pali redactor because of Buddhaghosa’s commentary (Ps 98-8): Purindadassā ti sabbapathamaṃ dhammadānadāyakassa. Sakkassā ti samathassa, ”Purindadassa means first of all, giver of the dharma; sakkassa, means capable, skilful.” But there is no such word as purinda-da in P and so we must assume that the redactor simply did not understand his exemplar, well known (in brahman circles) as an epithet of Indra (puram-dara) and changed it accordingly. The Ch translate 飛迦 (Shijiă, PB: šiajk-kia, “Śakya clan”) adding yet another dimension to the semantic field: sakka = śakya; sakka = Sakra; and sakka = Śākya, with whatever was in his exemplar for

---

950 Mylius, Wörterbuch, 440. See also Sheth, Prakrit Dictionary, s.v. pahia, 582.
951 Ńāṇamoli & Bodhi, Middle-Length Discourses, 491.
puramdana, translated as “non-returner to existence” (不還有, bù huán yǒu, which may mean anāgāmin). 952

47) A Brief Excursus on śleṣa

In the above discussions there have been numerous examples of puns - homonyms with two different meanings, both apt in the context, e.g. atta, “self” vs. atta, “taken up”; dīpa, “island” vs. dīpa, “light”; appamatta, “diligent” vs. appamatta, “contented with little,” etc. - but we are not always sure to what extent these are recognized as such by the native speakers, commentators, etc. There are indeed cases (e.g. pahita in Sn 425-a or atta in Sn 787-c) 953 where the pun is expressly drawn out by the commentator, suggesting that the Indian cultural mind was well aware of śleṣas and their creative potential as a figure of speech; and certainly in later (kāvya) Indian poetics theory, the full impact of the śleṣa was explored and exploited. While there are no poetics śāstras extant from the time the Buddha’s teachings were committed to memory and/or writing, we know from such compositions as the Sabhīyasutta and various commentaries that the authors were particularly fond of puns for etymological purposes. In the former work, for example, the Buddha derives the word viriyavā (viriya + vant, “energetic” < S vīrya, “valour”), from virayo (taken as virajo “free from passion” or virato, “ceased” in the P and Mvu versions), equating viraya and viriya with an epenthetic form of vīrya. There are lots of other examples of these deliberate etymological punnings like the definition of Tathāgata in the

952 T01n0026_p0632b20.
953 See page 183 and 205 above.
commentary to the *Brahmajālasutta*. A well-known example of an MI pun is the word *satta* which occurs in the common compound *bodhisatta*; it has at least half a dozen different meanings, depending on how it is re-Sanskritized (*śakta*, “capable of”; *sakta*, “devoted to”; *sattva*, “being, essence”; *satvan*, “hero, warrior”; *śapta*, “cursed”; *sapta*, ”seven”; *satta*, “seated”; *śākta*, “teacher”; *śakta*, “power, ability,” etc.). That MI speakers were well aware of the homonymic potential of the word *satta* is shown by the *Sattasutta* (SN 3, 189-190) where Rādha asks the Buddha the meaning of the word being (*satta*); the Buddha responds, emphasizing the pun on *satto/sattva* and *satto/sakta* (*<S śaṃj, “to cling, stick, adhere to”*):

*Rūpe kho Rādha yo chando yo rāgo yā nandī yā taṅhā tatra satto tatra visatto tasmā sattoti vuccati;* “One is stuck, Rādha, tightly stuck, in desire, lust, delight, and craving for form; therefore one is called a being.” (and so on with the other *khandhas*). Per the commentary *satto* here means *laggo* or stuck; but is that all it means? Certainly it could also mean *śakta* (< *śāk* ) in the sense of “equal to,” which also takes a locative case or even *śapta* (*<S śap*) in the sense of “cursed” (“which desire, passion, delight, craving for form, Rādha, (the being) is equal to it/cursed in respect of it/sworn to it”). Is this interpretation too far-fetched? Perhaps, but it is certain that *satta* had several semantic strata, although we cannot prove how many were top-of-mind to the average MI speaker. The Ch translation renders *satto* as 染著 (*rānzhuó,*

---

954 For *viriyavā* see Norman, "Four Etymologies," 150-151. For *Tathāgata* see above page 5 and references.

955 See discussion in Levman, "Vedhamissakena," 37.


957 Spk 2, 336-7: *Tatra satto tatra visatto ti, tatra laggo, tatra vilaggo.*
"defiled attachment"), capturing both the sakta ("attached") and the śapta ("cursed") dimensions of the meaning.\footnote{T02n0099_p0040a06.}

The word sattha is another wide-ranging MI homonym with meanings derived from S śastra ("weapon"), śāstra ("science, art, lore"), sārtha ("caravan" or sa-artha, "wealthy, having property, having meaning, importance, etc."), derived from S verbs ṣās, p.p. śāsta or āsta, "ordered, chastised, informed, announced, told," śāstr (nom. sing. śāstā, teacher or śāstra, "precept, rule," that which is taught); or < S śas, p.p. śasta, "cut," śastra "weapon;" or < S śvas, p.p. svasta, "breathed," S svāsthya ("self-dependence, sound state of body or soul, health, ease, comfort, contentment, satisfaction"); to name the most common. In a common trope, for example, the Buddha as teacher (satthā) is likened to a caravan leader (sattha-vāho) who leads his disciples across the wilderness. In the commentary on the first gāthā of the Sāriputtasutta (Sn v. 955-c, describing the Buddha as vagguvado satthā, "a teacher of lovely speech"), the Niddesa explains the word teacher: satthā: the Blessed One is a caravan leader. Just as a caravan leader helps beings cross the wilderness, cross the wilderness of robbers, the wilderness of famine, the wilderness without water, … so he brings them through to a peaceful country. In just this way the Blessed One is a caravan leader who brings beings across the wilderness, the wilderness of birth, the wilderness of old age, disease, etc."\footnote{Nidd 1, 446\textsuperscript{9-15}: Satthā ti satthā Bhagavā satthavāho. Yathā satthavāho satte kantāram tāreti, corakantāram tāreti, vālakantāram tāreti, dubbhikkhakantāram tāreti, nirudakantāram tāreti uttāreti nittāreti patāreti khemantabhūnim sampāpeti evam eva Bhagavā satthavāho satte kantāram tāreti; jātikantāram tāreti, jarākantāram tāreti, byādhikantāram … pe … maraṇakantāram…} Here the Buddha is portrayed as a kind of Moses figure and sattha ("caravan") is certainly not the only meaning resonating; he is also the leader of the teachings (śāstra), the leader of that which is important, that which has
attained its purpose (sārtha), and the leader of those praised (śasta). How many of these meanings were present to the average MI speaker would depend upon the acuity and language facility of the interlocutor; to one degree or another the MI aural faculty was attuned to the semantic malleability of words.

48) sabbatopabham A3, A4 (-a > -u)

This is a very interesting example of a word (-pabhaṃ) to which the commentators have ascribed three different meanings, discussed in detail by Norman. He suggests that the earliest version of the transmission (i.e. BMI) was sabbato-paha, where the form -paha(u) was variously interpreted as -prabhā by some editors and -prabhū by others; nevertheless, he is still puzzled by Buddhaghosa’s interpretation of the word as “ford” (i.e. tīrtha). I will not repeat all Norman’s work here, but will include a short summary of the various forms and translations, including some new material I have uncovered in the Tib translation. First, the context. In the Kevaddhasutta, the Buddha is asked a question by Kevaddha which he reformulates as follows:

kattha āpo ca paṭhavī tejo vāyo na gādhāti?
kattha dīghaṅ ca rassaṅ ca aṅuṃ thūlaṃ subhāsubhāṃ?
kattha nāmaṅ ca rūpaṅ ca asesaṃ uparujjhatā ti? (DN 1, 223-10)

"Where do earth, water, fire, and wind, and long and short, and fine and coarse, pure and impure, no footing find? Where is it that both name and form die out, leaving no trace behind?"

To which the Buddha answers

viññānam anidassanaṁ, anantam sabbatopabham.

ettha āpo ca pathavī tejo vāyo na gādhati,
ettha dīghañ ca rassañ ca anuṁ thūlaṁ subhāsubhaṁ
ettha nāmaṁ ca rūpaṁ ca asesaṁ uparujjhati,
viññanassa nirodhena etth’ etам uparujjhali ti. DN 1, 223¹²-¹⁷:

“Where consciousness is non-manifesting, endless, sabbatopabham, here water, earth, fire and wind find no footing, here long and short, fine and coarse, pure and impure, here name and form cease entirely; with the cessation of consciousness all this ceases.”

Now let us look at the first line of the answer in detail:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Commentary</th>
<th>Tiṅkā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DN 1, 223¹²</td>
<td>viññānam</td>
<td>titthassa nāmaṁ</td>
<td>ettha hi papan ti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kevaddha (Kevaṭṭa)</td>
<td>anidassanaṁ</td>
<td>(“name of a ford”)⁹⁶¹</td>
<td>pānatitthaṁ… kenaci</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁹⁶¹ Sv 393¹⁴-²⁵: Tattha viññātabban ti viññānam, nibbānassa tam nāmaṁ. Tad etam nidassanābhāvato anidassanaṁ. Uppādento vā vayanto vā thitassa anāñathatī anto vā etassa n’ atthi ti anantām. pabhan ti papan (var. pahan ti papaṁ; papaṁ ti papaṁ; papaṁ ti pana). Etam kira titthassa nāmaṁ. Taṁ hi
| sutta | anantaṃ sabbato-pabham (var paham) | anupakkiliṭṭhatāya samantato pabhassaranti attho. The name of a ford, and a name meaning “shining everywhere with purity.”

---

Brahmanimantanika sutta | viññāṇaṃ anidassanaṃ anantaṃ sabbato pabham. | 1) sabbato pabhāsampannaṃ, “endowed with radiance” Apabhassarabhāvahetūnāṃ sabbaso abhavā sabbato pabhāti sabbato pabhāṃ “sabbatopabham” means

---

*pipanti ettā ti papaṃ, Pa-kārassa pana bha-kāro kato. Sabbato pabham assā ti sabbato pahan (var. pabhan). Nibbānassa kira yathā mahā-samuddassā yato otaritu-kāmā honti tam tād eva titthām atitthām nāma n’ atthi, evam eva aṭṭha-tiṃsāya kamma-ṭṭhānesu yena yena mukhena nibbānaṃ otaritu-kāmā honti, tam tād eva titthām nibbānassa atitthām nāma kamma-ṭṭhānāṃ n’ atthi. Tena vuttam sabbato pahan ti (var. paham). “What should be understood here: consciousness, that is the name of nibbāna, that is non-manifesting (anidassanaṃ), because of the absence of attributes. In it there is no arising, no decay, or no change of the immovable, hence it is endless (anantaṃ). pabhāṃ is the name of a fording place, for that name (papaṃ) means “here they drink.” The pa-syllable has been changed to a bha- syllable; hence sabbato-pabham (“everywhere a fording place”). That indeed is a fording place wherever they desire to enter into nibbāna which is like a great sea; it is certainly suitable for (entering into) nibbāna. Therefore it is called sabbato-pabham. In this way, by whatever entrances amongst the 38 meditation subjects they wish to enter into nibbāna, that is indeed a fording place, it is not unsuitable (for entering into) nibbāna.”

962 Sv-ṭḥ 1, 5139-13: Titṭhassa nāman ti vatvā tattha nibbacanaṃ dassetum pipanti ettā ti papan ti vuttam. papivanti ettā hi pānatittham. Bha-kāro kato niruttinayena. Visuddhatthena vā sabbatopabham, kenaci anupakkiliṭṭhatāya samantato pabhassaran ti attho. “Having said ‘It is the name of a fording place,’ he says ‘papaṃ means “Here they drink,” to show its etymology. ‘They drink here,’ because it is a water-fording place. The bha-syllable has been used for etymological interpretation. With the meaning of purity sabbato-pabham has the sense of ‘shining everywhere’ with a certain stainlessness.”*
2) *sabbato pabhūtaṃ*,
“prevailing everywhere”
3) *titthassa nāmaṃ*
“name of a ford.”

radiance everywhere because of the complete absence of the causes of non-resplendence. 964

An additional possibility (but not in the commentary) is Ānāṇamoli & Bodhi’s translation of *sabbato-pabham* as a neg. present participle of *pabhavati* (with the initial *a*- omitted because of sandhi with the final -o of *sabato*) “not claiming being with respect to all.” 965 This will be discussed below.

963 Ps 2, 413\(^{16-21}\), (first two points only, the third is the same as Sv 393): **Sabbatopabhan ti sabbaso pabhāsampannam. Nibbānato hi aṇī no dhammo sappabhataro vā jotivantataro (var. jotimattaro) vā parisuddhataro vā paṇḍarataro vā n’ ātthi. Sabbato vā pabhūtam eva na katthaci n’ ātthi ti sabbatopabham. Puratthimadisādisu hi asukadisāya nāma nibbānaṃ n’ ātthi ti na vattabbam. Atha vā, [continues with Sv 393\(^{20}\). “Sabbatopabha means endowed with radiance. For there is no phenomenon which has greater radiance, greater splendour, greater purity or greater brightness. Or it means pervading everywhere - there is nowhere it is not. For it cannot be said that in the eastern direction, etc. or any such direction, that there is no nibbāna.” In the final sentence of this commentary (which talks about the those things which consciousness is not commensurate with - *ananubhūtaṃ* - the compound in the Burmese recension occurs as *sabbatopatam*, “flying/falling everywhere,” which I assume is just a typo.

964 Ps-pt 2, 317-318 (Burmese recension).
965 Ānāṇamoli & Bodhi, *Middle-Length Discourses*, 428 and 1247, footnote 513. The PED also suggests that “it is not at all improbable to take *pahaṃ* as a present participle of *pajahati*, thus meaning ‘giving up entirely’…” which Peter Harvey, *The Selfless Mind: Personality, Consciousness and Nirvana in Early Buddhism* (Richmond: Curzon Press, 1995), 206 translates as “drawing back from everything.”
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tib source</th>
<th>Tib Text</th>
<th>S translation</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tib parallel to Kevaddha sutta in</strong></td>
<td><strong>rmam par shes pa</strong></td>
<td><strong>vijñānam</strong></td>
<td><strong>khyab pa</strong> is normally translated by a form of S व्याप (“pervade, permeate”) or a form of स्फूता (“diffused, expanded”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Derge 4094</strong></td>
<td><strong>bstan du med pa</strong></td>
<td><strong>anidarśanām</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abhidharmakośa-aupāyikanāmaṭika.</strong></td>
<td><strong>mtha’ yas pa thams</strong></td>
<td><strong>anantam sarvatas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>cad du khyab cing</strong></td>
<td><strong>vyāpya-vyāpaka</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>khyab pa de ’byung</strong></td>
<td><strong>uparudhyate</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>bar mi ’gyur gyi’</strong></td>
<td>“non-manifesting, endless, consciousness, permeable and pervading, is stopped.”</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tib parallel in rgyal ba thams cad kyi thugs</strong></td>
<td><strong>rmam shes</strong></td>
<td><strong>vijñānam</strong></td>
<td>bdag po translates inter alia, adhipati (“ruler, commander, king”); svāmin (“master, lord,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>kyi dgongs pa zab mo</strong></td>
<td><strong>bstan med</strong></td>
<td><strong>anidarśanām</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>dbu ma’i de kho na</strong></td>
<td><strong>mtha’ yas pa’/</strong></td>
<td><strong>anantam</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>nyid spyi’i ngag gis</strong></td>
<td><strong>kun tu bdag po de la</strong></td>
<td><strong>sarvatas p(r)abhū...</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>ni’/... ‘gags par ‘gyur.</strong></td>
<td><strong>uparudhyate. “non-</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

966 In Negi, *Dictionary*, the usual word to translate *khyap pa* is व्याप्ति (“pervasion”). The expression *khyab dang khyab byed* translates the compound व्याप्याव्यापकाः, which is close to (and I believe has the same meaning as) *khyab cing khyap pa*, i.e. something that is both [Verb]-able nad [Verb]-ing, a gerundive and a participle.
The first of the Tib *sūtras* is a parallel version to the P *Khevaddha sutta* (DN 11) except here the interlocutor is called rTa thul (Āsvajit); exactly what was in the translator's exemplar in the -prabham locale is hard to tell, as here the word *khyab cing khyab pa* was chosen which may be translated something like "permeable and permeating" - normally translating some form of the S víyāp ("to reach or spread through, permeate, pervade"). The related verb víprāp = pra + vāp ("to reach, extend, stretch, reach to") may be derivable from the exemplar -paha or, (if -h- is taken as a syllable divider as it is in G) -papa, and if the initial -p- was heard/written as -v- (as is

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ston pa nges don rab</th>
<th>manifesting consciousness, endless, appearing everywhere (or “lord of all”),… is stopped.</th>
<th>owner”); prabhu (“master, lord king”)’</th>
<th>vibhū (“lord, ruler, sovereign”); or pati (“lord, master”).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gsal zhes bya ba</td>
<td></td>
<td>qv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bzhugs so/967</td>
<td></td>
<td>vibhū (“lord, ruler, sovereign”); or pati (“lord, master”).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

967 TBRC: [http://tbrc.org/link/?RID=O1GS6011|O1GS601137728$W23703#ReadingRoom/UT2MS24728-005-0002/66](http://tbrc.org/link/?RID=O1GS6011|O1GS601137728$W23703#ReadingRoom/UT2MS24728-005-0002/66), page 67. Accessed May 2013. The work is by Bsod nams sang ge (1429-89) and means "Completely illuminating the meaning of the definite teaching of the speech of the highest suchness of the profound middle way, as per the intention and wish of all conquerors." Per Norman, “An epithet,” 27 (Collected Papers 3, 186), this gāthā (with kun tu bdag po) is also quoted in the RatnāvalīTib translation which I have located (but with kun du bdag po) at [http://asianclassics.org/reader.php?collection=tengyur&index=4158](http://asianclassics.org/reader.php?collection=tengyur&index=4158), pecha 110 A and B. The work is known as rgyal po la gtam bya ba rin po che’i phreg ba in Tib. Accessed May 2013. In Michael Hahn, Nāgārjuna’s Ratnāvalī (Bonn, 1982), 37 (verse 94-b), the verse is found with kun tu bdag po. Evidently kun du is simply a misspelling for kun tu ("everywhere").

968 Negi, Dictionary, 2460.
often the case in P and the Pkts),\textsuperscript{969} then it is possible that -vapa or -vaha was interpreted < S \( \text{vāp} \) (since long vowels, in early writing were often omitted); however this is doubtful since all the other witnesses have adduced a word starting with \( p- \). The second Tib example points to an exemplar with the nom. sing in \(-u\), as also happens in G (\(-pah(a)u = S -\text{prabhu} = \text{Tib bdag po}\).

There are two Ch versions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ch source</th>
<th>Ch text</th>
<th>Transliteration</th>
<th>Translation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T01n0001_p0102c17, translation of the <em>Kevaddha sutta</em> (堅固, Jiāngù)</td>
<td>應答識無形 無量自有光</td>
<td>\textit{Yíngdá shí wūxíng} \textit{wúliàng zìyǒu guāng}</td>
<td>“He replied: consciousness is immaterial, measureless and self-illuminating.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T01n0026_p0548b11-12, translation of the <em>Brahmanimantanika sutta</em> (梵天請佛, Făntiān qīng fó)</td>
<td>以識無量境界故. 無量知. 無量見. 無量種別.</td>
<td>\textit{Yī shí wúliàng jìngjiè gù. Wúliàng zhī. Wúliàng jiàn. Wúliàng zhǒngbié.}</td>
<td>“Because consciousness is a measureless realm, (therefore it is) measureless knowledge, measureless perception and measureless</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the first case the character 光 (guāng) appears to be translating some form of the word -prabhā; the second instance does not seem to correlate with any of the MI forms. This (光) is also straightforwardly derivable from MI -paha, Norman’s suggestion for the earliest form of the transmission. This then leaves the word -papa which Buddhaghosa associates with the word tittha (“ford”) evidently through its association with the verb ṽpā (pipanti etthā. “they drink here”). This in fact appears to be a form of the noun -patha (pahāṃ attested in AMg and in some of the variants)970 with the meaning “way, path, road, course,”971 whose etymology, but not meaning, was lost. With the wrong derivation through S ṽpā and gādha (S “fordable,” P gādhati “have a firm footing” at DN 1, 22313), MI -paha (= S -patha) became -papa (= tīrtha), with the intervocalic -h- treated as a syllable divider or hiatus-glide. Contextually -paha as -patha makes perfect sense and Rhys Davids original translation “accessible from every side” may well have had this in mind, although he doesn’t say;972 Buddhaghosa’s explication of a tittha as a place where one enters into the great ocean of nibbāna is of course equally applicable to -paha (patha) as the path to liberation.

There is one other fragmentary reflex of this verse which has come to light recently: vijñāyanidarsanam anantam sarvam prthuṃ, where -paha(u) has been back translated to S prthu, “expansive, extensive, spacious” (< S ṽprth, “to extend”). This also fits the context, very

970 Norman (“Epithet,” 30; also Collected Papers 3, 189) does not feel these variants trace back to the original pre-P reading, but to a Sinhalese scribal traditions where ha and bha are confused.

971 Pischel §403; Mylius, Wörterbuch, 440 s.v. paha (“way, path”).

similar to \( \text{pra} + \sqrt{\text{bhū}} \) in meaning (caus. “to increase, spread out, extend”); again this suggests a transmission through a G-type dialect where nom. and neut. sing. in \(-u\) was common (\(-pahu\)). This then gives us four possible manifestations of the underlying form \(-paha(u): prabhā, prabhu, patha, prthu\), all of which are normal derivations of the original form. Thus in answer to Kevaddha’s question, "Where do earth, water, fire, and wind, and long and short, and fine and coarse, pure and impure, no footing find? Where is it that both name and form die out, leaving no trace behind?"

I would translate as follows:

“Where consciousness is non-manifesting,\(^{974}\) endless, a pathway to everywhere (\(\text{patha}\))/shining everywhere (\(\text{prabhā}\))/extending everywhere (\(\text{prthu}\))/everywhere the lord (\(\text{prabhu}\)), here water, earth, fire and wind find no footing, here long and short, fine and coarse, pure and impure, here name and form cease entirely; with the cessation of consciousness all this ceases.”

What did the text mean by \(\text{sabbato-paha(u)}\)? And how many of these meanings were understood by a normal MI listener? We of course will never know for sure, but, from the discussion of the commentators and the varieties of understanding demonstrated amongst the MI, Tib and Ch scribes, we can be certain that \(\text{sabbato-paha(u)}\) was a very polysemous

\(^{973}\) See Chungyang Zhou, ‘\(\text{Das Kaivartisūtra der neu entdeckten Dīrghāgama-Handschrift, Eine Edition und Rekonstruktion des Textes;}\)’ (Göttingen: Georg-August-Universität., 2008), 9, referenced in Bhikkhu Anālayo, \A Comparative Study of the Majjhima-nikāya\ (Taipei: Dharma Drum Publishing Corporation, 2011), page 297, footnote 161. Zhou’s MA thesis was not available to me. See also GDhp, §75.

\(^{974}\) For a discussion of the meaning of this word (\(\text{anidassanam}\)), see Bhikkhu Anālayo, \Majjhima-nikāya\, 297 and footnote 161.
compound, with several strata of meaning resonating and reinforcing each other. One final remark: the above tries to make sense of sabbato-paha(u) within the P tradition; if we step outside the commentarial tradition as Ven. Ñāṇamoli has, we may in fact be closer to the meaning. Notice that of the three epithets for viññāṇam, all are negative compounds (anidassanāṁ, anantaṁ) except the last (sabbato-pabhaṁ). Yet the overall sense of this verse is really a description of nibbāna as an absence of consciousness and the first line of the Buddha’s answer is really describing consciousness in a privative way, in preparation for the final line which talks about the complete cessation of consciousness. In effect the Buddha is saying that where consciousness in the normal meaning of the word (cognizing objects, etc.) does not exist, where it is non-manifesting, endless, etc., and no objects can take a foothold, then it has ceased and one has attained nibbāna. Therefore it makes more sense to take the third compound as a privative as well, and translate as Ñāṇamoli recommends, with -paha representing -apaha and representing the neg. present participle of pabhavati (“to arise, originate,” apabhāṁ, a condensed form of apabhavāṁ, with -ava- → -a-975 with the initial privative a- lost after the final -o which is normal P sandhi.976 The phrase would then read “The (nibbāna) consciousness which does not manifest, which is measureless, which is everywhere non-arising, where sense objects…have no footing, with the cessation of (normal) consciousness, everything ceases.”

975 Usually -ava- → -a- in MI, but there are examples of -ava- → -a-. See Lüders, Beobachtungen, 85, footnote 5; S skandhāvāra, “headquarters” > khandhāvāra > AMg. khandhāra or S tālāvacara, “dancer” > AMg. tālacara.
The phrase *manta-bhāṇī* occurs in several places, all in the *Khuddhaka Nikāya* (Dhp, Th, Thī, Jā. and commentaries) with reference to a virtuous disciple or an enlightened sage. The PED defines the meaning as “reciter of the Holy Texts, figurative for a clever speaker.” It derives *manta* from Vedic *mantra*, “divine saying, magic charm, spell.” The commentary by and large explains the word differently; for example, the gloss on *mantabhāṇī* from Dhp 363-b is *mantabhāṇī ti mantā Buccati paññā, tāya pana bhaṇanasīlo (“mantabhāṇī - mantā is called wisdom, by it one becomes disciplined in speaking”). Here *mantā* is taken as a feminine noun synonymous with *paññā*, but it is not attested as such outside the commentaries. It appears to be derived from the absolutive or agentive nominal form of *vman*, “to think, learn, observe, understand, examine, investigate, etc.,” which is normally *matvā* in P and S, with an alternate form *mantā* in P and in AMg. (which also has an alt. form of *mattā*); the agentive form in the nominative sing. is identical (*mantā < P mantar, S mantṛ, “thinker, seer, wise man”). It occurs in this form (*mantābhāṣṭi*) in the corresponding verse 54 of the PDhp. This then suggests another possible translation for this verse

*yomukhasamyato bhikkhu,*

*mantabhāṇī anuddhato*…

---

977 Dhp-a 4, 937-8.

978 Lüders, *Beobachtungen*, §167 comments on *mantā*, dessen Existenz sehr zweifelhaft ist…” Carter & Palihawadana, Dhp, p. 502 suggest that the identification of *mantā* with *paññā* was nom. pl. i.e. “the term mantras is a synonym for prajñā.”

979 Pischel §582. An example from the Āyāraṅgasutta 1,3,1,3 is *mantā eyaṃ ahiyaṃ ti pāsa*, translated by Jacobi, *Jaina Sutras*, 28, as “Considering this, O prudent one, look!”
“The bhikkhu whose mouth is restrained, who speaks after having examined, who is not overbearing…” instead of the usual translation of *manta-bhāṇī* which takes it as derived from *manda* ("slow, little, gente") as "speaks gently." In this latter scenario, P *manta* is a hyper-Palism, i.e. an overcorrection, since the source dialect the scribe was translating from tends to voice intervocalic consonants which were not usually voiced, the scribe mechanically “corrected” by devoicing. However, there are lots of precedents from the P tradition for interpreting *mantā* as an absolutive; for example, commenting on the phrase *mantā mantā ca vācaṃ bhāsati nidhānavatiṃ kālena* (“…but should use wise words, words to be treasured, words in season”) in DN 3, 106-24-25, Buddhaghosa writes *mantā mantā ca vācaṃ bhāsatī ti ettha mantā vucaṭṭi paññā. Mantāya paññāya. Punā mantā ti upaparikkhitvā.* ("Here ‘mantā’ is called wisdom, *mantā* = *mantāya*, with wisdom; the second *mantā* means having investigated"). This dual use of *mantā* as an absolutive and a noun is also found in DN 3, 84-5, where, commenting on an alternative reading of *mattaṃ mattaṇā ca* (var. *mantā mantā*) *bhattaṃ bhuñjeyyāsi mattaṃ mattaṃ ca pāṇīyaṃ pivveyyāsi* (“He should eat his food, drink his water with proper measure/after thoroughly investigating with wisdom”) the comentator writes "*mantvā mantvā ti* [var. *matvā matvā* in Burmese] *vā pātho. Paññāya upaparikkhitvā ti attho.* "With regard to the alternate reading *mantvā mantvā*, ‘having investigated with wisdom, having investigated”

981 See Lüders, *Beobachtungen*, §167 and Brough, GDhp, 249.
983 Sv 3, 89215-16. Thanks to Lance Cousins for pointing out this reference to me.
investigated’ is the meaning.” A similar explanation is also found in the commentary to Sn 455-d (manta carāmi loke): rāgadikīṅcanānaṃ pana abhāvena so akiṅcano, mantā jānitvā nāṇānuparivattīhi kāyaṃkammādīhi carati, tenāha: gottaṃ ... pe ... loke ti; mantā vuccati paññā, tāya c’ esa carati, ten’ evāha: manta carāmi loke ti, chandavasena rassaṃ katvā (“Because of the absence of any passion, etc., whatsoever, he has nothing; having known with wisdom, (or having investigated, having found out), he roams about with his bodily actions informed by wisdom. Thus they say ‘Knowing the clan... he wanders in the world.’ mantā is called wisdom and he wanders with it. Thus they say ‘He wanders in the world with wisdom’ (or ‘Having investigated, he wanders in the world’), with the -a short because of the metre.” Here mantā can be interpreted as an absolutive, a fem. noun or a fem. noun with shortened instrumental (i.e. mantā = mantāya).

Returning now to mantabhāṇī in Dhp 363-b (PDhp 54-b) and the commentary on it; here it is identified with wisdom, but in the commentary to Th 2-b it seems to be interpreted as both a noun and an absolutive: “mantabhāṇī- mantā is called wisdom and having investigated with

---

984 Sv 3, 821-2. Lance Cousins comments (email, July 1, 2012), “These kinds of variation are interesting because they clearly go back to a period when double consonants and anusvāra were often not written. So a form matā matā could stand either for mattā or for mantā (=mantā) or even mantvā and had to be deduced when the orthography was standardized. It would be clear in recitation.” Since long vowels were often not written, the transmitted form could also be interpreted as mattaṃ mattaṅ ca, which is what we have in this case at Dn 3, 84-5.

985 Read mantā; short -a to accommodate triṣṭubh metre.


987 See Norman, Word of the Discourse, page 244 ad Sn 455 where he makes this point. For further discussion see his notes ad Sn 159, page 190-191. Norman consistently translates mantā as an agent noun, “thinker,” which in the various contexts, is not much different from translating it as a gerund, “after investigating, having thought, having examined,...”
wisdom, he speaks, this is *mantabhāṇī*. ‘He speaks, not uttering a sound (except) at the proper time, etc.’ is the meaning…”

He is not a blowhard, always puffing himself up, *anuddhato*, but speaks only after having himself investigated carefully. The commentary then goes on to suggest yet another possibility for *mantabhāṇī*< Skt *mantra*, “spell”: “Or, ‘he speaks’ because of speaking spells (*manta-bhaṇanavasena*), therefore *mantabhāṇī*. The meaning is ‘He speaks just what is well said, what is possessed of the four limbs, which he himself speaks without any bad speech.’”

This interpretation of *mantabhāṇī* as derived from the *mantā* as absolutive or agent noun (“having thought,” “thinker”) or as a fem. noun synonymous with *paññā* or as a masc. or neuter noun meaning “spell” is quite different from how the Western commentators have interpreted the word. A derivation from *manda* was first suggested by Senart in 1898 and Brough confirms it in the GDhp where the reflex *manabhanī* is found. Lüders was reluctant to accept the meaning “speaking little” and suggests that the actual source word was *mandra* (“pleasant, agreeable, charming, (esp.) sounding or speaking pleasantly”), which then meant “speaking in a friendly fashion.”

However Brough felt, that if that was the case then the


989 Th-a 1, 3312-14: *Manta-bhaṇanavasena vā bhaṇati ti, mantabhāṇī; dubhāsitato vinā attano bhāsana-[var. sāsana]-vasena caturanga-samannā-gataṃ subhāsitam yeva bhaṇati ti attho.

990 Senart’s opinion is mentioned in Lüders, *Boebachtungen*, §167 and Brough GDhp, 249, both without citation.
received form in the GDhp should have been *madra (as S _candra_ > G _cadra_), and that the meaning of “speaking in moderation” was perfectly adequate.\textsuperscript{991}

There are problems with the word _manda_. It is related to _matthara_ (“lazy, tardy, indolent, dull, stupid, silly”) and primarily negative in meaning (“slow, tardy, apathetic, idle, lazy, sluggish, dull-witted, unhappy, ill, bad, wicked”), apparently derived from the verb _vmanda_ “to tarry, stand still, pause.” Its meaning of “slight, gentle” seems to be pejorative (i.e. disparaging) derivatives of the primary meanings. In all cases where it occurs in P, it has this negative meaning (e.g. Sn 666-c and 820-d where _mando_ = “fool”). Turner calls it a “defective word group” and Kuiper believes it is of Munda origin, connected with the Munda word _banḍa_ (“maimed, defective, crippled”), with a change of _b-_ > _m-_ at the beginning of the word, characteristic of this language family.\textsuperscript{992} It is not an appropriate word to describe a _bhikkhu_ or a disciple of the Buddha.

However, this is how the UV has interpreted it (translating _mandabhāṣī_ in UV 8.10-b and 28.8-b) and the Tib translation has _dal bus smra_ (“speaking slowly and gently”) which is a translation of _manda_.\textsuperscript{993} The commentary says that the _bhikkhu_ “speaks only a little bit, he speaks slowly and gently because of expressing just the word that is needed and meaningful.”\textsuperscript{994} The Ch

\textsuperscript{991} In Khotanese however (an eastern Iranian language related to G through a common ancestor), the change of _-ndṛ_ > _-mn_ did take place. See Norman, “Gāndhārī,” 62 and H. W. Bailey, “Gāndhārī,” _Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies_, 11: 1943-46 (1946), 778-79. Mehendale, Aspects of Indo-Aryan Linguistics, 41 states that in eastern MI (which he calls the “original Buddhist canon”) _-ndṛ_ or _-ndṛ_ changed to _-nn_ and that P _mantabhāṣī_ is to be derived from _mandabhāṇin_ or _mandrabhāṇin_.


\textsuperscript{993} Per Negi, _Dictionary_, 2197.

\textsuperscript{994} _dal bus smra zhirg zhes bya ba ni nyung ngu smra ba yin te/ don dang ldan zhing dgos pa’i tshig tsam brjod pa’i phyir dal bus smra ba’o’i in Balk, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavivaraṇa, 372_30-32 (ad UV 8.10).
translation of Dhp 363-b uses 寡言安徐 (guǎyán ān xú, “few words, quiet and gentle”) to translate the compound in their source, which also seems to have *manda* in their exemplar, but with a positive meaning. However, the oldest commentary we have, the *Mahāniddesa*, interprets the word as relating to wisdom and has nothing to do with “moderation” as is so translated by Norman:995 “*mantā* [“having investigated” or a noun?] is called wisdom, which wisdom and discernment is absence of confusion, investigation of the doctrine, right view. Having investigated with wisdom, having investigated, he speaks the word, saying much, speaking much, proclaiming much, clarifying much, defining much. He does not speak what is wrongly spoken, wrongly proclaimed, nor does he prattle on, utter bad speech or insulting words.”996 Here the *bhikkhu* speaks much that is helpful and nothing damaging; the underlying theme is speaking with wisdom - it is not a question of speaking slowly, gently or with moderation. Lüders’ suggestion of a derivation from *manda* (“freundlich redend”) is attractive because it makes sense, but does not match any of the commentary.

There are then two commentarial traditions, one taking *manta(ā)* as a fem. noun meaning “wisdom” and “having investigated” (which both probably derived from absolutive of *vīman*) and a second deriving it from S *manda*, meaning “slow, gentle, little.” As we have seen the latter derivation involves a significant amelioration of the word’s meaning over time. A third possibility

---

995 *Group of Discourses*, 107 (Sn 850, *mantabhāṇī*, “speaking in moderation”).
996 Nidd 1, 21929-2202: *mantā vuccati paññā; yā paññā pajānanā … pe … amoho dhammadicayo sammādiṭṭhi. Mantāya pariggahetvā vācaṃ bhāsati, bahum pi kathento, bahum pi bhañanto, bahum pi dipayanto, bahum pi voharanto, dukkaṭaṇā dukkatthāṃ dubbhāṣitaṃ dubbhanītaṃ dullapitaṃ duruttaṃ vācaṃ na bhāsatī ti, mantabhāṇī. Notice that the expression *mantāya pariggahetvā pariggahetvā* is virtually identical to Sv 3, 821, which says *paññāya pariggahetvā pariggahetvā*. See page 390 above.
is a derivation from S mantra which no one seems to have taken seriously. Of these possibilities the first seems most logical as it requires no hypercorrection explanation for the P, it is attested in the PDhp corresponding verse, and well attested elsewhere in the canon. The UV version - and the Tib and Ch translations which presumably depended on it - must then be viewed as a wrong Sanskritization (to manda-). The G reflex manabhaṇī remains to be explained; the scribe could not have had manta(ā) in his exemplar as that ordinarily > *mata in G. One must assume therefore an intermediate stage mantā > *mandā (a normal change in Mg and AMg),997 which word mandā the G redactor rendered as maṇa, (but with an unexplained retroflex nasal).998

I would therefore translate manabhaṇī as “speaking with wisdom,” “having investigated, he speaks” or “the thinker (wise one) speaks,” variously interpreting manta- as either an instrumental noun, a gerund or an agentive noun, all of which translations are very close in meaning.

50) isipatana A5 (mistranslation)

The compound isipatana is a hyper form, which Norman defines as “forms which are unlikely to have had a genuine existence in any dialect, but which arose as a result of wrong or misunderstood translation techniques.”999 They are the best evidence for demonstrating that P was the result of a translation process from an earlier stratum, whose meaning has sometimes

997 Pischel §275.
998 See Brough, GDhp 46. Ordinarily -nd- in G > -n(n)- and -nt- > -d- e.g. śānta > śāda in GDhp 55.
been completely lost. Isipatana is a place outside of Benares where the Buddha (and all
Buddhas) preached his/their first sermon, the *Dhammacakkavatattvasutta*. It is also known as
*migadāya* (< S *mṛga-dāya*, Deer-Park) which compound usually accompanies *isipatana* as a
secondary, explicatory epithet. Its derivation is from Skt < *ṛṣya+vrjana* (“antelope enclosure or
pasture”) which developed > *isi-vajana > isi vayana* and then by mistranslation, taking -*y-* as an
intervocalic glide representing a stop, and -*v-* as a lenition of *p-* > *isipatana* or, in some cases,
*isivadana*, taking the -*y-* for a different stop.1000 This then became, in the well-known etymology
from the Mvu *ṛṣayो ‘tra patitā ṛṣipatanam*(1, 359: “the seers here descended, so ṛṣipatana”),
even though ṛṣivadana (‘speaking of the seers”) is the more common name in the Mvu.1001 The
Tibetans use both etymologies: *ri dwags kyi gnas drang srong smra ba* (Deer Park sages’
propounding, or - in the below etymology - propounding for the benefit of the sages = ṛṣivadana)
and *ri dwags kyi drang srong lhung ba* (Deer Park sages’ alighting = ṛṣipatana).1002 Most Ch
versions simply translated Deer Park (鹿野, *lù yě*) but one gives a literal translation of Isipatana,
仙人墮處 *xiān rén duò chù*, “Place of descent of the celestial beings.”1003 In the
*Dhammacakkavatattvasutta* commentary, all three etymologies of the word are given:

“Because of the arising and alighting of the seers its name was called *isipatane migadāya*; in a
park called Deer Park, because it was provided as a fearless retreat for animals. Here those
omniscient seers wherever they have arisen, alight, they sit down (to hear) the turning of the

1000 Colette Caillat, "Isipatana Migadāya," *Journal Asiatique* 1968, (1969), 177-83. Lüders illustrates the
confusion between the verbs *vrajāmi* and *vadāmi*, through the underlying BMI form *vayāmi* in
*Beobachtungen*§106.
1001 BHSD s.v. *ṛṣipatana*.
1002 *Mahāvyutpatti* 4130 and 4131
1003 T02n0110_p0504a07-08. *Fóshuōsānzhùān fǎlún* ("The Buddha teaches the three
turnings of the dharma wheel").
wheel of dharma. From Nandamūlakpabbhāra, arisen after the attainment of cessation in a week, having come through the sky to Anotattadaha where they do what has to be done like the performance of ablutions, etc., the Pacceka Buddhas and seers descend here (at Isipatana), and gathering for the purpose of the Uposatha and on other days, they arise from here returning to Gandhamādana - thus with this alighting and arising of seers, it is called Isipatana."

So, although the derivation of *isipatana*-vadana was completely misunderstood, the original meaning of the word (*isivayana* = *isivajana* = Deer Park, an animal sanctuary) was retained in one derivation, and fake etymologies were invented for both the *patana* (alighting) of the seers and the *vadana* (propounding) to the seers. This is a well-known but still fascinating example of linguistic change over time and the misunderstandings that sometimes result therefrom. Had the compound remained in its "original" form without Sanskritization ("*isivayana"), then, although these "folk" etymologies may well have been invented, the deliberate nature of the homonymic ambiguity would have been preserved, without any need to limit the compound to one meaning.

51) *sammattam/samadha* A4 (interchange of voiced and voiceless consonants)

---


1005 In Pkt *vayana* has three meanings: *vadana*, *vacana* and *mandira*. Presumably the latter (*mandira* = "temple") comes from *vayana* as *vṛjana* ("a sacrificial enclosure"). See Sheth, *Prakrit Dictionary*, 747.
In Dhp 287-a occurs the compound *puttapasusammatāṁ* ("intoxicated by sons and cattle"), which is mirrored in the PDhp 365-a (*puttapaśusammatāṁ*) and the UV 1.39-a (*puttapaśusammatāṁ*), but not in G 334-a (*putrapaśusamadhā*).

\[\text{tam puttapasusammatāṁ byāsattamanasaṁ naraṁ} \]

\[\text{suttaṁ gāmaṁ mahogho va maccu ādāya gacchati.} \]

"As a great flood carries off a sleeping village, death carries off that man who is intoxicated by sons and cattle, whose mind is distracted." 1006

Brough argues that the reading *sammatāṁ* (< S *sam + āmad*, "to become completely intoxicated or exhilarated," p.p. *samattā*) is "textually somewhat insecure" as the sense of mental distraction is already in the verse (in the next line *byāsattamanasaṁ*, "possessed with longing"), and there is a version of the verse in the MBh with *sampannāṁ* which is "adequate for the sense required." He therefore considers the G *samadhā* as an equivalent to *saṃpādam*, with an unusual change of *-mp-* > *-m-*. 1007 Carter & Palihawadana argue strongly for the

1006 Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 42.
1007 Brough, GDhp, 276-77. The conjunct *-mp-* usually > *-b-* (§47, 66a), but sometimes *-mp-* > *-m-* as in *samadhaye > samajadi* (GDhp 178, 327). For MBh reference, see W. Rau, "Bemerkungen und nicht-buddhistische Sanskrit-Parallelen zum Pāli-Dhammapada," in Claus Vogel, ed., Jñānāmuktāvalī. Commemoration Volume in Honour of Johannes Nobel on the Occasion of his 70st Birthday offered by Pupils and Colleagues (New Delhi: Saravati-Vihara Series, 1959), 172. There is no such word as *saṃpāda* in S; in Pkt the word (*saṃpāda*) means "accomplishing, giving what is wished, attaining" (Sheth, Prakrit Dictionary, 846) and is derived from the causative stem of *sam + vipad, (= sampāda*), meaning "brought about, produced, effected," or "furnished with, provided with," which appears to be how Brough...
traditional reading, amongst other reasons, because the reading is attested in two very old Sinhala Works, including the old commentary on the Dhp. The word has been controversial; Lüders believed that the correct reading was samṛddham (< S sam + ṛdh, “to increase, prosper, flourish) which Brough rejects on metrical grounds and Max Müller suggested that the underlying word was sammatam (< S sam + ṛman, “to honour, value, esteem”). The commentary is not particularly illuminating except that it suggests that the compound in question is a dvandva (sons + cattle + material wealth), not a dvandva within a tatpurusa (“intoxicated with/possessed of sons + cattle”), as it is generally taken: “Having obtained cattle and sons endowed with good looks, strength, etc., thinking my sons are handsome, strong, wise, able to do what has to be done, that my oxen are lovely, free from disease, able to bear large loads, that my cows have abundant milk, he is intoxicated (sammatam) with these sons and with these cattle, his mind is possessed with longing (byāsattamanasaṇḍ); having obtained whatever, gold or money, robes and bowls, etc., the mind is attached to the desire for more than that; the mind is attached to any place whatsoever, whether what is obtained is sense-object perceived by sight or the other senses, or (monk’s) requisites having those qualities mentioned above.” This was Brough’s point: the attachment of the mind is mentioned in

is taking it. There is of course a noun sampad derived from this verb, meaning “accomplishment, possession, riches,” etc.

1008 Carter & Paliwawdana, Dhp, 486, footnote 27 and 28.


1010 Dhp-a 3, 4320-4338: taṃ rūpalādisampanne putte ca pasū ca labhitvā ’mama puttā abhirūpā balasampannā paṇḍītā sabbakiccasamatthā, mama goṇā abhirūpā arogā mahābhāravahā, mama gāvī bahukārī’ ti evam puttethi ca pasūhi ca sammatam naram, byāsattamanasan ti hiraṅnasuvaṇṇādīsu vā pattacīvaraṇādīsu vā kiṅcideva labhitvā tato uttaritaram patthanatāya sattamānasam vā,
pāda b (byāsattamanasam), therefore sammattam as “intoxication” was redundant: taṃ puttapasusammattam byāsattamanasam naraṃ, “(death carries off) that man who is intoxicated by sons and cattle, whose mind is distracted;”¹⁰¹¹ presumably Brough would translate with sammattam = sampannam: “… that man whose mind is attached, who is endowed with sons and cattle.” But as the commentary notes, his mind is not just stuck on sons and cattle, but also on other things. Therefore the Tibetans translate

bu dang nor phyugs 'byor pa la
mi yi yid ni rnam chags pa (Tib UV 1.40-a & b)

“(death carries off) the man whose mind is stuck to sons and cattle and wealth,” taking ‘byor pa as the nominal form of the verb ‘byor ba (“to arrive, to connect with”), meaning “wealth.”¹⁰¹²

This appears to be a translation of the S exemplar putra-paśu-sampadam, the latter being a dvandva and object of the bahuvrīḥī compound byasattamanasam, modifying naraṃ. The Tib commentary supports this interpretation, noting, “The man who foolishly has made a most excellent collection and safeguarding of his possessions in samsāra, the Lord of Death takes and will carry off - this is the summarized meaning,” and in a gloss on longs spyod (“resources” = S bhoga), the commentator writes, “desire for valuables and cattle and wealth” (or “desire for

---

¹⁰¹¹ Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 42.
¹⁰¹² Note that there are four variant editions with the verbal form ‘byor ba (and 10 with ‘byor pa). See Zongste, UV, 41. Per The Illuminator Tibetan Dictionary ‘byor pa means “wealth” and ‘byor ba, “to connect.”
an abundance of valuables and cattle).\textsuperscript{1013} Clearly the Tib version goes beyond sons and cattle. Therefore Brough’s interpretation of G \textit{samadha} as a form of \textit{sampāda} (= \textit{sampanna}) is probably correct, except that he takes this as a p.p. of \textit{sam} + \textit{vpad}, while it appears to be the the nominal form meaning, “possessions, riches, wealth, etc. (< S \textit{sampad}); this would then make the compound \textit{puttapasusammattam} (or G \textit{putrapaśusamadha}) a \textit{dvandva}, “…the man, whose mind is attached to (possessed with longing for) sons, cattle and riches…” or a \textit{dvandva} within the context of an overall \textit{tatpuruṣa}, “… the man, who is possessed with longing for the acquisition (\textit{sampad}) of sons and cattle,” or a \textit{dvandva} within the context of an overall \textit{bahuvrīhi}, modifying \textit{naram}, “the man, possessed with longing, who possesses sons, cattle and riches…” They all say the same thing, but are subtly different from each other. This is one tradition; \textit{sammattam} from \textit{sam} + \textit{vmad}, may well be a secondary derivation, or they are both derived from a putative earlier form \textit{*sam(m)ad(d)a} or \textit{*sam(m)at(t)a} (without geminates in the earliest scripts), where one tradition decided on \textit{sammatta} as the correct meaning, devoicing, -\textit{d}- > -\textit{t}- (if \textit{*samada}) and the other took it as it was received, restoring the -\textit{mp}- in place of the -\textit{m}-, as noted above.\textsuperscript{1014} Whether only one or both of these meanings were “intended” by the composer

\textsuperscript{1013} Balk, \textit{Udānavargavivaraṇa}, 138\textsuperscript{27-30}: rmongs pas ’khor ba’i yo byad legs par bsags pa dang bsrung ba la sogs pa mchog tu byed pa’i mi ni ’chi bdag gis blangs te khyer bar ’gyur zhes bya ba ni ’di’i bsdus pa’i don to/. and page 139\textsuperscript{3-4}: nor dang phyugs phun sum tshogs pa ’dod do.

\textsuperscript{1014} There are other possibilities not considered here: in AMG \textit{sammatta} = S \textit{sammat}a “honoured” which is possible in the context and AMG \textit{sammatta} = S \textit{samyakt}va “perfection, completeness,” which also seems possible. See Mylius, \textit{Wörterbuch}, 616.
is impossible to say. The Ch rendition is less helpful as the gāthā translated is very approximate and loose.\textsuperscript{1015}

52) \textit{pāceti/pājeti/peseti/payedi/prājeti/prāpayati} A1

Indic speakers and writers loved word-play. The Dhp is full of instances where one word and its synonym or near-synonym means two different things. The phrase \textit{anikkasāvo kāsāva} in Dhp 9 is an example, where one does not deserve the \textit{kāsāva} (“monk’s robe”), if they are not free from impurities (\textit{kasāva}, hence \textit{a-ni-kkasāvo}, “not free from impurities”). In Dhp 44-a the verb \textit{vicesati} appears to have been transmitted in a dialect where intervocalic \textit{-c-} and \textit{-j-} were both represented by a glide, judging from the variant form (\textit{vijessati}) and the glosses by the commentator:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ko imaṃ paṭhaviṃ vijessatī (var. vicesati)}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{Yamalokaṃ ca imaṃ sadevakaṃ?}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{ko dhammapadaṃ sudesitam}
\end{quote}

\begin{quote}
\textit{kusalo puppham iva-ppacessati?}
\end{quote}

" Who will conquer this earth and this world of Yama with its gods? Who will gather the well-taught word of the doctrine, as a skilful man gathers a flower?"\textsuperscript{1016}

\textsuperscript{1015} T04n0210_p0569b13-14 || 人營妻子 不觀病法，死命卒至，如水湍驟, \textit{Rén yíng qīzi bù guān bìng fǎ, sīmìng cù zhī}, \textit{rú shuǐ tuān zhòu}. Men are concerned with wife and children, they do not see the law of decay/sickness. Death arrives suddenly like the rush of a water torrent."
The first verb could mean either “he will conquer” < S < vi+ ्ji, or “he will examine/distinguish” < S vi+ ्ci, both contextually relevant, plus the commentary provides the additional phonetically similar glosses with alternation of -c- and -j- in vicinissati < S vi + ्cint, “to examine, investigate,” vijānissati < S vi + ्yānā, “to understand, recognize,” and paṭvijjhissati, < S prati + ्vyadh, “to penetrate, comprehend.”¹⁰¹⁷ This same alteration is present in other parts of the Dhp where the GDhp appears to have retained the underlying malleable form (payedi in GDhp 148-d, “drive the life of creatures,” aya payedi praṇiṇa), from which at least three phonological alternatives resulted: P pājeti (< S pra + ्aj, “to drive forward, urge one”); P pāceti (with the same derivation and meaning, with the change -j- > -c- and linked to peseti < S pra + ्c, “send forth” in the commentary),¹⁰¹⁸ plus in the same verse pācenti (< caus. S ्pac, “bring to an end” with variant pājenti, “They drive forth”). This took on yet another from in the UV 1.17-b with prāpayati (< S ्prāp, “to lead or bring, to cause to reach of obtain”), which is probably a back-formation from prāpeti, also pointing to the same underlying form as in G payedi where the intervocalic glide was interpreted as a labial stop rather than a palatal one. For S prāpayati,

¹⁰¹⁶ Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 8.
¹⁰¹⁷ Dhp-a 1, 334⁵-⁶: vijessati [var. vicessati] Burmese] ti attano 乃至ena [var. vicinissati in Burmese recension] vijānissati, paṭvijjhissati, sacchikarissatiti atttho. The last verb has no phonetic relationship to vicessati; it is derived from S sākṣāt + ्kr, “to realize, experience for oneself.” For discussion see Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 73-74. For other examples of word-play see page 64 (ad Dhp 9-10)
¹⁰¹⁸ Dhp-a 3, 60¹⁵-¹⁶ ad Dhp 135. Āyuṃ pācenti ti jīvitidriyāṃ chindanti khepenti; gopālako viya hi jarā ca maccu ca, gono viya jīvitindriyam, gocarabhūmi viya maranaṃ tattha jāti tāva saṇṭhām jīvitindriyam jarāsantikam peseti, jarā byādhino… “They drive life’ means they cut off the faculty of life, they cause it to be wasted. Old age and death are like the cowherd, the ox is like the faculty of life, death is like the pasture field, there birth first sends (peseti) the faculty of life of beings to the presence of old age, old age to disease, etc.,
Tib has two verbs, \textit{phyin byed} (“to cause to come”) which usually translates a form of S \textit{vāhana} (“conveying, bringing”) and \textit{skyel ba} (“transport, convey carry”), semantically related to S \textit{nayati}. The commentary is not very helpful, glossing \textit{phyin byed} as \textit{thob par byed} (=Skt \textit{prāpayati}) and \textit{skyel ba} as \textit{phyin byed}.\textsuperscript{1019} So what verb(s) the Tibetans had in their exemplar and whether they were the same, as in the MI witnesses, is impossible to tell. The Ch version is very loose and does not well approximate the sense of the MI verses (or is based on an alternative textual transmission), at least in terms of the verbs, so it is not useful.\textsuperscript{1020} The PDhp recension (200-b) has \textit{prājeti} for the first verb and \textit{adhivattati} (“it overpowers,” 200-d) for the second. Amongst the MI witnesses, the only possible explanation for the phonologically similar forms \textit{pāceti/p(r)ājeti/pāpeti (= prāpayati)} is that they all translated from an underlying BMI form \textit{pa(ā)yet(d)i}, - preserved in G - interpreted the meaning according to the understanding of the scribe, and substituted the appropriate stop in the Sanskritizing phase. This is a good example where four forms of the translation process have been preserved, the underlying and earlier “root” (not necessarily the “original” of course), and three different variants.

\textsuperscript{53) \textit{dhammaprīti/dhammapīti/dharmapridi/dharmaprīti} A3}

\textsuperscript{1019} Balk, \textit{Prajñāvarman’s Udānavargavivaraṇa}, 93\textsuperscript{3} and 93\textsuperscript{24}. See Negi, \textit{Dictionary ssv} for Tibetan-Sanskrit equivalent

\textsuperscript{1020} T04n0213_p0777b13-14: 如人操杖行 牧牛飲飼者 人命亦如是 亦即養命去, \textit{Rú rén cāo zhàng xíng mǔniú yín sī zhē rénming yì rúshí yìjí yǎng míng qù}, “Just as a man with a stick causes cattle to feed and drink in the pasture [to be later killed for their meat], so it also is with human life - the discarding of life that was raised.” A commentary on this story can be found in the \textit{法句譬喻經 (Fǎjù Píyù Jīng, Dharmapāda} with commentary), T04n0211_p0575c29-p0576a20, where the Buddha encounters a herd of cattle, of which half had already been killed for their meat. Thanks to Dr. Zhang Dewei for this reference.
A similar situation occurs in Dhp 79-a where P *dhampapīti* can be isolated as the underlying form, giving rise to reflexes *dhamapridi* in G 224-a, *dhampapīti* in PDhp 348-a and *dharamprītiḥ* in UV 30.13-a.

*dhammapīti sukhaṃ seti vippasannena cetasā,*

*ariyappavedite dhamme sadā ramati paṇḍito*

"He who drinks of the doctrine sleeps happily, with a clear mind. The learned man always rejoices in the doctrine taught by the noble ones."\(^{1021}\)

The word *pīti* means "drinking" in S < ṝpā, *pibati* "to drink"; it also means "protection" < Skt ṝpā, *pāti*. With the conjunct *pr-*, *prīti* means "joy, pleasure, gladness" < S root ṝpri, "to please, gladden." So when we read *dhammapīti sukhaṃ seti vippasannena cetasā,*… "he sleeps happily *dhammapīti,* with his mind purified…” the compound could mean "whose joy is the dhamma," or "whose protection is the dhamma," or "whose drink is the dhamma." Each make sense in the context. The commentary seems to be unaware of the pun, interpreting only the meaning "drinking": "*dhammapīti* means drinking the *dhamma,* drinking the *dhamma* is the meaning. It is not possible for what is called *dhamma* to be drunk like drinking rice-gruel from a bowl. Attaining the nine-fold super-mundane *dhamma* by the individual, experiencing for oneself with *dhamma* as support, penetrating the four noble truths of suffering etc., by exact

\(^{1021}\) Norman, *Word of Doctrine*, 12.
knowledge and realization, etc., that is indeed drinking the *dhamma.*”  

All the other MI traditions adopted the one *pīti* meaning; in the Tib translation as well, it is translated *chos la dga’ byed* (“having joy in the doctrine”) and the commentary builds only on this theme: “the joy of being born from the clear realization of the doctrine, the joy of dwelling in the dharma, in this manner, dwelling in bliss.” The Ch also translate 喜法, *xī fǎ,* “happiness in the law.”

Brough suggests that “it seems certain that in the original verse *dhamma-pīti* was intended to convey a double sense, both, *pīti* and *prīti*…it is possible that *prīti-* ‘protection’ (*śaraṇa*) is also intended…*dhamme ramati* in the second half of the verse gives a further indication that the sense of *prīti-* was also in the mind of the author of the verse.”

54) *muccati/mucchati/mūrchati* A3

Dhp 71 is a difficult verse containing two complex similes. It reads

*na hi pāpaṃ kataṃ kammaṇaṃ sajju khīraṃva muccaṭi*

*ḍahantaṃ bālam anveti bhasmacchanno va pāvako.*

1022 Dhp-a 2, 12615-127: *dhammapiṭṭhi ti dhammapāyako dhammaṃ pivanto ti attho, dhammo ca nām’ esa na sakkā bhājanena yāguḍīni viya pātum, navavidhām pana lokuttaradhammaṃ kāyena phusanto ārammaṇato sacchikaronto pariṇābhisamayāddhi dukkhāddhi ariyasaccāni paṭivijjhanto dhammaṃ pivati nāma.*

1023 Balk, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavivaraṇa, 8681-2: *chos mngon par rtogs pa las skyes pa’i dga’ ba ni chos la gnas pa’i dga’ ba ste/ des de bde bar gnas pa’o/*

1024 T04n0210_p0564a06.

1025 Brough, GDhp, 244.
“For an evil deed when done does not curdle the same day, as milk does. Burning like fire covered in ashes, it follows the fool." Note that Norman has taken muccati (< S vímuc “to be loosed, to be released”) as mucchati (< S vímurch “to thicken, congeal, assume shape or substance, have power, take effect”), to which we will return below. The problem with this translation is that Norman has taken sajju (< S sadyas, “on the same day, at once immediately”) to modify pāda a, while the commentary makes it clear that it modifies khīraṃ in pāda b: “Milk does not coagulate at the very instant it comes out warm from the udders of a cow - just as that new milk (sajukhīraṃ) does not coagulate, does not change, does not give up its original condition at that very moment. But if, after milking, one places (the milk) in a vessel, as long as one doesn’t put in buttermilk, etc. a sour substance, and as long as one does not use a sour bowl, a curd bowl, etc. then it does not change its nature, but it changes it afterwards, in the very way that an evil deed just done does not ripen. If it would ripen (immediately), no one would dare to do an evil deed. As long as the aggregates born of virtuous deeds last, so long do they protect him; with the dissolution of the aggregates, it (karma) bears fruit in the aggregates which are reborn in hell and reborn, it follows the fool, burning (him). What like? Like fire covered in ashes. Just as covered ashes whose flame has gone out and is subdued, and no longer burns because it’s covered with ashes, but, once it has been heated up burns by the burning of the skin, etc., all the way up to the brain, in just this way as well, an evil deed which someone has done, follows the fool in the second or third individuality burning (him who is) reborn in hell, etc.”


1027 Dhp-a 2, 673-6814: *Tattha sajukhīraṇ ti tām khaṇāṃ yeva dhenuyā thanehi nikkhantām abbhunakhīraṇī [var. na] muccati ti na [var. na omitted] paraṇamatā; idaṃ viṭṭaṃ hoti: yathā idaṃ
milk does not change until later; in the same way a fire which has been subdued can smoulder for a long time under ashes before coming back to life. So Müller’s translation of this verse, captures the right sense: “An evil deed, like newly-drawn milk, does not turn (suddenly); smouldering, like fire covered by ashes, it follows the fool.” Part of the problem with this translation is the word *sajju* which suggests that milk changes immediately, while the commentary makes the point that it doesn’t (we must take *sajjukhīram* in the sense of “new milk”); yet, to make matters more confusing, milk does indeed curdle within 12 hours, so Norman’s translation is taking that into account, by the negative simile (milk changes immediately but karma does not change for some time). Max Müller was himself confused by the verse because of *muccati* (which he derived from *vimuc*, and wondered whether it could mean “changing or turning sour” and because of *Manu* 4, 172 which he quotes, *nādharmas carito loke sadyaḥ phalati gaur iva*, “for an evil act committed in the world does not bear fruit at once, like a cow (which does),” which is the opposite of the commentary. Childers also had problems with this verse; he makes the point that *sajju* modifies *khīram* not the first clause, and that *muccati* when applied to milk means “to curdle” in the sense of “to be got rid of,” thus

---

*sajjukhīram tam khaṇaṇī neva na muccati na pariṇamati na pakatīm vijahati, yasmīṃ pana bhājane duḥhitvā gahitaṃ yāva tattha takkādiambilam na pakhipati, yāva dadhibhājanādikam ambilabhājanam na pāpuṇāti tāva pakatīṃ avijahitvā pacchā jahati, evam pāpakammam pi kariyāmānam eva na paccati, yadi vipacceyya na koci pāpaṃ kammaṃ kātuṃ visaheyya, yāva kusalābhīnibbattā khandhā dharanti tāva nam te rakkhanti,. tesaṃ bhedā apāye nibbattakkhandhesu vipaccati vipaccamānaṇaṃ ca dahkan aṃ bālam anveti. Kiṃ viyā ti: bhasmacchanno va pāvako, yathā hi chārikāya pāticchanno viṭaccitarīgāro okkanto pi chārikāya paticchannattā na tāva dahati, chārikāṃ pana tāpetvā cammādānaṃ dahanavasena yāva matthaluṅgā dahanto gacchati, evameva pāpakammam pi yena katham hoti tam bālam dutiyeva tatiye vā attabhāve nirayādīsu nibbattam dahanam anugacchatī ti.

1028 Müller & Fausbøll, Dhp, 21.
deriving it from व्युष्, “to get rid of.” So he translates, “As newly drawn milk will not curdle for a long while, as fire covered by ashes goes on smouldering for a long while, so it takes a long while to get rid of the consequences of an evil action.” He notes that the two meanings of मुक्ति are lost, depriving the simile of most of its force. In fact, although the pun between व्युष् and व्युर्षिः is definitely audible, व्युर्षिः is probably the primary meaning intended as suggested by Lüders in 1940, and confirmed by Norman. The pun with व्युष् was probably intended and may well have resulted from a dialect which de-aspirated aspirates, or from native Munda or Dravidian speakers for whom MIA was a second language, and who lacked aspirates in their native syllabary. The Tibetans seem to interpret the same way as the commentary and translate नजेस पर सदिग पस ‘प्रहल दु नि ‘ओ मा ल्टा बुर ‘ग्युर मि ‘ब्यूड…”definite evil deeds do not change immediately like milk (does not change immediately),” despite the fact that the Tib equivalent of साज्जु (‘प्रहल दु, “at once”) is placed with the phrase on karma rather than the other way round. The verb ‘ग्युर ब्यूड typically translates a form of the स वि + व्युर्षिः (“transform, cause to alter or change, esp. for the worse”) which is close in meaning to व्युर्षिः. The commentary reads similarly to the Dhp अत्थकथाः: “The meaning of ‘at the time of the action it does not ripen’: because of the non-appearance of experiencing in this very lifetime all karmic acts. An example of the teaching, harmonious with the doctrine is milk; at the very moment (it comes out), it does not change into curds. However, at a later time it does change into curds. Moreover, an example inconsistent with the dharma is ‘immediately’ (साद त्या = सादयाः?): there is a species of herb, which if one put it in the milk, just by inserting it, the milk changes into

---

1031 Lüders, Philologica Indica, 184; Norman, Word of the Doctrine, 82.
1032 Negi, Dictionary, 708.
curds. Evil acts are not like this. Thus the fool ‘causes a fire,’ because it causes great harm at the time of ripening of the evil acts which follow after the being who has done the evil.”

The Ch version of this gāthā occurs in chapter 17 (Pāpavagga) and has the same sense as the other versions: “Evil does not (mature) immediately, like new (lit: “pulled”) cow’s milk; crimes wait in secrecy, like a fire covered with ashes.”

This is another case where the restoration of the “correct” sense of muccati > murchati, destroys the richness of the verse. Clearly in the original composition of the verse both meanings were to be understood: evil deeds, like milk, do not coagulate (muccati = P mucchati = S murchati) immediately as they ripen in future lives; one is also not liberated (P muccati = S mucyate) from evil deeds, for the same reason. This can also be interpreted, as Childers did, based on the single verb muccati: evil deeds, like milk, are not gotten rid of..., with murchati as a secondary (but unetymological) overtone. The problem is that in MI muccati and mucchati are usually not interchangeable the -cc- and -cch- are separate phonemes, and both aspiration and deaspiration are possible. So it is impossible to tell which form is earlier or the “original,”

—

1033 Balk, Prajināvarman’s Udānavivaraṇa, 39217-30 (ad UV 213): byas ba’i don te/ las thams cad kyang mthong ba’i chos nyid la myong bar mi snang ba’i phyir ro/ mthun pa’i chos kyi dpe bstan pa/ ’o ma lta bur zhes bya ba yin te dper na ’o ma ni dus de nyid du zhor mi ’gyur te/ ’on kyang dus phyi ma zhig na zhor ’gyur ba de bzhin no/ yang na chos mi mthun pa’i dpe ni ’phral du zhes bya ba ni sad tya zhes bya ba’i rtswa’i rigs yod de ’o ma la des btab na btsug pa tsam nyid du zhor ’gyur te/ sdig pa’i las ni de lta bu ma yin no/ des ni byis pa sreg par byed/ ces bya ba ni sdiq pa’i las smin par ’gyur ba’i dus na shin tu gnod par byed pa’i phyir te/ sdig pa byed pa’i skye bo’i rjes su ’brang bar ’gyur ro/

1034 T04n0210_p0565a9-10: 惡不即時，如攜牛乳，罪在隱[伺]伺，如灰覆火. È bù jìshí, rúgòu niù, zuì zài yǐn[si]sì, rú huī fù huǒ. A second UV version (identical) with commentary is found at T04n0212_p0671b29-c10.
whether mucchi was aspirated (which is common in MI) or mucchati deaspirated (uncommon). Nevertheless, based on semantic suitability, mucchati (as it occurs in the PDhp 107-b) makes more sense contextually, and therefore is probably the earlier form.

55) rūpasāṅkhavimutto/rūpasāṅkhāvimutto A5

In the Aggivacchasutta, the Buddha is questioned by Vacchagotta on the nature of the Tathāgata, whether he exists after death, doesn’t, both exists and doesn’t exist or neither exists or doesn’t exist. The Buddha responds with a question about the nature of fire, showing Vaccha that the question of where did the fire go after it was extinguished was not relevant (na upeti, “does not apply”); the following description of the Tathāgata then occurs, spoken by the Buddha: “So too, Vaccha, the Tathāgata has abandoned that material form by which one describing the Tathāgata might describe him, he has cut it off at the root, made it like a palm stump, done away with it so that it is no longer subject to future arising. The Tathāgata is liberated from reckoning in terms of material form (and so the rest of the aggregates), Vaccha, he is profound, immeasurable, unfathomable like the ocean. The term 'reappears' (upapajjati) does not apply, the term 'does not reappear' does not apply, the term 'both reappears and does not reappear' does not apply, the term 'neither reappears nor does not reappear' does not apply…”

The compound rūpa-sāṅkhā-vimutto (found in the PTS, Thai, Cambodian and

1035 Geiger, Grammar, §40.
1036 Translation by Ānāmoli & Bodhi, Middle-Length Discourses, 593: MN 1, 487-88: Evam eva kho Vaccha yena rūpena tathāgataṁ paññāpayamāno paññāpeyya taṁ rūpam tathāgatassa paññāṁ uchinnamūlaṁ tālāvatthukatam anabhāvamkatam āyatim anuppādadhammaṁ; rūpasāṅkhavimutto [var. rūpasāṅkhāvimutto] kho Vaccha tathāgato, gambhīro appameyyo duppariyogālho seyyathā pi
Sinhalese editions) “liberated from reckoning in terms of material from” (< S sam + ākhyā, “to reckon, calculate, count up”) has an unusual counterpart in the Burmese edition, ṛūpa-sankhaya-vimutto, “free from loss in terms of form,” or “free from the destruction of form” (< S saṃ-kṣaya < saṃ + ākṣi) with a somewhat different meaning. Which is correct? It is easy to see how this happened in the transmission of the doctrine. Either the original from was - sankhaya, and the -aya > -ā or the original form was -saṅkhā and the final -ā was interpreted as a development from -aya > -ā, and “restored.”

Logically, they both make sense, with slightly different emphases. The first compound says that the Tathāgata has transcended the very notion of the five aggregates and can not be thought of in those terms; he has completely gone beyond the human conceptual structure. The second suggests that he is liberated from the destruction of the aggregates, having achieved some immutable mahāsamuddo (“great ocean”) state of being. How did the traditions interpret this passage? Buddhaghosa writes, “By which form (yena rupena) means by which form someone might name the Tathāgata a person, saying ‘he has material qualities.’” This might apply to either word -saṅkhā- or -saṅkhaya-, but favours the former as -saṅkhāta and saṅkhā are derived from the same verb (saṅkhāyati < S saṃ + ākhyā). The Ṭīkā has “By which form’ (yena rupena) means by the breaking up of the clinging, etc. to existence through the phenomenon of form. ‘That form (tam rūpaṃ)... has been abandoned by the Tathāgata (Tathāgatassa pahīnāṃ) means that because the Tathāgata, whose mind is free from mental obsessions, has abandoned the fetters that have bound him to

mahāsamuddo, upapajjatīti na upeti, na upapajjatīti na upeti, upapajjatī ca na ca upapajjatīti na upeti, n’ eva upapajjatī na na upapajjatīti na upeti.

1037 See von Hinüber, Das ältere Mittelindisch, §142.

1038 Ps 3, 1992-3: yena rūpenā ti yena rūpena sattasarikhātaṃ tathāgatam rūpī ti paññāpeyya. The compound sattasarikhātam could also mean Tathāgata as reckoned as dependent…” for satta is a homonym with a variety of meanings in the context.
form, his nature is non-arising.” Neither of these directly addresses the actual compound rūpa-saṅkhāya(ā)-vimutto, but there is another commentary on this passage which occurs in the Khemāsutta (SN 4, 374f) where the bhikkhu Khemā instructs King Pasenadi about the nature of the Tathāgata in almost identical words to the Buddha’s own description in the Aggivacchasutta. Here the compound in question takes yet another form, rūpa-saṅkhāya vimutto (Sn 4, 3791) where presumably the word saṅkhāya is in the ablative case, i.e. rūpe saṅkhāya vimutto, “freed from reckoning in terms of form,” although it might also be a type of syntactical compound with saṅkhāya the absolutive of sankhāyati, viz., rūpaṃ saṅkhāya vimutto, “freed, having considered form carefully.” The commentary takes it in the first instance:

“By which form the Tathāgata (yena rupena tathāgata) means by which form - long or short, dark or light - one might declare the Tathāgata to be a so-called person. ‘The Tathāgata has abandoned that form’ (taṃ rūpaṃ tathāgatassa pahīnaṃ) means by abandoning form which has these qualities, the Tathāgata has abandoned form. ‘He is freed from reckoning in terms of form’ (rūpasarāṅkhāya vimutto) means that there will be no arising of form in the future, and also with the elimination of the expression, ‘He will be of such a form, consisting of form or formlessness,’ he is liberated also from the arising of form.” Here the meaning is clear: the designation “form, feeling, etc.” is simply not accurate anymore, they do not apply to the

Tathāgata, he has transcended them. It is saṅkhā, “reckoning,” paññatti, “designation, concept, idea,” and vohāra, “expression” that he is free from, free from naming, free from nāmarūpa.

The Ch translation uses the verb 斷 (duàn, “cut-off, eliminate, sever”) to express the thought in the sūtra: “Because the Tathāgata has cut off form, sensation, perception, mental volition and consciousness are also cut off in this way. All is already eliminated. For example some people cut off the palm tree, which once broken will not return to life. The Tathāgata is also the same; he has cut off the five aggregates, he no longer endures birth. (He has achieved) nirvāṇa without thinking, the state of the non-arising of dharmas.” It suggests that the translator is taking the second compound rūpa-saṅkhaya-vimutto in the senses of “freed by the destruction of form, etc.” i.e. as an instrumental, rather than an ablative (“freed from…”) tatpuruṣa. There is also a version of this sūtra contained in the Tib translation of the Abhidharmakośaṭīkopāyika (chos mngon pa’i mdzod kyi ’grel bshad nye bar mkho ba), but unfortunately it does not translate this phrase (although much of the other material is there), so it was presumably not present in the original.

---

1041 T02n0100_p0445b26-2 (別譯雜阿含經, Biéyì zá āhán Jīng): 如來已斷如斯色故。受想行識。亦復如是。皆悉已斷。譬如有人斷多羅樹斷已不生。如來亦爾。斷五陰已。不復受生。寂滅無想。是無生法。

1042 D4094. The relevant section occurs on pecha 158a, line 7 and may be found at http://www.aciparchive.org/ace/#lyt%28vol%29col%28tendg%29title%283033%29sq%28chos%20mngon%20pa%27%20mdzod%20kyi%20%27%27grel%20bshad%20anye%20%20mkho%20%20ba%20%29hit%28first%29%29%20pg%28315%29, starting with be’u de bzhin du de bzhin gshegs pas… (“Vatsa, in this way the Tathāgata….”). Accessed May 2013.
This is an interesting example of an arcane expression with two variants, both of which are intelligible in the context, and where one has apparently derived from the other and changed the original meaning. By the “majority rules” criterion of historical linguistics, the correct reading is -saṅkhā- and it is also most cogent in meaning; however in terms of directionality it is easier to posit an original -saṅkhaya- > -saṅkhā- with -aya > -ā, rather than a back-translation, -saṅkhā- > saṅkhaya. And of course it could have been a simple dictation mistake.

56) vivatta-chadda/vighuṣṭa-śabda A1, A4 (ś- >< -ch)

One of the most fascinating examples of the vicissitudes of transmission is how an old epithet of the Buddha, vivatta-chadda ("one who draws away the veil") has become vighuṣṭa-śabda ("resounding name") in Sanskritized Pkt. The phrase occurs in a standardized pericope describing the thirty-two lakṣaṇas of the mahāpurisa: if he becomes a wheel-turning monarch, he will possess the seven treasures and will conquer and pacify the land; if he leaves home he will become a fully enlightened Buddha who will "draw back the veil of the world." At first Norman thought the BHS version was the earlier form, but then changed his mind a few years later, because of the existence of the epithet vi(y)aṭṭa-chauma (same meaning; S chadman > AMg. chauma) in the Jaina canon. Norman provides quite a tortuous derivation for

1043 DN 1, 897-9: …sace kho pana agārasmā anagāriyam pabbajati, arahām hoti sammā-sambuddho loke vivatṭacchaddo. Translation from Walshe, Long Discourses, 112.
the evolution of the hypothetical original form *vivṛṭta-chadda > *vivuṭṭha-chadda > vi(y)utta- > *vihuṭṭa- (insertion of an -h- glide) > vihuṭṭha > *vighuṭṭha- > vighuṣṭa. The change of -chadda > -śabda occurred as a hyper-Sanskritisation in a dialect where the ś- > -ch. There is always the possibility that vivatta- > vighuṣṭa was a “willkürliche Umdeutung” (“arbitrary reinterpretation”) by a scribe, who, once he understood chada as śabda, was influenced by such similar expressions as vighuṣṭa-kīrti (“fame spread wide”) and made up vighuṣṭa based on the vague phonetic similarity with vivatta, and his familiarity with similar compounds. Nevertheless Norman felt that the occurrence of vighuṣṭa-śabda in three BHS texts (Lalitavistara, Mahāvastu and Mahāvadānasutta) was too much of a coincidence for each to have developed the same compound separately and that they must go back to a single source. To this we may add the Tib and Ch translations which also seem to have had vighuṣṭa-śabda (or something very similar) in their exemplars. The Tibetans translate this phrase sgra grags (sgra = śabda, grags pa = vighuṣṭa). I have not made an exhaustive study of the Ch, but from a look at the sections corresponding to vivatta-chadda in the Lakkhana and Ambaṭṭha suttas, we find in the former 名稱流布周聞十方 (míngchēng liúbù zhōu wén shífāng, “his name is disseminated and

\[1046\] This is von Hinüber’s opinion. For the change -chadda > -śabda, see Ibid, 112; also in Collected Papers 3, 99. For von Hinüber’s opinion see, “Sanskrit und Gāndhārī,” 32-33 (also in Kleine Schriften, Teil 1, 586-87). He points out that in G chada = S śabda. He calls the derivation from vivatta > vighuṣṭa unlikely: “Nur eine Fülle von Annahmen, die wenig Wahrscheinlichkeit in sich haben, würde von vivatta zu vighuṣṭa führen.” (“Only with a large amount of assumptions that have little likelihood in themselves would vivatta lead to vighuṣṭa.”)

\[1047\] Per Negi, Dictionary, 527 (grags) 848 (sgra). In the former citation Negi quotes the compound from the Tattvsamgrahapanjikā: vighuṣṭa-śabda iti sakalajagatprakhyātakīrtih (vighuṣṭa-śabda means “fame celebrated amongst all the people”). According to the Sutta correspondence project (http://www.suttacentral.net/, accessed June 2013), there is a Tib correspondence for the Ambaṭṭhasutta in the Tib Vinaya, but I have been unable to locate it. There are however numerous use of the compound sgra grags, presumably translating vighuṣṭa-śabda.
heard everywhere in the ten directions")\textsuperscript{1048} and 有大名稱 流聞天下 in the latter (yǒu dàmíng chēng liú wén tiānxià, “He has great fame which pervades the world”).\textsuperscript{1049} It is therefore, fairly certain, that all these are derived phonologically from one source and unlikely to be an arbitrary reinterpretation which somehow spread around the sub-continent, presumably from a single scribe’s invention. I think the answer lies in the Pkt form vi(y)attā which, as well as being a derivative of S vivṛtta (“opened”), is also (in the form viatthā, with -ṭṭha- replacing -ṭṭa-, attested in the P variants in the aspirated form),\textsuperscript{1050} equivalent to S vikṛṣṭa (“extensive, vast, sprawling, long, far, sounded”) and it is this word that was “mistaken” for viatth(a). From vikṛṣṭa > vighuṣṭa is not a large leap, and in any case, the two have a similar meaning, in this usage of the past participle (“whose name is extensive/sounded”). A normal MI evolution would be viatthā > vikṛṣṭa > *vikhuṣṭa (-k- > -kh-; vocalic -r- > -u-), and from there to > vighuṣṭa involves just a simple lenition of the consonant.\textsuperscript{1051} The latter (“proclaimed loudly” < S vi + ṭbhu, “to proclaim aloud”) was probably chosen by the scribe as a more apt verb in the context than vikṛṣṭa, although the meanings are very similar. This suggestion then solves an old mystery: the BMI form of this compound was viatth(a)-cchadda and it took on the meaning vighuṣṭa because viatth(a) also meant vikṛṣṭa which was very similar in meaning and only steps away phonologically from vighuṣṭa. The final compound member -cchadda was interpreted as śabda,

\textsuperscript{1048} T01n0026_p0493b08. The second set of characters,周聞十方 may well be translating another word.

\textsuperscript{1049} T01n0001_p0082a23.

\textsuperscript{1050} See Norman, “Two Pali Etymologies,” 322; also in Collected Papers 2, 73. DN 2, 16\textsuperscript{24} has vivatthachado as well as vivattaccchadda. In AMg viṭṭa = S vivṛtta and viatthā = S vikṛṣṭa, per Mylius, Wörterbuch, 552 (viatthā = “auseinandergezogen, ausgedehnt, lang, weit”) and Sheth, Prakrit Dictionary, 765.

\textsuperscript{1051} See Pischel §206. The derivation may also run vikṛṣṭa > vikuṣṭa > vihuṣṭa > vighuṣṭa.
both in order to make sense of \textit{vik(h)uṣṭa/vighuṣṭa}, and because in some dialects like G and perhaps others \textit{-chada} was one of the Pkt forms of that word.

57) Chinese translations of the Sn \textit{Atṭhakavagga} A5

One of the continuing findings of this study is the inaccuracy of the transmission/translation process which occurred because of dialect changes. This sometimes led to complete change of meanings, as in the example just discussed (\textit{viaṭṭa} < \textit{vivṛttā} and \textit{viaṭṭha} < \textit{vikṛṣṭa}), and an impoverishment of the (in this case) BHS canon, where an important doctrinal message (the Buddha’s piercing of the false veil of existence) is replaced by empty hyperbole (“far sounding words”). These confusions were of course not restricted to within the MI Buddhist teachings, but were also prevalent in translations into Tib and Ch. One of the oldest compositions in Buddhism is the Sn and within the Sn, the last two books, the \textit{Atṭhakavagga} and \textit{Pārāyanavagga} are old enough to have their own commentary in the canon. Unfortunately we have no other MI versions of these text, although the \textit{Atṭakavagga} was translated into Ch under the name \textit{義足經\textcopyright Yìzú Jīng}, usually called the \textit{Arthapada Sūtra}. Some parts of this translation seem completely unrelated to the P (see discussion on page 209 above) and others correspond but with significant differences in interpretation on the part of the Ch translator. In Sn 773, for example, in \textit{pāda c} the P reads \textit{pacchā pure vā pi apekkhamānā}, “...desiring [what comes] after or [what went] before...”\textsuperscript{1052} Here \textit{apekkhamānā} is taken as the present participle of \textit{apa + i kkhati} (< S \textit{apa + vikṣ = apekṣ}, “to look for, expect, hope”) which the commentary

\footnote{\textsuperscript{1052} \textit{Norman, Group of Discourses}, 98.}
confirms with the gloss kathāṃ pure apekkhaṃ karoti? (“How does one hope for the past?”). The Ch interpretation is however quite different, translating pāda c 不觀去來法 (Bù guān qù lái fǎ, “things of the past and future he never doth glance”), taking apekkhamānā as a-pekkhamānā, the negative form of pekkhamāna (< S vṛkṣ, “observe, look at, behold”), in effect translating the exact opposite of what is found in the P. Another interesting example is found in Sn 899 where pāda d reads: satthā va hīno (var. satthā vihino) pavasaṃ gharamhā, which Norman translates (p. 112) “… as one who has lost his caravan [and is] far from home [desires his caravan or home].” The word sattha is a homonym in P (see discussion above, page 377) which has several meanings including < svārtha (“one’s own affair or cause, one’s own self-interest”). The commentary makes it clear that we are here dealing with sattha = sārtha, “caravan,” but also puns on the word satther, “teacher”: “Just as a man who has left his home lives with a caravan, when he is separated from the caravan, pursues the caravan or returns to his own home, in just this way, a person with views grasps after this teacher (satthaṃ) or another teacher, this dhamma teaching or another dhamma teaching, this sect or another sect…” Here sattha, “caravan,” is equated with “home” which is the detached

1053 Nidd 1, 3310-14: pacchā puraṃ vā pi apekkhamānā ti. Pacchā vuccati anāgataṃ, pure vuccati affitaṃ; api ca affitaṃ upādāya anāgatañ ca paccuppannañ ca pacchā, anāgataṃ upādāya affitañ ca paccuppannañ ca pure. Kathāṃ pure apekkhaṃ karoti? Afterwards means the future, before means the past. Moreover, with reference to the past, both the future and the present are afterwards, with reference to the future, both the past and the present are before. How does one hope for/expect/look for the past?” (he then recalls his past lives).

1054 Translation by Bapat, Arthapada Sūtra, 1, 152.

1055 Nidd 1, 3122-28: yathā puriso gharato nikkhanto, satthena saha vasanto, satthā ohino, taṃ vā satthāṃ anubandhati sakaṃ vā gharāṃ paccāgacchati; evam eva so diṭṭhigatiko taṃ vā satthāraṃ gaṅhāti, aṅṇaṃ vā satthāraṃ gaṅhāti; taṃ vā dhammakkhaṇaṃ gaṅhāti, aṅṇaṃ vā dhammakkhaṇaṃ gaṅhāti; taṃ vā gaṇaṃ gaṅhāti, aṅṇaṃ vā gaṇaṃ gaṅhāti,...
state mentioned in the next gāthā (Sn 900-c: ‘suddhi asuddhi ti apatthayāno, “not desiring purity [or] impurity”), contrasted with the views of this or that satthar, teacher. The Ch translator takes satthā as the ablative of svārthā, someone who is “bereft of his own self-interest,” or as Bapat has translated “He is fallen from his aim and mere suffering doth he meet.” (自義失生死苦, zì yì shī shēngsǐ kǔ). 1056 Apparently the translator did not have the Niddesa at hand.

One further example occurs in Sn 810, where in pāda b we find the compound vivittamānasam which has two possibilities for parsing, vivitta-mānasam (“solitary, pure, distinguished mind”) or vivittam-ānasam (= -āsanam with metathesis of -s- and -n-, “solitary residence”). The Niddesa takes it in the latter sense and comments: “āsanam means where they sit. A bed, a seat, a cushion, a small mat, a piece of leather for a rug, a mat of grass, a covering with leaves and straw. This seat (āsanam) is devoid of seeing disagreeable forms, it is separated and secluded from them; it is devoid of hearing disagreeable sounds…” 1057 The Ch, however, take it in the sense of vivitta-mānasam (“mind purified”), translating 比丘諦莫妄念 (bǐqiū dì mò wàngniàn, “The monk does not have any illusory thoughts about the truth”), with apparently 諦莫妄念 (lit.: “no deluded thoughts about the truth”) equated to vivitta-mānasam, 1058 another example where the MI and Ch traditions differ. Buddhaghosa, however, quotes this gāthā in Visuddhimagga, ...

1056 Translation of Sn 900 by Norman, Group of Discourses, 112. For Ch, see Bapat, Arthapada Sūtra, vol. 3, 1418-19. The last three characters 生死苦 (lit: “suffering of birth and death”) are a very loose approximation of pavasam gharamhā (“dwelling far from home”).

1057 Nidd 1, 13116-20: Āsanam vuccati yattha nisidanti, mañco pītham bhisi taṭṭikā cammakhanḍo tinasanthāro pannasanthāro palāsanthāro; tam āsanam asappāyarūpadassanena rittam vivittam pavivittam, asappāyasaddassavanena rittam [var. vittam] vivittam pavivittam, ...

1058 Translated by Bapat, vol. 1, Arthapada Sūtra, 1865238-8, as “On the Truth, the Bhikṣu contemplates without being forgetful.” T04n0198_p0179a15.
21, 110 with vivitta-mānasam, (trans. as “seclusion of mind”),\textsuperscript{1059} despite the Niddesa interpretation. The Burmese Chattha Sangayana edition has “corrected” the text and Dhammapāla’s gloss to vivittam-āsanaṃ, which could refer to either, but (because of the repetition of citta in the preceding compound (kāyacittavivekasiddhiyā), appears to refer to mānasam): “of a monk who resorts to a secluded residence/secluded mind (vivittam-āsanaṃ/vivitta-mānasam)\textsuperscript{1060} because he has accomplished the detachment of mind and body.”

58) sīthila/sāthila/susthira/sīśīla A1, A3, A4 (change of -t- > -l-)

This is a well known sticky wicket which occurs in Dhp 346-b and also in Jātaka 201 (Jā.2, 140\textsuperscript{19-23}, Bandhanāgārajātika) and in the Bandhanasutta (SN 1, 77\textsuperscript{16-19}) All of these have been harmonized to the same reading:

etam dalhaṃ bandhanam āhu dhīrā ohārinam sīthilaṃ duppamuñcaṃ.

etam pi chetvāna paribbajanti anapekkhino kāmasukhaṃ pahāya.

“This longing]…wise men call a strong fetter, which drags down, is hard to loosen by those who are slack. Cutting even this, people go forth without longing, abandoning the happiness of

\textsuperscript{1059} Noṣamoli, Visuddhimagga, 689. In the P edition (Warren, Visuddhimagga, 572) the editor lists the Nidd variant but apparently none of the manuscripts he possessed (6 Burmese and Singhalese MSS) showed it, as there is not variant listed for the compound vivitta-mānasam. The compound may be found on p. 666\textsuperscript{22} in the PTS edition.

\textsuperscript{1060} Vism-a (2, 473, Myanmar edition online version as part of DPR), bhikkhuno kāyacittavivekasiddhiyā vivittamāsanaṃ bhajamānassa. See also Bapat, Arthapada Sūtra, 186, footnote 4.
The problem is the word *sithilam* (<S śīthila, “loose, slack, relaxed, untied,”) which appears not to make sense in the context, as it modifies *bandhanam* and therefore means “a loose bond” which seems to be an oxymoron. Norman resolves this, using a suggestion by Brough, by treating *sithilamduppamuñcam* as a compound, with the -ṃ- being used m.c. However, although this resolves the semantic issue, making *sithilam* part of an instrumental or genitival *tatpurusa* compound (“hard to loosen for those who are slack”) instead of an adjective modifying *bandhanam*, it does not resolve the metrical issue which requires a long-short-short for a correct *triṣṭubh* metre. Lüders felt that the “Grundform” must have been *suṣṭhilam* (<S susṭhira, “very firm or steady”) which is reflected in the UV version, and which was changed by the P redactor to *sathilam* (one of the variant readings for *sithilam* in other P contexts), and from there > *sithilam*. The G version has *śīśila*, which is a normal derivation from *śithila* (-th- > -ś-) and the PDhp has *sukhumam* (“subtle”), which does not correspond. Moreover the Tib translation, which usually corresponds to the UV, instead of *susṭhiram*, has *lhod kyang* (“although loose”) which is the normal translation for S *śithilam(api).* The Ch versions translate as if they had *susṭhira* (固, gu, “hard, firm”) in their exemplar. The commentaries have taken *sithilam* as modifying *bandhanam* and have

---

1062 Brough GDhp, 131; Norman, ibid, 159. Norman says that the metrical problem is overcome by “assuming that *sithilam*- is a compound with -ṃ- m.c., to give the break short-short-long,” however, as Brough points out the UV version *susṭhiram* gives the correct metre except for the last -ṃ- which should be short.
1063 Lüders, *Beobachtungen* §82.
1064 Negi, *Dictionary*, 7584.
1065 The translation of the Dhp has: T04n0210_p0571a17慧說愛為獄, 深固難得出, Huì shuō ài wèi yù, shēngù nándé chū, “A wise person says that desire becomes a prison. It is deep and firm and difficult to get out of.” UV version at T04n0213_p0778a11. It is different but still uses 固: 為愛染纏綿, 堅固難出離,
sought to rationalize as follows: “‘Loose’ not like bonds of iron, etc., which prevent the four postures and (render one) immovable; for although bound with this bond, they even go to other places and other oceans,” and, in the commentary on the Dhp: “‘Loose’ where the bonds are, (for) it does not cut the flesh of the skin, it does not draw blood, it does not reveal the bound state. It affords the performance of actions on water or land-routes, therefore sithilaṃ.” Thus, the bonds are “loose,” as one can still act and one is not aware of nature of the bondage. The Tib commentary rationalizes in yet a different fashion: beings are unaafraid of the bonds because they think it is easy to be free of them which is a wrong view. However, “If one enters (into the bond) as one wishes/easily/comfortably (yathākāmaṃ) with looseness (lhod pas, “relaxedly”), one binds the self, he does not know. Because of the difficulty of freeing oneself from that, although one desires the release, one is not able to.” They are loose bonds because they are easy to enter into, although hard to get rid of. The Tib gloss then provides one possible solution to the problem: sithilaṃ is an adverb formed from the adjective, with the meaning “easily,” and modifies the adjectival compound duppamuṇicāṃ which modifies

Wèi àirǎn chánfù, jiāngù nán chū lì, “One is bound by the entanglements of love and desire which are solid and difficult to extricate oneself from.” In the Dhp version 深，shēn, seems to translated ohārinam (“dragging down, weighty, heavy”) and 固, gù, susthiraṃ; in the UV version 堅固 only seems to translate susthiraṃ.

1066 Spk 1, 14725-28 ad Bandhanasutta SN 1, 7630-7719: sithilan ti, na āyasādi bandhanam viya iriyāpatham nivāretvā ṭhiṭam. Tena hi bandhanena baddhā paradesam pi parasamuddam pi gacchanti yeva.

1067 Dhp-a 4, 5614-17: sithilan ti bandhanatṭhāne chavicammamaṃsāni na chindati lohitaṃ na nīharati, bandhanabhāvam pi ajānāpetivā thalapathajalapathādīsu kammāni kātuṃ defi ti sithilaṃ. One variant has na deti... (“It does not afford the performance...”)  
1068 Balk, Prajñāvarman’s Udānavivaṇṇa, 15712-15: lhod pas ji ltar ’dod pa bzhin du ’jug pa na bdag ni bcings so zhes mi shes pa yin no/ de rab tu dgrol bar dka’bas dgrol bar ’dod kyang dgrol bar mi nus pa yin te/
bandhanam (“the bonds which are difficult to be freed from easily”). This resolves the issue of having a tatpurusā compound with an unusual anusvāra in the middle, but the metrical problem remains. Lüders hypothesis - that the original word was *suṭṭhilaṁ, without the doubling in written form, and that sathilaṁ and sithilaṁ are spoiled versions (“verderbt”) by a P scribe to whom the first form was unknown - might also work except that we have no evidence of a form *suṭṭhilaṁ, and explanations which require random changes are not particularly cogent. It does however resolve the problem with the metre: in this scenario the compound would be a karmadharāya compound modifying bandhanam, *suṭṭhila-duppamuñcaṁ (“bonds which are very firm and difficult to be free from”), and the metre is correct (long-short-short-long-short-long-x). It also accounts for the UV form sustīraṁ, as a back-formation. The Pkt word suṭṭhia/sutthiya (< S susthita, “well established, firm, unshaken”) is probably a better candidate for this “Grundform” as it is well attested in AMg and Mg in which dialects an intervocalic -t- often changes > -l- (Pischel §244: S sūta > Mg śūla; S asīta > AMg āśila; S susthīta > sutthīta > sutthiya or *sutthila), plus it occurs in both retroflex and dental form, which would account for the saṭṭhila/sithila forms in P.1069 The change from -u- > -a- or -i- remains to be explained, and although the Pktts sometimes exhibit these changes, it is not attested for this word and we must assume that it occurred through some confusion with the MI word sithila/saṭṭhila which also may have had a form *suthila.1070 In this case the translation would be almost semantically identical

1069 See Sheth, Prakrit Dictionary, 914, 916. See also Turner, Comparative Dictionary, 13538.
1070 Pischel §123, 124. The vowel sequence -u-, -i-, -a- in words of more than two syllables, Lüders believed to be a feature of the eastern dialects (e.g. purisa, munisa), per Beobachtungen §36. Thus sithila may well have an earlier form sutthila which Mehendale accepts in Some Aspects of Indo-Aryan Linguistics, 53 (Mehendale, however, believes the word still meant “loose” and that this meaning was not inconsistent with dalham, citing a passage from the Taittirīya Saṃhitā 3.2.4.3 where the words drṣṭhe and
to the above with *sutthiya/*sutthita/*sutthila-duppamuṅcaṁ being a karmadhāraya modifying bandhanam (“bonds which are well established and difficult to be free from”). Even if this is correct, this still leaves the strange form sukhumāṁ unexplained, which does not appear to be phonologically related to the others.

59) *vibhū, vibhūta* A6

What does the word *vibhūta* mean? It is the past participle of the verb *vi + bhū* which has the meaning of “to arise, develop, be manifest; be equal to or a match for, suffice; pervade, fill; to be able to or capable of; to exist.” However in P, the verb means “to cease to exist” and it’s past participle is usually translated “destroyed or annihilated.” Yet there is no trace of such a meaning in Vedic, from which Middle Indic developed. How did the P form take on a meaning opposite to the earlier Vedic one?\(^{1071}\) It is a mystery. The only canonic usage of *vibhūta* in the older, positive sense, may be in *Sandhasutta* (AN 5, 322\(^{33}\)-326\(^{19}\)) where the Buddha describes to Sandha how a “thoroughbred person” (*purisājānīya*) should meditate. He says, “Herein, Sandha, for the goodly thoroughbred man, in earth the consciousness of earth is made clear… (and so forth with regard to the other elements, the arūpajhānas and what is seen, heard, sensed cognized, reached, sought after and examined by the mind).\(^{1072}\) The author justifies the

---


translation “made clear” on the basis of the commentator who equates the word *vibhūta* with *pākaṭa* (“evident, clear, manifest”). He quotes a *sutta* where *vibhūta* apparently means “transcending” (*samatikkama*) and a clear (*vibhūta*) view of the *tilakkhanas* is engendered, because of insight meditation.\(^\text{1073}\) In his new translation of the AN *Bhikkhu* Bodhi has changed the meaning of *vibhūta* to “disappeared”: “the perception of earth has disappeared in relation to earth.”\(^\text{1074}\) He argues that this is the only meaning of *vibhūta* in the *Nikāyas* and that the context also supports this interpretation, as the thoroughbred meditator is not meditating in dependence on anything and in the *sutta*, even the devas do not know what he is meditating on.\(^\text{1075}\) Ven. Bodhi also mentions the *Saññāsutta* (AN 5, 318\(^\text{10}\)-321\(^\text{6}\)) where Ānanda asks the Buddha whether a *bhikkhu* “could obtain such a state of concentration that he would not be percipient of earth in relation to earth…” This only occurs when he has entered *nibbāna*: “this is peaceful, this is sublime, that is, the stilling of all activities, the relinquishment of all acquisitions, ...”\(^\text{1076}\)

---

\(^{1073}\)Mp 5, 8015-20: *pathaviyaṃ pathavisaññā vibhūtā hoti ti* pathavārammane uppannā catukkapajacakajhānasaññā vibhūtā pākaṭa hoti; ‘vibhūtā bhante rūpasaññā avibhūtā atṭhikasaññā’ ti imasmiṃ hi sutte samatikkamassā atṭhīlāya vibhūlatā vuttā. Idha pana vipassanāvāsenā aniccadukkhānattato diṭṭhātā vibhūtā nāma jātā. “A clear perception in the fourfold & the fivefold system of meditation has arisen regarding the sense-object earth. ‘Clear, Sir, is the perception of form, unclear the perception of bones.’ In this *sutta*, the state of *vibhūta* is said on account of transcending, but here a clear view regarding impermanence, suffering and not-self is engendered because of insight meditation.” The origin of this verse is not known, although it is also referred to in the *Visuddhimagga* 3, 110 (PTS 112\(^5\)-3).


\(^{1075}\) AN 5, 325\(^7\)-8:

*Namo te purisājañña namo te purisuttama
yassa tenābhijānāma yam pi nissāya jhāyasī ti.*

“Homage to you, O remarkable man, Homage to you, O highest of men. We do not understand what you meditate in dependence on.”
the destruction of craving, dispassion, cessation, nibbāna.”¹⁰⁷⁶ These very words are repeated in the next sutta, the Manasikārasutta in the case of a monk who obtains “such a state of concentration that he would not attend fo the eye and forms, the ear and sounds, etc.”¹⁰⁷⁷ It does seem, therefore, that vibhūta has changed from its older meaning, “made clear” or “arisen” to its opposite, “disappeared.” However, the Niddesa commentary to the Sn use of the word vibhūta preserves some vestiges of how this may have happened, once again confirming Norman’s observation that the commentary is sometimes more accurate than the root text (see below).¹⁰⁷⁸

By way of background, there seems to have always been some ambivalence in the Buddhist teachings about what happens at the highest stages of meditation. In the arūpa jhānas (meditation on boundless space, boundless consciousness, nothingness and neither perception nor non-perception), there is no materiality to concentrate on, but there is still some form of awareness - although not possessing the normal consciousness, the meditator "still meditates" (evam jhāyī kho).¹⁰⁷⁹ In the ninth jhāna, the cessation of perception and feeling, normal perception does cease, but this appears to be a culmination of various other meditation stages where perception does not cease, but is heightened through insight. Yet even within

¹⁰⁷⁶ Bodhi, AN, 1557-58. AN 5, 318¹⁴-319¹⁸: siyā nu kho bhante bhikkhuno tathārūpo samādhipatiḷābhō, yathā neva pathaviyaṁ pathavisāṇī assā,... etam santam, etam paṇīlam, yad idam sabbasarīkhārasamatho sabbūpadhiṭānissaggo taṇhākkhayo virāgo nirodho nibbānaṁ ti.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Bodhi, AN, 1559. AN 5, 321¹¹-¹⁴: siyā nu kho bhante bhikkhuno tathārūpo samādhipatiḷābhō, yathā na cakkhuṁ manasikareyya, na rūpaṁ manasikareyya, na sotāṁ manasi kareyya, na saddāṁ manasi kareyya...

¹⁰⁷⁸ Norman, "Buddhism and the Commentarial Tradition," 210, 217.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Saddhasutta, AN 5, 326⁶. See also discussion above on sabbatopabhaṁ (section 48, page 378 above) where name and form dies out and consciousness ceases.
that meditative state there is an experience of dhammas of some kind: in the Anupadasutta, where the Buddha describes Sāriputta’s experience of the jhānas, we read that after he emerged from the samāpatti, Sāriputta “recalled the states that had passed, ceased, and changed, thus: ‘So indeed, these states, not having been, come into being; having been, they vanish.’” This does suggest that there was some experience of dhammas even within the meditative state. In the Mūlapariyāyasutta, for example the aspiring bhikkhu is counselled to imitate the Tathāgata who, unlike the ordinary person who perceives earth as earth and superimposes various dualistic conceptions on top of the percept, “having directly known earth as earth, he [the Tathāgata] does not conceive [himself as] earth, he does not conceive [himself] in earth, he does not conceive [himself apart] from earth, he does not conceive earth to be 'mine,' he does not delight in earth.” Similarly, in the Mahāsatipaṭṭhānasutta, the meditator, “observes the body with reference to the body” internally and externally, and he abides, “contemplating arising phenomena in the body… contemplating vanishing phenomena in the body,…contemplating both. Or else, mindfulness that ‘There is body’ is present to him just to the extent necessary for knowledge and awareness;” and he does so as well with respect to feelings, mind and mind-objects. In these cases the meditator is certainly aware and taking the earth, body, feelings, etc., as his meditation subject; as the sutta says, whoever

---

1080 Bodhi & Ñāṇamoli, Middle Length Discourses, 902. MN 3, 28: ye te dhammā atītā niruddhā vipariṇātā te dhamme samanupassati: Evaṃ kira ‘me dhammā ahutvā sambhonti hutvā paṭiventīti. Thanks to Khristos Nizamis for this reference.
1081 Ñāṇamoli and Bodhi, MN, 89. Mn 1, 6: pathavim pathavito abhiññāti, pathavim pathavito abhiññāya pathavim na maññati, pathaviyā na maññati, pathavito na maññati, pathavim me ti na maññati, pathavim nābhinandati;
1082 DN 2, 292: Samudaya-dhammānupassi vā kāyasmim viharati, vaya-dhammānupassi vā kāyasmim viharati, samudaya-vaya-dhammānupassi vā kāyasmim viharati. ‘Atthi kāyo’ ti vā pan’ assa sati paccupāṭhitā hoti yāvad eva ñāna-mattāya paṭissati-mattāya…
practices the four foundations of mindfulness for just one week may expect arahantship or the state of non-returner. In the *Mahārāhulovādasutta*, the Buddha advises his son to view all the *khandhas* as “This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self,” and to develop meditation that is like the earth, water, fire, air and space elements; the first four are not sullied by dirty things and space is not established anywhere.  

Evidently, there is a progression from mindful, heightened perception of phenomena associated with the self and phenomena of the world outside the self, to gaining insight that these are not the self and ceasing to identify with them, and finally to the attainment of peace where the very percepts fade away. The polysemous word *vibhūta* seems to allude to all of these stages as the commentator of the *Niddesa* makes clear, in his explication of the *Kalahavivādasutta*, Sn verse 872:

> “Nāmañ ca rūpañ ca paṭicca phassā, icchānidānāni pariggaḥāni, icchā na santyā na mamattam atthi, rūpe vibhūte na phusanti phassā.”

which Norman translates, “Contacts are dependent upon name and form. Possessions have their origin in longing. When longing does not exist, possessiveness does not exist. When form has disappeared, contacts do not make contact.”  

1083 MN 1, 4216-8: *sabbaṃ rūpaṃ: n’ etam mama, n’ eso ‘ham-asmi, na meso attā ti evam-etam yathābhūtām sammappaññāya daṭṭhabban-ti.* All form is to seen as it actually is with correct wisdom,’This is not mine, this I, I am not (does not exist) this is not my self.” This is the heart of the Buddha’s message of *anattā*, repeated 193 times in the canon, according to the DPR.

This a short form of the *paṭicca samuppāda* sequence, reducing it to links four (*nāma-rūpa*), six (*phassa*), eight (*taṇhā*) and nine (*upādāna*). *nāma-rūpa* conditions the six sense spheres (*ṣad-āyatana*, omitted) which conditions contact (*phassa*). The word *icchā* ("desire, longing") and *pariggaha* ("grasping") represent *taṇhā* and *upādāna*. *taṇhā* is conditioned by feeling (*vedanā*, omitted) which is conditioned by contact, and *upādāna* is conditioned by *taṇhā*. The commentary explains that “depending on both the eye and forms, eye-consciousness arises; the meeting of the three is contact. Except for the contact of the eye with the form, both the eye and forms are related phenomena associated in the name.” The same goes for the other faculties and their objects.\(^{1085}\) The suggestion here is that naming causes perception and that is in fact stated outright in verse 874-d, *saññānidāna hi papañcasamkhā*, “for the origins of perception is that which is called "naming" (*prapañca*).\(^{1086}\) When *nāma* ceases, *rūpa* ceases and so do contact, craving, grasping, etc., and all the other links. The commentary has a long explanation of the sentence *rūpe vibhūte na phusanti phassa* (Norman, “When form has disappeared, contacts do not make contact," ) and it is clear that the word *vibhūte* does not just mean “disappeared.” Here *vibhūta* is equated with *ṅāta* (var: *ṅāna*) “having known” or

---

\(^{1085}\) Nidd 1, 276\(^{1}:4\): *cakkhuñ ca paṭicca rūpe* [accus. pl. per Geiger §78.6] *ca uppajjati cakkhuviññānam, tinṇam saṅgati phasso*; *cakkhuñ ca rūpā ca rūpasmiṃ cakkhusamphassaṃ thapetvā sampayuttaṅkā dhammā nāmasmiṃ.*

\(^{1086}\) The word *papañca* is very arcane. The PED translates the compound *papañcasamkhā*, as “sign or characteristic of obsession,” which would render, “for the origins of perception is a sign of obsession,” which meaning is not very clear. Norman translates “for that which is named ‘diversification’ has its origin in perception” taking *saññānidāna* as a locative, rather than a genitival *tatpurusā*. I translate *papañca* as “naming” along with Mervyn Sprung (see page 239 above). The word refers to the manifold aspect of the universe which is created by naming and therefore also has the sense of “obstacle” (PED), “illusion, obsession” (PED), “false statement” (BHSD) and “activity, spreading out” (BHSD). In S it has the primary meaning of “expansion, manifoldness, diversity, prolixity, appearance, phenomenon.”
“wisdom,” tīrāṇa “judgment” or “evaluation,” pahāṇa “abandonment,” and samatikkama “transcendence,” and in the context seems to be closest in meaning to vītivatta, “gone beyond, transcended, surpassed” (< S vyati+ ṛt, “abandon, escape, pass through” or ati+ ṛt, “pass beyond, surpass, overcome”) as the author of Paramatthagotika has glossed it.1087

“When form is surpassed, contacts do not make contact.” ‘Form’ refers to the four great elements and form made out of the great elements. ‘When form is surpassed (vibhūtā):’ there are four reasons why form is surpassed – surpassed by wisdom, surpassed by sound judgment, surpassed by abandonment and surpassed by transcendence.”

At the end of this section the commentator summarizes: “When form is surpassed, contacts do not make contact.” When form is surpassed (vibhūte), perceived distinctly (vibhāvite or annihilated), transcended (atikannte), exceeded (samatikānte), gone beyond (vītivatta), the five contacts do not make contact - contact with the eye, the ear, the nose, the tongue and the body when form is surpassed, the contacts do not make contact."1088

In both these series there seems to be a sequence from vibhūta as knowing and seeing ("How is form surpassed by wisdom? He knows and sees all form whatsoever, both the four great

1087 Pj 2, 553-5: rūpe vibhūte na phusanti phassā ti rūpe vītivatte pañca phassā na phusanti.
1088 Nidd 1, 2778-13: rūpe vibhūte na phusanti phassā ti. rūpe ti cattāro ca mahābhūtā, catunnañ ca mahābhūtānām upādāya-rūpaṃ. Rūpe vibhūte ti catuhi kāraṇe rhūpam vibhūtam hoti, nātavibhūtena, tīrāṇavibhūtena, pahānavibhūtena samatikkamavibhūtena... 27814-18: rūpe vibhūte na phusanti phassā ti. rūpe vibhūte vibhāvite atikkante samatikkante vītivatte, pañca phassā na phusanti, cakkhusamphasso sotasamphasso ghānasamphasso jivhāsamphasso kāyasamphasso ti, rūpe vibhūte na phusanti phassā.
elements and form composed of the four great elements”), to evaluation and judgment (“How is form surpassed by judgment? In this way, having understood form, he judges it as impermanent, suffering, a disease, etc.”), to abandonment (“How is form surpassed by abandonment? In this way, having evaluated form, he abandons desire and passion with respect to form, he dispels it, he abolishes it, he destroys it”), to transcendence (“How is form surpassed by transcendence? For the person who has reached the four formless meditations, forms are surpassed, annihilated, transcended, completely transcended, overcome”). The word vibhāvita in this context is ambiguous - it is the past participle of the causative form of vi + bhū and ordinarily (in Vedic) would mean “perceived distinctly,” but in P it has an additional acquired meaning of “annihilated” along with vibhūta. In this Niddesa context it could mean either, with the former meaning a synonym for ānāta and the latter a gloss on the privative meaning of vibhūta.

One thing is clear (vibhūta) from the above exercise the meaning of vibhūta is avibhūta! Is the word to be taken positively or negatively? and is the primary meaning “clear, distinct, manifest,” (pakaṭa), “known” (ānāta), “judged” or “evaluated” (tīrana), “abandoned” (pahāna), or “transcended” (samatikkama)? It is impossible to say; all we can be sure of is that Bhikkhu

---

1089 Nidd 1, 277: Rūpaṃ jānāti: yaṃ kiṃci rūpaṃ, sabbaṃ rūpaṃ, cattāro ca mahābhūtāni catunnaṃ ca mahābhūtānaṃ upādāyarūpaṃ ti jānāti passati.

1090 Nidd 1, 277: Kathāṃ tīranaṃvibhūtena rūpaṃ vibhūtaṃ hotī? Evaṃ ānātaṃ katvā rūpaṃ tirēti aniccatu dukkhatu rogato...

1091 Nidd 1, 278: Kathāṃ pahānavibhūtena rūpaṃ vibhūtaṃ hotī? Evaṃ tirayitvā rūpe chandarāgāṃ pajahati vinodeti byantikaroti abhāvaṃ gameti.

1092 Nidd 2, 278: Kathāṃ samatikkaṃvibhūtena rūpaṃ vibhūtaṃ hotī? Catasso arūpasamāppatiyo paṭiladdhassa rūpā vibhūtā honti vibhāvita atikkanta samatikkantā vīṭivattā.
Bodhi’s translation as “vanished” captures only a small part of the word’s semantic field. How did this change of meaning take place? There are two possibilities that I can think of: *vibhūta* was probably transmitted as “*vihūta*, with the -*bh* > -*h*-, a common occurrence in the Aśokan edicts, MI and even in Vedic times.\(^{1093}\) If the actual derivation was from *vidhūta* (“dispelled, removed, abandoned, relinquished”), but mistakenly translated as *vibhūta*, that might account for the origin of the conflation of the two meanings, depending upon the context; however this is unlikely as *vidhūta* occurs very rarely in P and only in the later writings, although it is attested in Vedic times.\(^{1094}\) It is more likely that the word developed along the lines described in the *Niddesa* above, originally meaning “made clear” in the sense of seen and understood (*jānāti, passati*), and then evolving along with Buddhist meditation practice and epistemological theory to mean “analyzed, evaluated” (*tīreti*), leading to pervasion (one of the original meanings of *vi + bhū*) in the sense of the collapse of subject and object, with the percepts then subject to abandonment (*pahāna*) and transcendence (*samatikkama*). It is at this point, when this fourfold process has taken place, that vanishing of the perception of external objects would occur. This in fact is a fairly accurate description of the meditation process starting from *jhānas* one (detaching oneself from sense-desires and concentrating the mind with thinking and pondering) through to nine (the cessation of perception and feeling).\(^{1095}\)

\(^{1093}\) Bloomfield & Edgerton, *Vedic Variants*, §119, 122. For Aśokan edicts see page 152 above.

\(^{1094}\) The word *dhūta* (said of Soma, with the meaning “rinsed” per MW) occurs in the ṚV, although *vidhūta*, doesn’t. Its first appearance is in the *Nirukta* 1.18d *jñānavidhūtapāmpā* (“sin dispelled by knowledge”). The *Visuddhimagga* devotes the whole of chapter two to “The Ascetic Practices” (*Dhutanīgandīdēsa*).

\(^{1095}\) DN 1, 73\(^{23-25}\): *so vivicc’ eva kāmehi vivicca akusalehi dhammehi savitakkaṃ savicāraṃ vivekajāṃ pīṭi-sukham pathamajjhānaṃ upasampajjā viharati*. “Being thus detached from sense desires, detached
A Note on *vibhava*

A similar problem arises with the meaning of the word *vibhava*. In Vedic, this word, which is a common *kṛt* form derived from *vi + ṣvēhu* means “power, might, greatness, wealth, money, property, fortune,” etc. It also has only this meaning in AMg, whereas in P it retains this meaning only in the *Jātakas* and later works. In the common canonical usage of the term, *vibhava* means “non-existence,” “cessation of life,” “annihilation” and occurs throughout the Buddhist teachings in the Second Noble Truth where it is the third form of *taṇhā*, usually translated as “craving for non-existence” (*vibhava-taṇhā*), contrasting with “craving for existence” (*bhava-taṇhā*) and “craving for pleasure” (*kāma-taṇhā*). There is no evidence in the commentarial tradition for a retention of the earlier meaning first suggested by Neumann, which would radically alter our understanding of the Second Noble Truth - craving for pleasure, craving for existence and craving for well-being, power, possessions, etc. That the meaning of the word *vibhava* is not as transparent as usually understood is clear from the Tib tradition which translates as ‘*khor ba dang ’bral ba la sred pa*, meaning “craving for freedom from *saṃsāra*” which of course has a completely different meaning than “craving for non-existence.”

---

from unwholesome states, he enters and remains in the first *jhāna*, which is with thinking and pondering, born of detachment, filled with delight and joy,” in Walshe, *Long Discourses*, 102.

1096 Mylius, Wörterbuch, 565, “Reichtum, Macht.”

1097 *Wohleinsdurst* (“craving for well-being”) in Karl Eugen Neumann’s translation of the *Mahāsatipāṭṭhānasutta*, on line at [http://palikanon.de/digha/d22.html](http://palikanon.de/digha/d22.html) (first published in 1907; accessed May 2013). In a footnote he likens this to the primordial desire mentioned in the RV 10.129.4 creation story.
This meaning is also evident in BHS along with the “orthodox” craving for existence.\textsuperscript{1098} At the moment, solving the dilemma of the dual (or more) conflicting meanings of \textit{vibhava} seems even more daunting than clarifying the ambiguities with \textit{vibhūta}.

\begin{center}
60) \underline{ahaṃkāra} A6
\end{center}

This last compound is unique among the examples discussed here; while the phonology remains constant over time, the meaning undergoes significant change and its usage in the Buddhist \textit{sāsana} is quite ambiguous and multi-faceted. The ambiguity does not result from phonological evolution, but is due to the compound structure of OI and MI and the plasticity of the word \textit{kāra}. An examination of its history provides a fascinating story of word pejoration, and highlights some of the major differences between the Buddhist and Brahmanical world-view.

The compound \textit{ahaṃkāra} has a universally negative meaning in Buddhist doctrine, having three or four different possibilities: 1) the making of an “I” (an accusative \textit{tatpuruṣa} compound \textit{māṃ karoti} or \textit{aham iti karoti}), which occurs because of \textit{avijjā} and \textit{sankhāra}, the first two links of the dependent origination cycle. When mental volition develops, presumably the “I” has appeared, although the association of \textit{ahaṃkāra} with consciousness in Sāṃkhyā philosophy suggests that it might relate to the third link, \textit{viññānaṃ} (see below). 2) action by an “I” or the working of an “I” (an instrumental or genitive \textit{tatpuruṣa, mayā-/mama-kāra}, i.e. \textit{mat-kāra}), which

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{1098} In the Tib version of the \textit{Dhammacakkappavattanasutta} (\textit{Chos kyi 'khor lo rab tu bskor ba'i mdo}), pecha 269A at \url{http://asianclassics.org/reader.php?ccollection=kangyur&index=32} (Accessed May 2013). For BHS see Edgerton BSHD, s.v.
\end{flushright}
is the mental volition identical with karma. This also can be considered a karmadāraya (“I, the doer,” aham kāraḥ or aham karomi), as it appears in the Tatiyanānātitthiyasutta (Ud 69-70), where various sectarians argue over whether the self and world is produced by the self or another (sayaṃkato ca paraṃkato ca attā ca loko ca), summarized in the gāthā as ahaṅkārapasutā ayaṃ pajā, paraṃkārupasaṅhitā (“mankind is attached to ‘I am the doer,’ ‘Another is the doer’”).

3) by extension and pejoration the compound has come to mean “pride, selfishness, egotism, arrogance” which is the PED’s suggestion for the primary meaning of the word. 4) the sound “I.” In the same way that ka-kāra designates the consonant “ka,” aham-kāra, designates the sound “aharṇ” and by extension “aham asmi” (“I am”).

This is a very old usage of the terms as it occurs in the two oldest Upaniṣads, the Brhadāraṇyaka and the Chāndogya. In the former, the statement aham asmi is associated with the creation of the universe: “In the beginning this world was just a single body shaped like a man. He [Prajāpati] looked around and saw nothing but himself. The first thing he said was, ‘Here I am!’ (so ’ham asmi) and from that the name ‘I’ came into being.” He then splits his body giving rise to husband and wife who copulate and from their union human beings and animals are born and

1099 Ud 7025. See H. G. A. van Zyest, “Ahaṅkāra,” in G. P. Malalasekera, ed., Encyclopaedia of Buddhism (Government of Ceylon: Ceylon, 1961-65), 279. The poem itself glosses the compound, ahaṃ karomi (“I do”) and paro karoti (“another does”). The CPD and DP define this usage of ahaṃkāra as “self-creation,” which is ambivalent in English, meaning either the self creates or creation of a self. The OED defines self-created as “Created, brought into existence, or constituted by oneself.”


1101 Olivelle, Upaniṣads, 13. 1.4.1: ātmaivedam agra āśīt puruṣavidhaḥ | so ’nuvikṣya nānyad ātmano paśyat | so ’ham asmīty agre vyāharat | tato ’haṃnāṁbhavat |
says “I alone am the creation, for I created all this.’ From this ‘creation’ came into being.”

In the *Chāndogya Up.* the actual phrase occurs in 7.25.1: “It (*bhūman*, “the world, the aggregate of all existing things, the infinite”) is below, it is above, it is in the west, the east, the south, the north, indeed, it is all that. Now, the substitute of the sound ‘I’ (*ahaṃkāra-aṭṭesa*) - I am below, I am above, I am in the west, the east, the south, the north, indeed, I am all that.”

Śaṅkara’s commentary makes it clear that the Infinite and the I are to be identified: “Why is the infinite not contained anywhere? “Because the infinite is below [above, etc.], nothing else is found apart from it, in which it might be contained. If something else existed other than the infinite, then the infinite might be contained there, but that does not exist. Thus the infinite is not contained anywhere. By pointing out what is to be regarded as the substratum, - where one sees nothing else, - and by pointing out what is beyond the range of perception - that the infinite indeed is below, [above, etc.], - one should not have the suspicion that the infinite might be other than visible life. Now, with the phrase *ahaṃkāra*, the substitution of “I” for Brahma is shown - this is the teaching of *ahaṃkāra*. With the words “I am below [above, etc.], with the phrase *ahaṃkāra*, the infinite is indeed indicated in order to show the state of non-otherness of the visible.”

As van Buitenen says, “The universal character of the *ahaṃkāra* is given from

1102 1.4.5: so 'ved ahaṃ vāva sṛṣṭir asmy ahaṃ hīḍam sarvam asṛkṣiiti /
tataḥ sṛṣṭir abhavat / translation from Olivelle, ibid, 14.

1103 *Chāndogya Up.* 7.25.1: sa evādhastāt sa uparistāt sa paścāt sa purastāt sa daksinataḥ sa uttarataḥ /sa evēdam sarvam iti / athāto 'hamkārādeśa eva / aham evādhasdād aham uparistād ahaṃ paścād ahaṃ purastād ahaṃ daksīnato 'ham uttarato 'ham evēdam sarvam iti

1104 Commentary to 7.25.1: kasmāt punāḥ kvacinna pratiṣṭhita ityucyate yasmāt sa eva bhūmādhasānna
tadvyatirekenyadvidyate yasminpratiṣṭhitaḥ syāt tathoparistādītyādi samānam sati bhūmno
'nyasminbhūmā hi pratiṣṭhitaḥ syānna tu tadasti sa eva tu sarvam atastasmādasaunāvācpratiṣṭhitaḥ yatra nānyatpaśyafyadhikaraṇādikartavatānirdeśātsa evādhastādīti ca
parokṣanirdeśāddraṣṭarīvādanyobhūmā syādityāsaṅkā kasyacīnīmā bhūdityathāto
the beginning; it cannot be anything but universal for it is the *ahaṃkāra* of the primordial being who creates by it the universe; it is not only the beginning of creation, it is its content.”

This usage of *ahaṃkāra* in the sense “the infinite,” is also found in the *Taittiriya Āranyaka* (10.66), which is also known as the *Mahānārāyaṇa Upaniṣad*. Here it is contrasted with *avyaktabhaṇa* ("unmanifest being") and appears to have the meaning of “all creation” in the prophylactic mantra: *avyakta-bhāvair-ahaṃkārair-jyotir-ahaṃ virajā vipāṃbhūyāsaṃ svāhā* ("With all unmanifest being and manifest creation, may I be the light, stainless, sinless. Hail!").

Whether the *ahaṃkāra* of the *Upaniṣads* pre- or post-dates its Sāṃkhya usage is impossible to say. For in Sāṃkhya dualism, *ahaṃkāra* is not a particularly positive *tattva* ("a true entity making up the universe") as it is one of the twenty-four elements counterpoised against *puruṣa*, the twenty-fifth. From *prakṛti* ("nature") *buddhi* ("intelligence") is produced from which *ahaṃkāra* results, equated with *abhimāno* “pride,” in the *Sāṃkhyaśāstra* (v. 24, *abhimāno haṁkāras*), which generates *manas*, the five sense capacities (*buddhindriya*), the five action capacities (*karmendriya*) and the five subtle elements (*tanmātra*); from the latter evolve the five gross elements (*mahābhūta*); all these with *puruṣa*, form the twenty-five entities of the universe. In


1106 This may be found at [http://www.sanskritweb.net/yajurveda/ta-10.pdf](http://www.sanskritweb.net/yajurveda/ta-10.pdf) Accessed May 2013. 10.66.4.
the Sāṃkhya system, liberation is when a practitioner realizes the difference between puruṣa and prakṛti buddhi, ahaṃkāra and its evolutes. Because of this dualism the meaning of ahaṃkāra perjorates over the years, and by the time of the Bhagavadgītā means “egotism and selfishness,” an afflictive character requiring cleansing. The negative meaning of ahaṃkāra is also present in the later Upaniṣads. e.g. Praśnopaniṣad, where “the perception of ego (ahaṃkāra) and the objects falling under that perception,” and the other faculties and elements are contrasted with the ātman which is their support. This of course is a core brahmanical belief that “If a man knows ‘I am brahman’ in this way he becomes this whole world.” The ignorance of oneness with Brahma creates suffering and the whole saṃsāric cycle. The major difference between Sāṃkhyan and Upaniṣadic thought is that the former believes in the reality (and eternity) of prakṛti, while the latter sees the world as an illusion, with Brahma subsuming all, including the self.

1107 Compare Manu 1.14: udbabarhātmanaś caiva manah sadasadātmakam manasaś cāpy ahaṃkāram abhimantāram iśvaram, translated by Olivelle, Manu, 14: “From this body, moreover, he drew out the mind having the nature of both the existent and the non-existent; and from the mind, the ego - producer of self-awareness and ruler.”

1108 e.g. Bhagavadgītā, 2.71: vihāya kāmān yaḥ sarvān | pumāṃs carati niḥsṛphaḥ | nirmamo nirmaṃgangkāraḥ | sa sāntim adhigacchati, translated by Edgerton as “Abandoning all desires, what | Man moves free from longing, | Without self interest and egotism, | He goes to peace.” the negative meaning of ahaṃkāra is also present in the later Upaniṣads. e.g. Praśnopaniṣad 4.8 where ahaṃkāraś ca cāhaṃkāraś ca kartavyaṃ ca (“the perception of ego and the objects falling under that perception” per Olivelle, op. cit., 184-85.) and the other faculties and elements are said to rely on (samprati+ vsthā) the ātman, which once perceived, leads to liberation.

1109 4.8: ahaṅkāraś ca cāhaṅkāravyaṃ ca, translated by Olivelle, op. cit, 184-85.

1110 Brhadāraṇyaka Upaniṣad, 1.4.10: trans. by Olivelle, op. cit 15. ya evam vedāham brahmaśmīti sa idam sarvam bhavati.
The Buddha’s teachings specifically denied this view, that one is the whole world. In the *Alagaddūpamasutta*, this is described as one of the six wrong views, viz., regarding the *khandhas* as self, regarding what is “seen, heard, sensed, cognized, encountered, sought, mentally pondered as self, and believing, “That which is the self is the world; after death I shall be permanent, everlasting, eternal, not subject to change; I shall endure as long as eternity - this too he regards thus: ‘This is mine, this I am, this is my self.'”

The meaning of the *ahaṃkāra* compound in Buddhism is difficult to say; it occurs for the most part in the context just cited - the denial of the *khandhas* as mine, I or the self. For example, in the *Mahāpuṇṇamasutta*, the Buddha is asked, “*kathāṃ pana, bhante, jānato kathāṃ passato imasmīca saviṇīṇāṇake kāye bahiddhā ca sabbanimittesu ahaṃkāramamaṃkāramānānusayā na honti?*”, “Venerable sir, how does one know, how does one see, so that in regard to this body with its consciousness and all external signs, there is no I-making, mine-making, and underlying tendency to conceit?” The Buddha answers that form, feeling, perception, formations and consciousness are to be seen as they actually are (*yathābhūtaṃ*) as “This is not mine, this I am not, this is not my self” (*N’ etam mama, n’esoham asmi, na me so attā ti*). In the commentary to a similar section in the *Chabbisodhanasutta*, Buddhaghosa equates *ahaṃkāra* with *māno* (“conceit”) and *mamakāra* with *taṇhā* (“craving”). In the commentary to the *Anusayasutta* (SN 2, 252-32) - which is almost identical to the

1111 MN 1, 135-36: *so loko so attā, so pecca bhavissāmi nicco dhuvo sassato avipariṇāma-dhammo, sassatisamaṇṇ that’ eva thassāmi, tam-pi: etam mama, eso ‘ham-asmi, eso me attā ti samanupassati.*

For translation, Ānāmoli & Bodhi, *Middle-Length Discourses*, 229.

1112 MN 3, 19-12.

Mahāpuṇṇamasutta above - he glosses ahaṁkāra as ahaṁkāradīṭṭhi ("the wrong view of ahaṁkāra") and mamaṁkāra as mamaṁkāratāṇhā ("craving").¹¹¹⁴ There are several other occurrences of this trope in both the SN and AN in a similar context, and a whole samyutta section of the SN (Sāriputtasamyutta, SN 3 235⁵⁻⁴⁰¹³) where Sāriputta tells Ānanda of his experiences traversing the nine jhānas, where he is unaware of the attainment of any of them. Ānanda suggests that the reason for this is that “it must because I-making, mine-making, and the underlying tendency to conceit have been thoroughly uprooted in the Venerable Sāriputta for a long time that such thoughts did not occur to him.” The commentary equates ahaṁkāramamaṁkāra with pahīnattā or an “abandoned self.”¹¹¹⁵ These are the principal occurrences of ahaṁkāra in the writings. As mentioned above, the compound does occur in the Udāna, apparently with the meaning, “I, the doer.” There is one reference in the Nettippakaranṇa and several in the Petavatthu, none of which offer any additional insight into the compound’s meaning. The Saddhanītippakaranṇa (a 12th century P grammar), however, offers several glosses, equating nir-ahaṁkāra with amamo (“not egotistical, unselfish”); ahaṁkāra with vinibaddho (“bound”); with avalepo (“stained” < limpati, “to become soiled or dirty oneself”); and with māno (“conceit), which is also synonymized with maññanā (“conceit”), maññitattaṃ.

¹¹¹⁴ Spk 2, 215²⁻³: Ahaṅkāra-mamaṅkāra-mānānusayarā ti, ahaṅkāra-diṭṭhi ca mamaṅkāra-tāṅhā ca mānānusyarā ca.

¹¹¹⁵. SN 236¹⁻⁵ and following: panāyasmato Sāriputtassa diṅgarataṃ ahaṅkāramamaṅkāramānānusayarā susamūhatā. tasmā āyasmato Sāriputtassa na evaṁ hoti. Translation from Bodhi, Connected Discourses, 1015. Commentary Spk 2, 347²⁻²³: na evaṁ hoti ti ahiṅkāra-maṁkārānaṃ pahīnattā evaṁ na hoti.
(“pride”), māno (“arrogance”), aharikāro (“I-making”), unnati (“elevation”), ketu (“flag”), pagghaho (“lifting up”), and avalepo (“stained”).

The Tibetans also translate ahamkāra as nga rgyal, meaning “pride, arrogance, conceit,” which is also one of their translations of S māna. The Ch translate 有我 (yǒu wǒ, “there is a self”) for ahamkāra, (and 無有我 wúyǒu wǒ, “the absence of…” for nirahamkāra), 我所見 (wǒ suǒjiàn, “view of possession”) as mamaṃkāra and 我慢使繫著 (wǒmàn shī jì zhù) for mānānusaya (“the underlying tendency towards pride”). 我慢, wǒmàn = māna (“pride, conceit) and is also sometimes used to translate ahamkāra; 使繫著, shī jì zhù = anusaya, “causing to be fastened.”

Which meaning(s) of the four discussed above ahamkāra has in the Buddhist writings is difficult to say, as they all make sense in the context. The oldest meaning appears to be from the Chāndogya Upaniṣad where it has the meaning “the sound ‘I’.” Collins argues that the use of asmīti (“I am”) in the Mahānidānasutta suggests the “automatic spontaneous way in which the sense of self appears in the psychology of the unenlightened man,” and that the use of direct speech suggests that the “phenomenological datum of an ‘I’ is in fact the result of an act of utterance,” that is, the utterance “I” (ahamkāra). This inverts the Brahmanic notion that

1116 In the Burmese edition, available on DPR: page 190 (vinibaddho); 216 (avalepo); 233 & 328 (māno); 344 (amamo). The words ketu and pagghaho recall the compound pannadhaja (whose flag is lowered) as an epithet of the Buddha from the Upālisutta. See page 566.

1117 Negi, vol. 3, 922. nga rgyal is also the technical term for ahamkāra in Tibetan translations of Sāṃkhya philosophical works (see entry #3).

1118 See the Ch translation of the Rāhulasutta, SN 3, 13524-13617 at T02n0099_p0005a11-b04. The translation of 我所見, wǒ suǒjiàn, and the use of 我慢, wǒmàn = ahamkāra are from the DDB.

1119 Collins, Selfless Persons, 100.
speech is primordial and simply expresses the original sonic content of the universe, represented by the goddess Vāc; in the Buddha’s teaching, speech is an arbitrary act of will which itself brings the ‘I’ into existence and refers to nothing more than the sonic content itself (i.e. the sign), and the changing aggregates on which the label is based; since it is man-made, it has no truth value (only nominal value) and says nothing about what “actually exists” (although that phrase is problematical in Buddhism, as it is itself an extreme). In the
Mahānidānasutta Ānanda offers three possible views of the self: feeling is the self, feeling is not myself and the self is impercipient, or feeling is not myself but myself is not impercipient. The Buddha refutes them all; if the first is true, when a pleasant (or unpleasant) feeling passes away, so does the self (vyagā me attā, “my self is gone!”), which of course is absurd; in the second scenario, if feeling is not the self, the Buddha asks, “If friends, no feelings at all were to be experienced, would there be the thought, ‘I am’?” and Ānanda answer no. In the third possibility where the self is not impercipient, the same conundrum arises; if there are no feelings, there would not be any thought ‘I am this” (ayam aham asmi). 1120 This is simply another take on the teaching of the khandhas ≠ self. If it were true (khandhas = self), then the "self" would be coming into and going out of existence momentarily (udayavyaya), like the khandhas, which is illogical; the concept of the self is therefore ill-formed (nakkhamati, “it is not suitable”), despite Descartes famous dictum, which is shown to be illogical, for if feeling (or any of the khandhas, like thinking) = self, then na paṭisamvedemi (maññāmi) tasmā nāsmi, (“I do not feel/think, therefore I am not”). The arbitrariness of the word “I” is well shown in the

Arahantasutta, where a god notices various monks using the term “I” and wonders if they are khīṇāsava (“free from mental obsessions”), because the use of the “I” designation is associated by the god with wrong view. The Buddha answers that they are free of afflictions, and are only following the conventions of the world; in the commentary Buddhaghosa says that they don’t say “The aggregates eat, the aggregates sit, the bowl of the aggregates, the robe of the aggregates,” as this would be violating conventional discourse.\textsuperscript{1121} Yet it is not the aggregates that see, feel or think, as the Buddha has pointed out elsewhere; they simply represent the ongoing process of saṃsara. In the Bāhiyasutta (Ud, 6), the Buddha says: “Thus here, you should train in such a manner: in the seen will be merely what is seen, in the heard, just the hearing, in thought, only what has been thought and in what is cognized will be the mere fact of having cognized.”\textsuperscript{1122} It is the imputation of the hearer which creates the I, which means that for liberation to occur we must eliminate ahamkāra-mamaṃkāra-mānānusaya, I-making and mine-making and the underlying tendency to conceit, certainly; but we must also eliminate the

\textsuperscript{1121} Spk 1, 5\textsuperscript{20-25}: voḥāra-mattanā ti, upaladdhi (var. apaladdhi)-nissita-kathāṃ hitvā voḥāra-bhedāṃ akaronto ‘aḥam, mamā’ ti vadeyya. ‘Khandhā bhūrjanti, khandhā nisīdanti, khandhānaṃ patto, khandhānaṃ cīvaram’ ti hi vutte voḥāra-bheda hoti. Na koci jānāti. Tasmā evaṃ avatvā loka-voḥārena voḥaratī ti. “with just an expression’ (voḥāra-mattanā), having abandoned talk which depends on views, not violating conventional discourse one might say, ‘I, mine.’ It would be violating conventional discourse to say, ‘The aggregates eat, the aggregates sit, the bowl of the aggregates, the robe of the aggregates,’ as no one would understand. Therefore not speaking thus, he speaks according to conventional discourse.”

\textsuperscript{1122} Ud, 8\textsuperscript{5-7}: tasmāt iha te Bāhiya diṭṭhe evaṃ sikkhitabbam: diṭṭhamattam bhavissati, sute sutamattam bhavissati, mute mutamattam bhavissati, viññāle viññātattamattam bhavissatīti. See also the Kājakārāmasutta (AN 2, 24\textsuperscript{26-26}): AN 25\textsuperscript{12-20}: “Iti kho bhikkhave Tathāgato daṭṭhā daṭṭhabbham diṭṭham na maññati, adiṭṭham na maññati daṭṭhabbham na maññati daṭṭhāram na maññati (and so on with sutam mutaṃ and viññātaṃ)… “In this way, monks, the Tathāgata is a seer of what is to be seen but he does not impute something seen or something not seen, he does not impute something to be seen and he does not impute a seer…”
sign/sound of “I” and the sign/sound of “mine” (whether spoken or thought) which is the constant everyday utterance, unquestioned by all of us and underlying all our activities which continuously re-creates the ego, and the suffering that goes with it.

61. **nimakkho/nimoho**  **mrakṣo/moho** A5 (phonological confusion)

In verse 56-b of the Sn *Khaggavisāṇasutta* we find *nimakkho niddhanta-kasāva-moho* (*without hypocrisy, with delusion and faults blown away*) paralleled in the G version of the text 33-b with the *pada: *nimoho *nidhamto-kaṣaya-mrakṣo* (*without delusion, with faults and disparagement cleansed*). 1123

*Nillolupo nikkuho nippipāso*  
*nimmakkho niddhantakasāvamoho*  
*nirāsayo sabbaloke bhavitvā*  
*eko care khaggavisāṇakappo*

"Being without covetousness, without deceit, without thirst, without hypocrisy, with delusion and faults blown away, without aspirations in the whole world, one should wander solitary as a rhinoceros horn."

Norman's translation of *nimakkho* as "without hypocrisy," following the PED, seems to be wrong in this case, as Salomon points out. Edgerton makes it clear that the sense of this work

1123 Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 6 for the P. For G, see Salomon, *Gāndhāri Rhinoceros Sūtra*, 172. Salomon takes -*mrakṣo* as "disparagement" from BHSD (441); Norman takes *makkho* (the MI equivalent < S *mraka*) from the PED, "hypocrisy."
makkho (< Stk. mrakṣa) is always "disparagement" and "concealing of the good qualities of others," and Buddhaghosa's commentary is also quite clear: "nimmakkho, here the characteristic of destroying the good qualities of others is makkho ("disparagement"), the absence of this is nimmakkho." And the P compound is probably not a dvandva within an overall karmadhāraya, as both Norman and Salomon have it, but a tatpuruṣa within a karmadhāraya, "the bewilderment of the faults blown away." Buddhaghosa's discusses the nature of the kasāvas, of which he identifies six, in the following passage: "In that regard, what are the three faults? the fault of passion, the fault of anger, and the fault of bewilderment (rāgakasāvo, dosakasāvo, mohakasāvo), these are the three faults. What also are the three additional faults? The fault of the body, the fault of speech, the fault of the mind (kāyakasāvo, vacīkasāvo, manokasāvo). In regard to these, because of blowing away moha which is the root of all these five kasāvas except for moha, [then] the confusion of the kasāvas has been blown away (niddhanta-kasāva-moho); or because of the blowing away of confusion of the body-speech-mind kasāvas, the confusion of the kasāvas has been blown away. According to others, the state of being free from greediness, etc., is just the accomplishment of the condition of blowing away the anger kasāva by the absence of disparagement (nimmakkhatāya), [and blowing away] the kassāva of attachment." Here are three possible explanations for the compound, the first two based on the interpretation of moha as governing the kasāvas in the

1124 Pj 2, 1083:4: nimmakkho ti ettha paragunavināsanalakkhano makkho, tassa abhāvena nimmakkho...  
1125 Pj 2, 1088-18: "tattha katame tayo kasāvā: rāgakasāvo dosakasāvo mohakasāvo, ime tayo kasāvā, - tattha katame apare pi tayo kasāvā: kāyakasāvo vacīkasāvo manokasāvo" ti, tesu moham ṭhapetvā pañcannamā kaśāvānām tesaṁ ca sabbesañcā mūlabhūtassā mohassa niddhantattā niddhantakasāvamohō; tiṇṇam eva vā kāyavacīmanokasāvānām mohassā ca niddhantattā niddhantakasāvamohō, itaresu nillolupatādihi rāgakasāvassa nimmakkhatāya dosakasāvassa niddhantabhāvo siddho eva.
objective genitive, and one based on interpreting the *kasāvas* as representing the other two poisons of *rāga* and *dosa*; this, however is an explanation, not of this compound, but of the first two *padas*, starting with *nillolupo*.

Buddhaghosa's first explanation that *moha* is the root of the *kasāvas* and indeed all afflictions - seems to make good sense and is in accord with standard Buddhist doctrine. But the G version has reversed *moho* and *-mrakṣo/-makkho* which suggests, since *mrakṣo/makkho* is not one of the six *kasāvas*, that the P text is earlier, and the metathesis in the G recension appears to be a case of word metathesis caused by phonological confusion.\textsuperscript{1126} We know that in G *moho* was also written as *mokho* (G verse 35), and in the Niya documents as well there is the same use of -*kh* for -*h*-. As Brough points out, this suggests that the -*h* (a glottal fricative) was actually pronounced closer to a velar fricative, i.e. the sounds [x, γ], which would have been close in sound to the P *makkho*,\textsuperscript{1127} articulated at the same place in the mouth, especially to a translator unfamiliar with either one or both of P or G dialects. MI is not rich in fricatives. P, for example has only the alveolar fricative -*s*- and labiodental -*v*- and lacks any +back fricatives except for the glottal -*h*-. G however tended to spirantize some of its stops, e.g. -*dh*- and -*th-* > [z], written -*s*- or -*_s_* - -*h*-> -*kh* = [x, γ], as mentioned above; and -*kṣ*- > retroflex fricative (see below).\textsuperscript{1128} So it is quite natural that confusion might result on these sounds which phonetically were probably very close, e.g. P [mɔk’o] for *makkho*, vs. G [moxo or mɔxo] for *moho*.

\textsuperscript{1126} Nidd 2, (Burmese edition) 275, does however include *makkho* as one of the *kasāvas*, but not one of the primary ones (which are *rāga*, *doso*, *moho*).

\textsuperscript{1127} Brough, GDhp, §41.

\textsuperscript{1128} Brough GDhp, §13 & 43 for -*s*; §41 for -*h*; see following footnote for -*kṣ*.
The same may be said for the *mrakṣo/moho* confusion. Here there are two important points to note. The -r- in G *mrakṣo* did not make position (make the -a vowel preceding *mr*- long as the short -a is required for the *tristūbha* metre of the verse) and was therefore not pronounced; indeed it was sometimes written as *maks*- (GDhp 27-b, *makṣu*, GDhp 284-d, *makṣo*); secondly, the -kṣ- sound in G was actually pronounced as a retroflex fricative [ʂ], the sound -ṭṣ-, or aspirated -ṭṣ‘- which would be similar to the pronunciation of *mokho* (that is [moxo] above), both being fricatives, one -back and one +back) to the unfamiliar ear.¹¹²⁹ Phonetically, the G word for *mrakṣo* would have sounded something like [mɔʂo] [mɔco], or [mɔcxxo], which would not be too far from G *moho* [moxo] or P *moho* [moho] or [mho]. This is another instance which illustrates how important the oral tradition was in the Buddhist transmission, for these mistakes could only happen in an oral dictation situation, the presence of a manuscript for reference likely precluding these types of phonological errors.

62. *anaññaposī* A6

What does the compound *an-añña-posī* mean? It occurs in Sn 65-b, and is usually translated "not supporting others" or "nourishing no other."

¹¹²⁹ See discussion in H. W. Bailey, "Gāndhārī," *Bulletin of the School of Oriental (and African) Studies*, 11: 1943-46 (1946), 770-75 who argues that the -kṣ- sound is an unvoiced retroflex fricative which he transcribes as -ṭṣ- or -ṭṣ‘- with aspiration. See footnote 1436 for additional references. See also Brough, GDhp §16; the sound may also represent the sound *xš*, which is a combination of a velar [x] and palatal [ç] fricative. For the -r- not making position see Salomon, *Gāndhārī Rhinoceros Sūtra*, 174. A standard *tristūbha* cadence ending is long-short-long-x (x = either), which means that the final -a in *kaśāya* (read *kaśāya* as long syllables were not noted in this ms) was short: *kaśāya-mrakṣo* (long-short-long-x).
"Showing no greed for flavours, not wanton, not supporting others, going on an uninterrupted begging round, not shackled in mind to this family or that, one should wander solitary as a rhinoceros horn."  

But the adjective *posin* itself is ambiguous, as it apparently can have both active and passive meaning. The PED defines it as "thriving (on), nourished by," both passive meanings while the meaning in *anaññaaposin* is generally taken as active, as is another compound compound in which it occurs - *dāraposin*, "supporting a wife." Yet this is not always the case, as by far the most common compound containing *posin* uses the word in a passive sense: *anto-nimugga-posīni* (nourished by immersion inside [the waters]), qualifying lotus flowers in the extended metaphor describing the fruit of the third *jhāna*.

This ambiguity extends back to the usage of the Vedic word itself (*puṣ, puṣyati*, "to be nourished, to thrive, prosper") which can be either

---

1130 Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 7; the second translation ("nourishing no other") is by Bhikkhu Bodhi, from *Connected Discourses*, 236, translating the same phrase from the *Brahasamytuttaṃsutta*, SN 1, 14119.  
1131 DN 1, 7517, translated by Walshe, *Long Discourses*, 103, "fed from the water's depths."
intransitive or intransitive. So does *anaññaposin* mean "not supporting others" or "not supported by others?" Or something else? 1132

*Prima facie,* both qualities might be considered cardinal virtues for a monk or *paccekabuddha,* whom the compound usually qualifies. In the *Khaggavisāṇasutta* verse in question, the *paccekabuddha* wanders solitary as a rhinoceros "not supporting others" (i.e. without wife and children or any of the duties of a householder); yet at the same time, except for his food he is not supported by others, he is independent, self-reliant and *ātmadīpa,* a light unto himself.

The commentary to Sn 65 contains three possible explanations for the meaning of the word; Buddhaghosa was confused, and reading the *kā uppatti* story it is easy to see why. The King of Bārāṇasi is so captivated with his chef's creations that he hoards all the food to himself and will not share with his councillors and sons. When he realizes what he has done, he decides to restrain his craving, becomes a monk and eventually a *paccekabuddha.* Censuring his former bad behaviour he pronounces the following verse:

*Rasesu gedhaṃ akaraṃ alolo
anaññaposī sapadānacārī
kule kule appati baddhacitto
eko care khaggavisāṇakappo.*

1132 The CPD (p. 145) is the only dictionary to actually define the compound: "*an-añña-posi(n)*, mfn., not supporting others, said of the houseless ascetic, who maintains no family and fosters no passions;" this definition is too narrow, and may simply be wrong. See discussion below. Although the PED does not define the compound it places it under meaning 2 of *anañña* ("oneself only" s.v. *añña*, p. 13), suggesting the definition "nourishing/supporting oneself only." See discussion below.
"Showing no greed for flavours, not wanton, not supporting others [an-añña-posi], going on an uninterrupted begging round, not shackled in mind to this family or that, one should wander solitary as a rhinoceros horn."\textsuperscript{1133}

Now in this verse, "not supporting others" is taken as a virtue, while in the source story it is a symptom of greed. So one or the other is incorrect. However, if we take the compound in a passive sense ("not supported/nourished by another"), it makes better sense. For it was the food from the cook which produced the craving leading to greed; that is nourishment used in the metaphorical sense of fostering the development of greed and the affictions. The commentator is also not sure about the compound and offers three explanations:

1) "Free of staying, etc. with someone who must be taken care of, that is to say, being happy merely by maintaining [one's own] body. Or

2) Just as previously in the garden, my habit having been the production of greed concerning flavours, I was nourished by another, so I became not [greedy] when I abandoned that craving by which my greediness for flavours arose; that is to say he shows, "not nourished by another," because of not reproducing another future personality conditioned by craving. Or

3) The affections are called "others" because of being the stick that destroys the goal (or var. the self). By not nourishing them, that here is the meaning."\textsuperscript{1134}

\textsuperscript{1133} For the source story see Pj 2 117\textsuperscript{24}-118\textsuperscript{5}; Norman's translation on p. 7, op. cit.

\textsuperscript{1134} Pj 2, 118\textsuperscript{10-18}: anaññaaposi ti posetabkasaddhivadhisaraññaposiñci, kāyasandhāraññamattena santutthito ti vuttaṃ hoti; yathā vā pubbe uyyāne rasesu gedhakaraṇalolo (var. -si-la) hutvā anaññaaposi (var. anaññaaposi) āsiṃ, evam ahutvā, yāya tanhāya lolo hutvā rasesu gedham karoti (var. karomh), tam tanhāṃ hitvā āyati tanhāṃu-lakassa aññassa attabhavassa anibbattanena anaññaaposi ti dasseti; atha vā
Explanations 1 and 3 have posin in an active sense; explanation 2 in the passive. Explanation 1 is Norman's "not supporting others." Explanation 2 is a rather convoluted way of saying that nourishment by another causes craving and rebirth. Explanation 3 is a stretch, likening "others" to the afflictions, viz., not nourishing the afflictions. The number of variants, esp. the one juxtaposing aññaposī against an-aññaposī shows that the tradents were confused.

The same ambiguity is found in the Mahākassapasutta (Ud, 410-28). Here the Buddha describes Mahākassapa as an-aññaposī; the latter has recovered from an illness, and although five hundred gods offer to bring him food, he insists on going on the alms round himself. He is "not supported/nourished by others," in this case, the gods, but supports himself (see below for this meaning). Although the compound’s meaning based on the source story seems to be clear, the commentary stil entertains both the active and passive sense of the word:

1) "Here anaññaposim: "He nourishes another" (aññaposī), "he does not nourish another" (anaññaposī), because of the absence of another to be nourished by himself, without a companion, nourishing one (ekaposī, var. ekako, "solitary")," is the meaning. Therefore he shows the ease of maintenance (subharatam; var. svācāratāṃ, "good conduct") of that thera. For the thera lives, with the collection of alms, nourishing just himself, desiring little from another, he does not nourish another relative, friend, etc., because of being unattached, wherever [he goes]. Or

2) He is anaññaposī because of the absence of being supported by a certain other person. For the person whose four requisites are dependent on just one requisite-benefactor (paccaya-

atthabhañjanakatthena (var. atta-) aññe ti kilesā vuccanti, tesam aposanen anaññaposīti ayam p’ ettha attho.
dāyake), is not called anaññaposī, because of a practice which is dependent on one person (eka-āyatta-vuttito). But the theran [who wanders] "like the bee to the flower" (Dhp 49), according to the gāthā, by the strength of his leg, wandering around for alms, visiting new families all the time, nourishes himself with mixed food, [and he is called anaññaposī].

In this gāthā it is clearly explanation #2 that applies; the story tells us that Mahākassapa makes it a point to go for alms to the streets where the poor, the beggars and the weavers lived (yena daliddavisikhā kapanavvisikhā pesakāravisikhā, Ud 424), presumably following the Buddha’s instructions not to become attached to any one alms-giver. Yet the active sense of posin still persists in the commentary, although it seems to have no or little relevance in this particular case. The tension between the passive meaning of posin ("supported by") and the fact of alms-giving where the monk is in fact supported by the laity is probably the reason for the persistence of the active explanation, even though, as in this case, it has little relevance; the Udāna commentary here reconciles the meanings by interpreting anaññaposin, as not being supported by a specific person, but moving amongst flowers gathering nectar like a bee. In other cases where the passive is as or more apt that the active sense, the commentary persists in interpreting it only in the active. For example in the Brahmadevasutta, the monk is described as akiñcano bhikkhu anaññaposī, yo te so piṇḍāya gharam pavīṭho, translated as "Owning

nothing, nourishing no other, the bhikkhu has entered your house for alms," and the commentary says that he is *anaññaposi* because of "not nourishing a wife or child or another individuality except for this one." Here *an-añña* is expanded in meaning to mean a future life. In the *Piṇḍapātikasutta* (Ud 30\(^{17}-31^{20}\)), *attabharassa* is contrasted with *anaññaposino* ("supporting oneself and no other"), and once again the commentary takes *posin* only in the active sense.\(^{1138}\)

Both these interpretations take *an-* as negativizing the entire compound, viz., *an-* (*añña-posin*), "not (supporting/supported-by another)"; *añña-posin* is a *tatpuruṣa* and the overall compound is a *karmadhāraya*. However it can also be parsed *(an-añña)-posin*, "supporting/supported-by (not another)." where the overall compound is a *tat-puruṣa* and within it there is a descriptive (*karmadhāraya*) compound *an-añña*. This gives a different sense and one that neatly resolves the tensional ambiguities in the first phrase; for *an-añña*, as well as meaning, "not another," also has the sense of "alone, by oneself, oneself only" (PED), that is the opposite of *param* ("other), and with this meaning both the active and passive senses of *posin* converge: i. e. "nourishing oneself, nourished by oneself." As is well known OI and MI are quite fond of *a(n) + noun/adjective* structures as independent words, e.g. *an+eka* ("several"), *a + dvaya* ("unity, identity" as a noun; "only, unique" as an adj.), etc; in the canon *an-añña* is as commonly used

\(^{1136}\)SN 1, 141\(^{19-20}\). Bodhi, *Connected Discourses*, 236

\(^{1137}\)Spk 1, 207\(^{12-14}\): *Anañña-posī* ti, ṭhapetvā imaṁ attabhāvaṁ aṅṅassā attabhāvassā vā puttadārassā vā aposanatāya anaññaposi.

\(^{1138}\)Thanissaro Bhikkhu, *Udāna*, on line at http://www.accesstoinsight.org/tipitaka/kn/ud/ud.3.08.than.html. Commentary Ud-a 202\(^{1-3}\) ad *Piṇḍapātikasutta*, explains that *anaññaposino* means: "not supporting another, because not endeavouring to nourish other students (var. "friends"), etc. with the gathering of food" (āmisa-saṅganhanena aññe sissādike (var. piyādike) posetuṁ anussukkatāya anañña-posino).
in a positive sense ("self, same, identical, alone, etc.") as in the negative ("not another or not others"), and anañña is often used as an emphatic synonym for attan. The CullaNiddesa commentary on the Khaggivisaṇasutta Sn 65 takes it in the same way, glossing anañña-posī as "the pacceka buddha nourishes himself only, not another." If it is taken in this way (anañña = oneself) in all the above instances, then there need not be any tension between "not supporting another/others" and "not being supported by another/others." The Sn passage in question would then be translated as either "supporting/nourishing/taking care of oneself" (active) or "supported by/nourished by/taken care of by oneself" (passive), and rather than alluding to any tension between the active and passive senses of the terms (as the commentators discussed above have interpreted it), this translation simply repeats the ago-old Buddhist dictum of āttadīpa, relying on one's self in the past (supported by), present (supporting) and future (present as future sense), almost a synonym to attabharassa ("supporting oneself") with which it is paired in the Udāna verse above. A similar situation is found in the compound an-añña-neyya, usually translated "not to be led by others" (CPD); however, the gloss to Sn 55-c, makes it clear that it is to be understood as "self mastery" (sayaṃvasitaṃ).

1139 As for example in the injunction at DN 2, 100-1, viharatha atta-saranā anañña-saranā ("abide with your refuge in yourself, with a refuge in no other") or Vin 3, 2310-11, attagarihino mayaṃ bhante Ānanda anaññagarahino ("we are blaming ourselves, Ānanda, not blaming others") An example where anañña means "same" or "self" or "self same": MN 1, 25613-15, Mahātaṃhāsankhayasutta: Tathā 'haṃ Bhagavatā dhammaṃ desitaṃ ājānāmi yathā tad ev’ idaṃ viññāṇam sandhāvati saṃsaratī anaññian ti, translated by Bodhi, Middle Length Discourses, 349: "As I understand the Dhamma taught by the Blessed One, it is this same consciousness that runs and wanders through the round of rebirths, not another." For a list of words with negative prefix a(n)- see Whitney, Sanskrit Grammar, §1288a.

1140 Nidd 2, PTS 83, #36: anañña-posī (so paccekasambuddho) attānañ neva poseti na paran ti.

1141 Pj 2, 10624-27: anaññaneyyo ti aññehi idaṃ saccaṃ, idaṃ saccaṃ ti anetabbo, etena sayambhutam dipeti, patte vā paccekabodhiṇāne aññaneyyatāya abhāvaṃ sayamvasitaṃ. "anaññaneyyo not to be led by others who say "This is the truth, this is the truth." By this, he explains the sayamvasitaṃ ("self-
meaningful difference between "(not) (supporting/supported by another)," where the emphasis is on the verb, and "(supporting/supported by) (not another)," where the emphasis is on the the negativised pronoun, the opposite of another, i.e. the self, esp. when "(not another)" has this very meaning.

It remains to ask why most commentators "got it wrong," starting with Buddhaghosa in the Paramatthajotikā, followed by Dhammapāla in the Paramatthadīpanī. Only the author of the CullaNiddesa seems to have understood the compound (anañña) correctly as a synonym for the self. The notion of "not supporting/nourishing/taking care of others" is belied not only by the source stories, but also by the role of the Buddhist renunciant in ancient Indian society. Indeed, he/she did not support a spouse and children, but his/her role, to rid the self of afflictions and teach the Dhamma to the laity in fact represented the acme of supporting others. This of course is one of the slanders that the Mahāyānists levelled against the Theravādins that they worked only for themselves, not for others but the charge has no validity for any student of the Pīṭaka who is familiar with the numerous stories of the Buddha and his disciples’ compassionate behaviour to all whom they met. The persistence of the active interpretation of posin over the passive, is probably to be explained by the commentators' belief that the monk was in some sense "supported by others," even though the virtue that was being addressed here was not physical support per se, but the non-dependency on others for liberation, and in a practical vein, the non-dependency on any one particular person for requisites (as in the case of Mahākassapa); this biased the interpretation towards the active meaning of "not supporting produced, self-sufficient, independent," an epithet of the Buddha per Childers, *Dictionary*, 471), or he explains the self-mastery in the wisdom of paccekbodhim because of the absence of the condition of being led by another."
others" even when it seemed to be contextually irrelevant and a somewhat dubious virtue. Nevertheless it is still not clear why only one of three ancient exegetes recognized the "not another/others = self" equivalency, esp. when it was already used with that meaning in several other places in the canon, including the *Paramatthajotiṭṭhī* itself. "Supporting oneself" and "supported by oneself" in both active and passive form capture one of the core, primary virtues of those on the path to enlightenment, i.e. self-reliance, and this is the fundamental meaning of *anānāposin*, with various overtones and subtleties as discussed above.

63. **okamokata** A1, A5

No one is quite sure what the expression *okamokata* means in Dhp 34:

*Vārijova thale khitto okamokata ubbhato.*

*pariphandat' idam cittaṃ, Māradheyyaṃ pahātave’ ti.*

Norman translates, "Like a fish taken from its watery home and thrown on the ground, this thought quivers all over in order to escape the dominion of Māra." The phrase "watery home" is also used by Müller and Carter & Paliyawadana, and is based on Buddhaghosa’s gloss, which, as the PED points out "is not warranted." Here we read, "*Okamokata ubbhato* here means water in such an expression as 'With their robes filled with water' (Vin 1, 253, with var. *ogha*-, "filled with the flood"), and here means home, in such an expression as 'Having abandoned every home, he wanders homeless' (Sn 844-a); here also both meanings obtain,  

'From the residence which is called water (okamokato),' is the meaning.” One problem with this exegesis is that the reading should be okamokato, to make it an ablative; this could be a change m.c. as this syllable must be short according to the metre. But there are other problems. Beside the var. reading in the Vinaya reference (oga- instead of oka-), we also find in the UV (31.2-b) okād oghāt samuddhṛtaḥ (“taken out of the water, out of the flood”), and something similar is also found in the Tib and the Ch. The Ch translates shēn yuān 深淵, which means "deep abyss," the latter word used for S ogha, per the DDB. Tib has chu bo’i gnas nas rab btog te, "taken from its river home." where the primary meaning chu bo is river (nadī, sarit, āpagā, etc.) and flood (oghā). So there was apparently at least one oral tradition which derived at least one of the words of the compound from ogha. Unfortunately the G version of this pāda is missing, and may have unravelled the mystery; if it too had the intervocalic -k- (or -h-), keeping in mind that -k- -kh- and -h- sounds coalesced in the GDhp and Niya documents as an unvoiced velar or uvular fricative [x or χ], then this would account for the presence of the word oha (i.e. oka representing oha = S ogha with loss of aspirated stop > aspirate only) in the transmission tradition, and suggest that the source of the verse was from a G dialect. This

---

1143 Dn-a 2893-7: ‘okamokata ubbhato’ ti ‘okapuṇṇhehi cīvarehi’ ti ettha udakaṅ ‘okaṃ okaṃ pahāya aniketasān’ ti ettha ālayo, idha ubhayam pi labbhati okamokao ti hi ettha okamokato udakasaṅkhātā ālayā ti ayam attho. In the Vinaya quote (which tells the story of some monks who get soaked on their way to see the Buddha), there is an alternative reading ogha-puṇṇehi (Sp 110614).

1144 The Ch version may be found at T04n0213_p0795b08; for Tib see Zongste, Udānavarga, 350. See Negi, Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary, 1202.

1145 See, for example, the word makavhā = maghavan (“Indra,” maghavan > *mahavan > makavhā) in GDhp 120-a. This is one possible derivation. Brough gives maghavan > *magavhā > makavhā, with -k- substituting for -g- and transfer of aspiration. For the Niya documents see GDhp §41 and Bailey, "Gāndhāri," 792 where S mahī is represented by Niya makhi. See also GDhp §30 where Brough suggests that -k-in G = [χ].
still does not solve the grammatical problem, although oha-mohata(o) ubbhato, "pulled from the confusion of the flood" does sound more à propos in the context. A better explanation might perhaps be okam-okata-ubbhato, with okata = ogata/avagata, the use of -k- for -g- being quite common in the GDhp. This would give "immersed in the flood and taken (from it)" and require no change, although it is an awkward tatpuṣa/dvandva. In the end it is impossible to establish what the compound actually means, but the presence of the variants oka and oha/ogha does well illustrate the probable effects of dialect confusion in the oral transmission. Another example of this compound occurs in Dhp 91-d where the meaning 'whatever shelter they have" (PED) seems particularly inept, as they have already abandoned their shelter in the previous padas:

uyuyuñjanti satīmanto, na nikete ramanti te.

haṃsāva pallalaṃ hitvā, okamokāṃ jahanti te.

"The mindful go away [from their homes]. They do not delight in a house; like geese which have abandoned their pond, they abandon whatever shelter they have." The commentary confirms the interpretation of okamokāṃ as sabbālaye ("all homes" or "all attachments," Dhp 2, 170). There is no GDhp corresponding verse, but UV 17.1-d has okam oghaṃ jahante, "they abandon their home, the flood." Another possibility, as discussed above, and one which makes better contextual sense, is o(g)ha-moham, "they abandoned the confusion of the flood." The Ch version seems to have inverted the compound and has 已度痴淵, yǐ dù chī yuān, "they have

1146 Brough, GDhp §38.
crossed over the flood of delusion.” The Tib recension has *de dag khyim spangs chu bo rgal* ("they abandoned their home, crossing over the flood"), with the repetition of *chu bo* as in 31-2b. So, judging from the UV, Ch and Tib, there was clearly a tradition which transmitted the word *ogha* and perhaps *moha* as well. Whether *oka*, "home" represents another transmission, or simply a dialect form of these words is impossible to determine.

64. *paleti/pradeti/paridi/paraiti* A4, A5

In Dhp 49-c and corresponding verses we find three different verbs in the subordinate clause: P has *paleti* (< S व्पात्र or व्पातित्र in caus., *pālayati*, "to go on, to move, to keep going" per PED); GDhp 292-c has *paridi* (= P *paleti*), with the western -r- in place of eastern -l- of the P and same meaning; PDhp 127-c has *pradeti* (< S *pra + धित्र, to fly away*); and UV 18.8-c has *paraiti* (< S *pare + धित्र, "to go away, go along, depart") with var. -leti, restored by the editor to *pāleti*, as per P and G. Since the alternation of -ḍ- > -l- is very common in MI, and normal directionality is -ḍ- > -l-, this suggests that the earlier form was probably PDhp *pradeti*, both

---

1147 T04n0210_p0564b03, or "...the delusory flood."
1148 Zongste, *Udānavarga*, 172.
1149 Dhp 49: *Yathāpi bhamaro puppham, vaṇṇagandhamahethayam. paleti rasamādāya, evam gāme munī care.*
Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 8, translates "As a bee takes nectar and goes away without hurting the colour or the smell of a flower, so should a sage wander in a village."
1150 See Pischel § 240 and Geiger §42.3. However the alternation of -ḍ- and -l- goes back to Vedic times (see Bloomfield and Edgerton *Vedic Variants*, §270) and there are numerous examples of Vedic words which utilize both intervocalics, e.g. नादानाला ("reed"), क्रित्तिक्रिति ("he plays"), निदानिला ("abode"), etc. The Ch version of Dhp 49-c has छ, *qu*, "depart" at T04n0210_p0563b02; the Tib has *’phur ba* (Zongste, *Udānavarga*, 180) which means "fly" and usually translates utpatati or a derivative of धित्र, per Negi, *Dictionary*, 3652. Another example of this change may be found in Dhp 90-d where P has *parilāho*
because semantically it makes the most sense ("as a bee takes nectar and flies away...") and because it would normally change dialectically to \textit{paḷ(ḷ)eti} in the P (with -ḍ- > -l- or -l- and \textit{pr}- > p-) and \textit{paridi} in western G (with the -l- > -r- change); the UV version is simply a homonym of P \textit{paleti} with change of -l- > -r- = S \textit{paraiti}. Of course there is also nothing to prevent \textit{praḍeti} being a back-formation from \textit{paleti} either. The point to be emphasized here is not so much priority (which is often impossible to determine), as the nature of the oral/aural transmission process which can account for these changes as rooted in a pre-manuscript \textit{bhāṇaka} tradition; for the existence of one or more reference MSS in the translation process would normally result in harmonization of all these differences, not their preservation.

\textbf{Discussion}

i) the nature of the earliest recoverable Buddhist language

This study has examined an earlier language of Buddhism - variously termed “pre-canonical” (Lévi), a \textit{lingua franca} (Geiger), “proto-canonical” (Edgerton), a \textit{koine} (Smith), or Buddhist Middle Indic (von Hinüber) - underlying P and the other Buddhist Pkts, i.e. BHS, G, and the language of the PDhp. This is probably not the “original” language of Buddhism, - which, considering where the Buddha lived and taught, was likely an eastern Pkt closer to AMg or Mg - but a language of the trade routes, a \textit{Verkehrssprache} as Geiger termed it (page 27 above), a kind of simplified \textit{lingua franca}, pan-dialect in nature, which tried to eliminate the major dialectal

\(\text{("burning"), and PDhp 86-d has paridāhā (idem) and UV 29.35-d a re-Sanskritized paridāgho < S paridāha ("burning") < ṇdah, "to burn."} \)
differences, so that it could be understood by any MI speaker, including the MI speakers of the north-western sub-continent where Buddhism disseminated very early on. It had many similarities to G which was the most sociolinguistically dominant and prestigious of the dialects, coming from the Aryan north-west (see page 53), but was clearly not identical with it; for although G had eliminated many of the dialect differences, through lenition or disappearance of intervocalic stops, change of aspirated stops to aspirates only, etc., it still preserved dialect features of the north-west, like the distinction between the palatal, retroflex and dental sibilants, and it often retained the conjunct consonants with -r-, and the evidence (like the original spelling of *bāhana or the confusion over šiśthila/suthira, see items 44 and 58 above, Chapter 9) shows that these features were not in the earlier language. The words we have studied provide definitive proof of the existence and nature of this common source which must have existed in the putative reconstructed forms in order to account for the various derivatives. This is not simply a "reasonable hypothesis," but if the methods of historical linguistics are valid, a scientific certainty. So for example the only explanation for the four different interpretations of the compound sabbato-pabhaṃ (item 48, Chapter 9) and various reflexes, is that they all go back to an original transmission *-paha(u) (as the dialect must have had nom. sing. in both -a and -u, as does G) which was differentially interpreted (i.e. back-translated) to -prabhā, -prabhū-, -patha, and -ṛthu, by the respective scribes. The only other explanation is the highly improbable if not impossible suggestion that four independent traditions somehow coalesced in four phonologically similar words. One might have argued along such a line were this phonological similarity a rarity; however, as we have seen, it happens dozens or even hundreds of times. This study has identified many of these "protoforms" which must have existed to account for the parallel, cognate variants which have arisen from them (*su(ṽ)vaya,
item 7, Chapter 7; *ussāa/ussāya, item 8, Chapter 7; *vīrayo, item 11, Chapter 8;
*sāṃhinna/*sāṃhanna, item 14, Chapter 8; *pa(r)n(n)ahāra, item 15, Chapter 8;
pal(r)i’al *pal(r)iha, item 21, chapter 8; *ahiØVrati/*ahiVrati, item 28, Chapter 8; *sahāa, item 33, Chapter 8 *pa(ā)yet(d)i, item 52, Chapter 9, etc.). Morphologically, a particularly interesting example of this earlier form is the optative case where the Sanskritized Pkt of the PDhp appears to have preserved the earliest form (-eya < S -eta) which in P was -eyya (active) or -etha (middle); GDhp corresponding form was -e’ya for both, and in the Mvu it was Sanskritized to -eta. We can therefore consider the existence of an earlier, underlying source common to the later witnesses as an established fact.

What is the nature of this earlier communication form? It was malleable and flexible, adaptable to different dialects. It eliminated the major differences between the dialects by

1) the lenition or elision of intervocalic stops. I will be discussing this point in more detail in the following chapter. Voicing or devoicing of intervocalic stops was a problematic MI dialect feature as some MI dialects - like Krorainic, the language of the Niya document and Tocharian - were devoid of voiced stops, and others seemed to mix them randomly. Some of the native languages (e.g. Dravidian, Munda in certain contexts) also did not recognize voiced stops in

---

1151 See footnote 174, and discussion on this in Salomon, Gāndhārī Rhinoceros Sūtra, 51-52, where he says that "the archetype from which the G version was translated was...written in a midland MIA dialect...[which] seems not to have been very different from Pali as we know it today. For when we compare the extant P and G texts side by side, it is possible to derive the readings of the latter [G], in the great majority of cases, from forms identical or very similar to those which we actually have in the former [P]." In fact we have adduced several other examples in this study which show that G and P did not derive from each other, but from a common underlying form; see, for example, the discussion on the "protoforms" mentioned above and throughout.
their phonology.\textsuperscript{1152} Since voiced and voiceless stops were not phonemically distinctive for a good number of MI and MISL speakers, in the lingua franca or “inter-language” of the early teachings they were freely interchanged at the point of articulation, omitted, or replaced by a glide consonant (\(\text{-y-}\), \(\text{-v-}\), \(\text{-h-}\) or \(\text{-k-}\)), allowing each interlocutor or hearer to fill in the appropriate consonant from his/her dialect according to context. This often led to ambiguities.

2) the change of aspirated stops to aspirates only. Again the elimination of the stop probably relates to the lack of voiceless/voiced differentiation referred to above. Retention of the aspirate alone allowed an MI speaker to fill in the appropriate blank according to his/her dialect, and signalled an MISL speaker of the presence of an aspirate which he/she otherwise might not hear, for Dravidian speakers did not have aspirates, nor were aspirated stops part of the native sub-system of Munda speakers.\textsuperscript{1153}

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{1152} Burrow, Language of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents, viii, and Adams, D. Q. Tocharian Historical Phonology and Morphology (New Haven: American Oriental Society, 1988), 36. For Dravidian see Kamil V. Zvelebil, Dravidian Linguistics An Introduction (Pondicherry: Pondicherry Institute of Linguistics and Culture, 1990), 7. For Munda, see page 111.
\item \textsuperscript{1153} Ghosh, “Santali,” 26. This would also apply to confusion of stops and aspirated stops with the same voicing and same point of articulation. See footnote 16 for some examples. Another example is the compound \textit{yathodhikāṇi} (“to its full extent, as far as the limit, utmost”) which occurs in Sn 60-c, and also at Jā. 3, 381\textsuperscript{22} with variant readings of \textit{yatodhikāṇi} and \textit{yatothitāṇi}, with the \textit{-th-} > \textit{-t-} and \textit{-dh-} > \textit{-th-}.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
3) assimilation of most conjunct consonants to geminates or resolution through the addition of an epenthetic vowel. Conjunct consonants at the beginning of a word were either assimilated to a single stop, or resolved. Generally, by Aśokan times, assimilation was more prevalent in the west and resolution in the east.

4) all the sibilants, whether palatal, retroflex or dental were assimilated to a single dental -s-.

5) the glides -γ- and -ν- were often interchangeable as were -ν- and -m- in nasalized contexts, and -γ- and -j- (see item 22 above, Chapter 8). The Munda languages, Tib and Ch lack a -ν- sound which probably contributed to that sound’s plasticity.

6) loss of differentiation between -l- and -r-. -l- was typically an eastern feature and -r- a western, but they were often interchanged.

These are the principal simplifications that have been identified; there were many other changes that took place in specific linguistic contexts or under the influence of local dialectal idiosyncracies. It was probably not a single "standardized" language or dialect per se, but a fluid form of communication, which levelled the distinctive differences between the dialects (that is, a koine), to facilitate interregional communication, and allowing for each interlocutor to interpret the communication through the matrix of their own dialect. As we have seen, the simplification of the language by the elimination of many of the distinctive phonological features, led to phonological convergence, whereby one sound could have many derivations and possible meanings. It was up to the hearer or translator to pick the right word suitable to the dialect he or she was translating into. Often this was simple, for there was only one word that fit the context; but sometimes a choice had to be made between two or more possibilities. This problem became especially troublesome because of the trend towards Sanskritization which
began in the second century BCE and became more and more dominant in the early centuries of the Common Era. By their nature the Pkts were more homonymic than S and comfortable with it - a word like *satta* in P did not have to be translated, and it was up to the hearer/reader/commentator to pick the appropriate meaning in context; no translation was necessary as that was already the root term, the "Grundform." The problem arose with Sanskritization; which of the many derivations was the "correct" one? Only one could be chosen.

ii) the question of semantic ambiguity

The identification of this malleable, cross-dialect language as a common denominator to P and the other Buddhist Pkts is the first focus of this study; the second is the isolation of some of the lexemic content, which has been discussed above. An additional goal is the investigation of the question of meaning. For the phonological fluidity of the *lingua franca* is mirrored in the richness of its semantic fabric. One word could and did have several meanings, as has been demonstrated. Nevertheless, to what extent the polysemy can be used to elucidate the meaning of the early Buddhist texts is problematical. We have seen that the Buddha and his disciples were not adverse to this phenomenon of semantic polysemy. Unlike the Vedic tradition, where words were fixed and absolute sonic effusions of the absolute, language in the early Buddhist suttas mirrors the interdependent nature of life; there was nothing absolute about the meaning and one used words in full awareness of their conventional applicability and usefulness in describing intergrading phenomena - like milk, cream, curds, or the various kinds of self (see page 234 above) - without being misled by their supposed reality. So
Sanskritization, which involved fixing one meaning to a word, often obscured the etymological word play inherent in the teachings (like the derivation of \textit{brāhmaṇa} < \textit{bṛh} or \textit{brhm} or \textit{śramaṇa} < \textit{śram} or \textit{sam}, see items 44 & 45 above), and may have narrowed the semantic fabric of the teachings. This is strictly conjectural, as we do not know how the average MI speaker responded to the homonyms he/she heard, or indeed, whether they were heard as such.

Certainly in the learned commentary (ancient and modern), we know that in many cases the various semantic strata were discerned. The compound \textit{pahitatta}, for example, could and did refer to two complementary aspects of the path (Chapter Six); \textit{atta}'s use in the passages of the Sn discussed above referred to both the self and taking up those afflictions which created it, and \textit{niratta} to the absence of self and the laying down of its burdens (item 4 above, Chapter 7).

The compound \textit{dhammapīti} means both “drinking the dharma” and “joy of the dharma” (and perhaps “protection of the dharma,” item 53, Chapter 9), and evil deeds do not \textit{mucchati} (“curdle”) immediately and therefore one is not \textit{muccati} (“freed”) from the effects of them (item 54, Chapter 9). For many of these and other simple puns we can hypothesize that the early Buddhist tradition used them knowingly, but to what extent they were so understood by the listener, it is impossible to say. In some of the more complex compounds - like \textit{sabbatopabham}, for example, for which we have four possible meanings (item 48, Chapter 9) – we can not be so sure, either how many levels of meaning were understood, whether one or more or indeed what was intended by the composer - the whole issue of author intention is intractable. All we can say is that some words have two or more meanings in certain contexts and leave it to the reader to determine which one(s) resonate. Whether \textit{mantabhāṇī} means “speaking gently” or “speaking with wisdom” or “speaking after thinking carefully,” all three or only two, is not determinable (item 49, Chapter 9). The same goes for the multiple meanings of \textit{tāyi} (item 10,
Chapter 7), anibbisāṁ (item 5, Chapter 7), nirattha (item 6, Chapter 7), sutta (item 9, Chapter 7), nibbāna (item 2, Chapter 7), nekkhamma (item 19, Chapter 8), pannabhāra (item 15, Chapter 8), vibhūta and ahaṃkāra (items 59 & 60, Chapter 9), and many others detailed above. All we can do here is lay out the possibilities and try to explain the process by which the semantic ambiguity arose.

iii) resolving old confusions

A third benefit of this study - where this technique of comparison and reconstruction is particularly valuable - is in sorting out old confusions. We understand that isipatana and isivadana are both misconstruings of an original isivayana or isivajana (ṛṣivrjana, item 50, Chapter 9). We can reconstruct the word underlying prabhinnakhīlassa and prahīnakhīlasya and conclude with some degree of certainty that the first is the more accurate translation (item 46, Chapter 9). The compound vighuṣṭa-śabda is indeed cognate with vivatta-chadda through an earlier form viṭṭ(th)a- which was apparently misconstrued as < S vikṛṣṭa (item 56, Chapter 9). We can correct the derivation of paccekabuddha (item 1, Chapter 7), or at least provide a thorough exegesis of the term, taking into account all possible meanings. The existence of various hyperforms that we have identified emphasize once again that P and the other Pkts are the result of a translation process from an earlier stratum. Analysis of the use of the verb form nimisaṁ (item 42, Chapter 9) where what is exchanged is confused with what it is exchanged for, also shows the constructed nature of P, and suggests that it was never a spoken language anywhere.
iv) identifying oral transmission issues

This study also shows that many of the ambiguity problems in the canon are simply the result of jumbled transmission by the bhāṇakas. Consonant and whole word metatheses, word deletion, accidental epenthesis and phonological confusion are quite common (item 12, Chapter 8; item 61, Chapter 9). The parallel phrases na pāraṁ diguṇaṁ yanti and na pāraṁ dvigunāyati (item 37, Chapter 8) cannot be traced to any “Urform.” They are simply garbled, probably at the oral stage, and one has to choose the most appropriate version based on semantic, not phonological principles. The same can be said of the parallel phrases samsāraṁ moham vs. saṃsāraugham (page 36) or -saṅkhāvimutto vs. -saṅkhayavimutto (item 55, Chapter 9). We can understand how these inconsistencies arose, but the directionality is not certain. Examples of phonetic mellifluity as in damayanti/ramayanti, manayanti (item 16, Chapter 8) represent either genuine dialect ambiguity, phonological word-play or transmission errors - we can not be certain. Von Simson has isolated several of these phonological (but semantically divergent) correspondences in the P and S versions of the Mahāparinnibāṇa/Mahāparinirvāṇa, Mahāpadāna/Mahāvādana, and Catuspaṭiṣat sutras which he believes are explainable in terms of the oral tradition; i.e. because of auditory confusion, phonologically similar words- like P evam, S etan, P aṇñataro, S ājñātavān, P sammodi, S sammukham, etc. - emerge in syntactically similar environments, but with different meanings. Examples like these point to the complexity of the transmission process where the diachronicity is not at all clear, as we are missing many of the nodes on the transmissional

chain; we can still see that the witnesses are phonologically related, but we cannot see how one is derived from the other. The process of change is continuous, where each tradent does not necessarily pass the source transmission along in the exact form received. As the Buddha teaches, anicca is one of the three marks of existence, and this of course includes language.

v) use of non-Indic translations

In a case like attasambhavaḥ vs. anḍasambhavaḥ (item 32, Chapter 8), where there is imperfect phonological correspondence, reference to other non Indic versions (Tib and Ch which both reflect the anḍa- compound) are helpful at getting to the more cogent, contextually relevant compound. These Tib and Ch translations have been very useful in confirming our conclusions and expanding the dimensions of the study. The Tib translations are often word for word mirrors of the BHS and where they differ, they throw a whole new light on the translation process. For example their translation of (the word in their exemplar corresponding to anibbisam) as dug med (“without poison” < S nirviṣa, item 5) or the addition of the “cemetery ground” (from Prajinavaranam’s commentary) to their translation of bor ba (= nirasta; item 6, Chapter 7), or their translation of the word corresponding to P atikhitta as drangs pa (“bent” < S *āati + ākṛṣ, item 34, Chapter 8) provide evidence of semantic traditions heretofore undiscovered in MI sources. Ch translations, while often very general and in certain cases based on different traditions than the P and G texts, are sometimes surprisingly much simpler and clearer than the MI gāthā that they are translating (item 40, Chapter 9).

vi) commentarial tradition
In many cases the study confirms the commentarial understanding of the tradition which has preserved the semantic pedigree of the word (e.g. *unnaḷa*, item 24, Chapter 8 or *mantā*, item 49, Chapter 9), while various fanciful (and often wrong) interpretations have accrued alongside it.

But the commentarial tradition is itself not infallible (e.g. *bāhusaccena*, item 36 which probably derives from $S < \sqrt{sMr}$ rather than $\sqrt{srU}$) and can invent complex glosses for wrong etymologies (e.g., *isipatana*, item 50, Chapter 9 or *accasārī*, item 39, Chapter 8). A most interesting example is Sn 44 and 64 where the same word (*saṃchinna/-saṃhīna/saṃbhīna*-accompanied by numerous variants) means the exact opposite in a similar context; the commentary has preserved the two traditions and meanings, but the verse has not (item 14, Chapter 8).

One of the continuing findings of this study is the inaccuracy of the transmission. Whenever there is a problem with a verse, there are always numerous MI variants, as the tradents try to figure out what the original meant (item 3, Chapter 7; items 13, 20, 28, Chapter 8; item 41, Chapter 9 etc.). While sometimes these can all be traced to a single underlying form, often they cannot all be resolved this way, pointing to human invention and human error as potent forces in the transformation of the oral and written tradition. This sometimes led to complete change of meaning like item 56 where an important doctrinal message about the nature of reality (“piercing the veil of existence”) becomes watered down in the BHS tradition to an empty and common hyperbole, referring to the Buddha’s “far sounding words.” This is not to say that P is the earliest or even the most authentic tradition; no such generality can be made, as often the other Prakits are more accurate, as has been demonstrated (item 1, Chapter 7), or at least as
cogent in their interpretation. Perhaps a good model for this change can be drawn from the field of evolutionary biology: descent with variation. Although we can never isolate exactly “what the Buddha said,” we can trace back through the evolutionary strata to an earlier strata, expanding our historical horizons and inching closer to what happened in the early centuries of the Buddhist tradition. Norman called this strata Old Māgadhī and Lüders Māgadhī, which he believed to be the same as the Māgadhi of the Aśoka inscriptions, i.e., the language of Aśoka’s secretariat in Pāṭaliputra (administrative language or Verkehrssprache); he also called it Alt Ardha-Māgadhī, as did Alsdorf.1155 Von Hinüber called it BMI, which he felt already showed changes from the earliest language of Buddhism.1156 This language was similar to the northern pan-Indic trade language we have been describing above, which eliminated dialect issues through simplification of dialect differences. Conceptually, this makes sense; the language of Aśoka’s government, but, as Lüders suggested, at a further stage of phonological development to eliminate eastern and western dialect differences, and probably influenced by the dialect of the northwest which was prestigious and already at a further stage of development in terms of phonological lenition, would be appropriate for pan Indic uses, as a trade language, an administrative language, and a language for the spread of the Buddha’s teachings to divergent dialect groups. This transmission was then re-translated into the various forms (i.e. P) and dialects (e.g. G) and Sanskritized. Each time a translation took place, variation had the potential to enter, either through arbitrary fixing of a word’s meaning (and

1155 Lüders certainly believed this earlier stratum was the language of the “Urkanon,” i.e. the language in which the Buddha spoke, and Norman says that a work like the Sabhiyasutta was actually composed in such a Pkt, which comparative philology uncovers, suggesting that these words were actually spoken by the Buddha. See “Dialects in which the Buddha preached,” §3.14. These assertions are of course impossible to verify.

1156 See footnote 63.
thereby ignoring other possibilities), completely misunderstanding a word’s meaning, mis-hearing, mis-dictation, or (later, when writing entered the picture) scribal errors. Each of these variations remains as a node on the timescale, documenting the vagaries and idiosyncracies of the transmission process, which variation, considering how few manuscripts have been preserved, is quite formidable. This is not to say that we do not know what the Buddha taught, but that there has been significant variation from his “original words” is both natural and undeniable; and although we may not be able to fully and confidently define some of the key doctrinal concepts - *paccakabuddha, nibbāna, sutta, pannabhāra, nekkhamma, samaṇa, mantabhāṇī*, etc. - this process of comparative philology has been extremely valuable in illuminating their dense, rich and fluid phonological and semantic fabric. Although we can isolate a few of these underlying lexemes with some confidence, the main purpose of this study is to prepare the ground for a better understanding of the practices of translation and transmission, for a better comprehension of the “how” rather than the “what” of the Buddhist tradition, in a particular early point of its history.
Part Three

The next four chapters branch off on a new vector, but a direction that has been repeatedly alluded to throughout the previous study - i.e. the influence of non-IA languages on the development of P and the other Pkts. This is an area which has received very little attention to date, largely because of the lack of source material. Nevertheless a convincing argument can be made for non-IA linguistic influence on IA languages by studying issues like random voicing and devoicing of intervocalic consonants. In Chapter Ten I argue in the microcosm, that confusion over voicing is caused by bilingual speakers whose native language was not IA. In Chapter Eleven, I provide the background theory for linguistic diffusion from non-IA languages, and in Chapter Twelve I give an example of how a fairly common non-IA word can be better understood if its linguistic heritage is clarified. Finally in Chapter Thirteen I look at the dhāranīs of the Lotus Sutra, as they were transliterated in Ch. Carefully examining the transliterations, allows us to say something about the source Pkt and quite a bit about the process of transmission of the buddhadharma. Chapter Fourteen provides the conclusions.
Chapter Ten, Voicing, Devoicing of Intervocalic Consonants

Lüders felt that the language of the Urkaron coincided with the Māgadhī of the Aśoka inscriptions ("Alt-Ardhamāgadhi"), except that it was further advanced; voiceless stops between vowels were softened and voiced stops had already disappeared (see page 29 above). The language he was describing is similar to the Verkehrssprache described in the previous chapter, the language that the canon was translated into, and through which the Buddha’s teachings were disseminated across India. To what extent Aśoka’s Kanzleisprache, the administrative language of the ruling government in Pātaliputra and the Verkehrssprache were similar or identical is unknown; however, both show similar phonological features and development, and the equation of the northern pan-Indic trade language with the administrative language of Aśoka’s empire seems logical enough. Norman has shown that the “underlying Pkt” of the Aśokan edicts possessed many of these homogenizing features which tended to weaken or eliminate dialect differences.1157 Lüders had earlier compiled a comprehensive list of these, and for intervocalic lenition he cited the change of S adhikṛtya ("regarding") > adhigicya in the Bhabra edict, hidalogam ca palalogam (“this world and the other”) in J Sep. Ed. 2, H (while, however, Dh has hidalokam palalokam and even J is inconsistent with hidalogikapālalokikeṇa at section F); the change of S suffix -ika > -ikya and > -iya in the Aśokan edicts and P; change of -uka > -uva, e.g. S śuka, “parrot” > P suva; the lenition of -t- > -d- in the K, Sh and M, RE 5, J, ħidasukhāye, “for the benefit and happiness” (while Dh has hitasukhāye); Lüders considered the hyperform paṭipātayema, “you should produce” < S pratipādayati (although Dh has

---

"patipādayema) in J Sep. Ed. 1, M a more important example, as the change of S -d- > -t-
indicated that “in the spoken language -d- for intervocalic -t- was widely prevalent while one
officially held to the old orthography.”\textsuperscript{1158} The change of -t- > -d- is also found in numerous P
words: S niryātayati, “give back, restore,” > P niyyādeti/niyyādayati; Skt utpāta, “unusual natural
phenomenon,” > P uppāda; Skt prṣata, “spotted antelope,” > P pasada (also pasata); Sruta
“animal roar,” > P ruda.\textsuperscript{1159} He also cites the lenition of p- > -v-, S vyāprta, “occupied” > P
vyāvata and the P word thevati < S \textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{step}}.\textsuperscript{1160} Lüders then goes on to cite numerous examples
of intervocalic voiced consonants > Ø or > an intervocalic glide (-y- or -ý-), many of which we
have discussed above,\textsuperscript{1161} and a series of “hyperpālisms,” where the P scribe, faced with a
voiced consonant in his exemplar, and knowing that the source language regularly voices
voiceless consonants, “restores” the original by devoicing, but incorrectly: so S agalu, “aloe”
appears in P as akalu, Agasti (proper name), as Akitti, S aglāsnu, “tireless” as akilāsu, S āpagā,
“river” as P āpakā, and numerous other instances.\textsuperscript{1162}

\textsuperscript{1158} Lüders, \textit{Beobachtungen}, § 87-94. For the quote, page 81: “...in der gesprochenen Sprache schon in
weitem Umfange d‘ für intervokalisches t eingetreten war, während man offiziell an der alten
Orthographie festhielt.” The argument seems specious as Dh has spelled the word “correctly.”
\textsuperscript{1159} Ibid, §95-98.
\textsuperscript{1160} Ibid, §99-100.
\textsuperscript{1161} Lüders, \textit{Beobachtungen}, §101-115: S nija > P niya, and S *anejā > *aneja/aneyai/*ane‘a > back-
formed to P aneja; see item 22, Chapter 8 above; *virayo > P virato, BHS virajo, item 11, Chapter 8
above; S sa vrajati, “he goes,” > *sa vrayadi > *va sayadi > P va sayati; *vayāmi > P vadāmi, mistake for
vrajāmi; S sampādayati, “he is able to explain” > P sampāyati; S tadṛś > BHS tāyi > P tādi, item 10,
chapter 8 above); Skt *svādati, “he tastes” > P sāyati; S khādita, “eaten” > P khāyita, see page 44; S
avādesi, “cause to reound” > P avayesi.
\textsuperscript{1162} For the hyperpālisms, see Lüders, \textit{Beobachtungen}, §122-147. Norman gives examples of
hypercorrections in the Aśokan edicts in “Some aspects of the phonology,” 134-35; also in \textit{Collected
Papers} 1, 95-6, which also suggest that the Pkt underlying the Aśokan edicts tended to voice
intervocalic consonants.
Lüders’ explanation for these linguistic anomalies is attractive; but it is not consistent: in some cases the eastern dialects (Dhauli and Jaugaḍa, which are presumably closest to Aśokan Māgadhī, since no rock edicts from Pāṭaliputra, the capital of Magadha, have been recovered) devoice intervocalics which are voiced in their exemplar (the underlying Pkt of the Aśokan edicts), and in other cases they do not. The process is haphazard. The same may be said for P, which on the whole preserves (or perhaps better, restores) S phonology, except in a relatively few number of cases where the voicing is incorrect or falsely hypercorrected by mechanical devoicing of voiced intervocalics (or vice versa). Some suggest that these anomalies occurred because the scribe did not understand the word he or she was translating, but since there are hundreds of examples of “incorrect” voicing and devoicing in the literature, this does not seem an adequate explanation for every case. Mehendale argues that these errors came about through borrowings; i.e. the eastern source language was characterized not by voicing, but by devoicing and P simply imported these without changing them back to their original state - in this case there was no need to invoke mechanical back-translations and the hyperpālisms that sometimes result. The dialect which most consistently weakens and/or eliminates intervocalic consonants is G, however, it does not do so consistently either (e.g. loka,), and sometimes intervocalics appear to be strengthened, not weakened (as upaka = S upaga, “useful for” in Sh M RE 2 B or kothu = S krodha, “anger” in GDhp 274; ); the latter example may in fact be a survival of “historical spelling” as Brough suggests with no difference in

1163 Norman, “Some Aspects of the phonology of the Prakrit,” 132-33. Also in Collected Papers 1, 94.
pronunciation,\textsuperscript{1165} or it and \textit{upaka} may be a dialect feature, i.e. the inheritance of an allophone from a dialect where the differentiation between voiced and voiceless stops is not phonemic. This is certainly the case in the related language of the Niya documents, whose native language, like Tocharian was devoid of voiced stops, although both Khotanese and G maintained this distinction.\textsuperscript{1166} Proto-Dravidian language speakers also did not hear the voiced/voiceless stop distinction; voiceless stops occur at the beginning of a word and they are voiced intervocalically as allophones of their voiceless counterparts: they are in complementary distribution.\textsuperscript{1167} A similar situation occurs in Old Sinhalese (into which language the canon was translated in the 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BCE by A\textsuperscript{ś}oka’s son Mahinda, according to tradition), where voiceless stops between vowels regularly change to corresponding voiced stops, while rarely the opposite occurs.\textsuperscript{1168} In the Munda languages the contrast in the native subsystem between voiced and voiceless stops (except for retroflex) is neutralized in final position and before

\textsuperscript{1165} Brough, GDhp, §42.

\textsuperscript{1166} Thomas Burrow, "The Dialectical Position of the Niya Prakrit," \textit{Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, University of London}, 8, No. 2/3 (1936), 431. In Bloomfield & Edgerton’s \textit{Vedic Variants}, vol. 2, 20, the authors note that “The large mass of variants of this kind, clearly pointing to extensive influence of Middle-Indic phonetics in the earliest periods of the language, seems to us one of the most important results of this volume of the \textit{Vedic Variants}.”

\textsuperscript{1167} Sanford B. Steever, "Introduction to the Dravidian Languages," in Sanford B. Steever, ed., \textit{The Dravidian Languages} (London and New York, 1998), 15. In Proto-Dravidian, voiced stops are allophones or their voiceless counterparts. See also Zvelebil, "Dravidian Linguistics," 15.

\textsuperscript{1168} S. Paranavitana, \textit{Inscriptions of Ceylon, Volume 1, Containing Cave Inscriptions from 3rd Century BCE to 1st Century A.C. and other Inscriptions in the early Brāhmī Script} (Ceylon: Department of Archaeology Ceylon, 1970), xxx. In §27 the author lists several examples of intervocalic lenition in the inscriptions like S \textit{cāṭi} > \textit{cōḍi}; \textit{catuṣ} > \textit{cadu}; \textit{nata} > \textit{nāḍa}; in section 28 he lists examples of rarer intervocalic fortition: \textit{naγa}ra > \textit{nakara}; \textit{bhaginī} > \textit{bakini}, etc. Old Sinhalese, however, does have voiceless and voiced stops as part of its phonemic inventory, although the former usu. changes to the latter intervocalically.
vowels, where they are replaced by checked sounds, or optionally voiced consonants; so for example \textit{dak'}, “rain” > \textit{dag-a} or \textit{dak’-a} before /-a/, (“it rains/will rain”).\footnote{Arun Ghosh, "Santali," 31. \textit{k’} is a checked consonant.} In this kind of situation -\textit{k}- and -\textit{g}- are allophones.

Phonologically then, the linguistic tapestry of ancient India in the 5\textsuperscript{th} to 3\textsuperscript{rd} century BCE is highly complex. At least four strands can be identified: 1) numerous MI dialects, many of which have not been preserved (like Old Māgadhī) and can only be reconstructed, if known, 2) the natural evolutionary process of language which tends to simplification and lenition, 3) the effects of MI languages like Krorainic and IE Tocharian which lacked a voiced stop and the indigenous Indic languages - specifically Dravidian and Munda - who also lacked the voiced and unvoiced stop distinction, and whose MISL speakers were an important force influencing the phonological, morphological and semantic development of MI (see Chapter 11) and 4) the complications of an unquantifiable sociolinguistic dynamic in Aśoka’s influential administrative language and the prestigious brahmanical dialects of the Aryans’ ancient homelands in the northwest.

On top of all this one must of course add human error, which is the factor usually invoked for changes in the transmission. There are only three possible causes of these changes: 1) dialectal idiosyncrasy, i.e. natural phonological development where a definite change sometimes or always happens in a certain phonetic environment. We know for example that in G most intervocalic stops are subject to lenition of one form or another; 2) mistakes because a scribe did not understand the form; these are either hyperforms, i.e. mechanical back-formation according to the scribe’s understanding of how his dialect translates the source dialect, or just
wrong guesses based on ignorance and 3) mistakes because the dictator or scribe (either MISL or MI speakers whose native language lacked phonemic voiced consonants) was not able to distinguish between voiced and voiceless consonants.

Lüders, for example, considered *hidalgam ca palalagam* (“this world and the other”) in J Sep. Ed. 2, (H) to be an example of the eastern dialects’ voicing of voiceless stops. However, Dh which is the same dialect as J does not voice the -k- of *loka* (*hidalokam palaloka*), which would certainly been expected if *loka > loga* was a feature of these dialects. In fact, in the same Sep. Ed (J) has *hidalogikapālalokikeṇa* with both -g- and -k- in the same word, suggesting either a very sloppy scribe or perhaps one who did not recognize the phonemic difference between a voiced -g- and an voiceless -k-. Further evidence of the loss of voiceless/voiced distinction is Dh’s treatment of S *acala* as *ajalā*, while J left the word as is (*acala*) in Sep. Ed. 2 H, or the devoicing of Skt *prati + ṣpad*, caus. “strive to deal” by J (*paṭipātayema*) but not by Dh (*paṭipādayema*) in Sep. Ed. 1, L (the same phenomena occurs for the root *samprati + ṣpad*, caus. at Sep. Ed. 1, R: Dh *sampatipād*- and J *sampaṭipātayaṃtam*). The reverse situation obtains for the compound *hitasukhāye* (“for the benefit and happiness”< S *hita sukhaṇya*) in RE 5 J; Dh and Eṛṛ do not voice (*hitasukhāye*) while K, Sh, and M all do (*hidasukhāye*), while at RE 5 K both Dh and Sh do not voice (*hitasukhāye*) while K and M do (*hidasukhāye*). If Sh regularly voices intervocalic stops (which is usually the case) why did it not do so here in this latter case? And Dh’s lack of voicing also seems to contradict Lüders’ hypothesis. A similar situation also happens with the word *kamboja* (< S *kamboja*, PN) in RE 5 J, where Dh and Eṛṛ have spelled it incorrectly as *kamboca* while Gir, K, and M have *kamboja* and Sh has *kamboya*, with a lenition common in G. Norman calls the Dh and Eṛṛ spelling a hyper-correction, but it might also be a
mistake on the part of scribes who did not hear the difference between an voiceless -c- and a voiced -ɟ-.\textsuperscript{1170} \(Eṛṛ\) is deep in Dravidian territory and in Aśoka’s time a non-IA language(s), either Munda or Dravidian or both, was also spoken in Dh (part of Kalinga).\textsuperscript{1171} The same situation occurs with the transcribing of the PN for Antiochus in RE 2 A and RE 13 Q which shows much confusion between -k- and -g-. While the other REs are consistent with their choice of -k- or -g-, \(Eṛṛ\) has a form with -g- in RE 2 (Aṃṭiyoge) and one with -k- in RE 13 (Aṃṭiyoke), again suggesting a blurring of the voiced/voiceless distinction.

Most of these anomalies from the Aśokan edicts seem to be attributable to mistakes on the part of the scribes due to ignorance, hypercorrections, unfamiliarity with a new writing system, and/or failure to discriminate voiced vs. voiceless sounds. The nine instances detailed above, in which the individual scribes spell the same word in two different ways (voiced and voiceless), and the various other inconsistencies with the voicing, suggest more than just a hypercorrection (which presumably would at least be consistent, even if wrong), but a failure to

\textsuperscript{1170} Norman, “Some aspects of the phonology,” 135; also available in Collected Papers 1, 97: “the existence of Dh Y [=Erragudi] \textit{kamboca} … can only be explained on the supposition that the scribes at Dh and Y knew that their exemplars sometimes have -j- where their local Pkt had -c-. They presumably did not know the correct name of a people living far away from them.” Another possible explanation is that the source transmission contained \textit{kamba}ya (as in Sh) and the two different consonants replacing the glide were simply guesses.

\textsuperscript{1171} See Lévi, “Pré-aryen et pré-dravidiens,” 11-13 who suggests that Kalinga and Trilinga (which spoke Telegu) are the same place; see also Henry Yule and A. C. Burnell, \textit{Hobson-Jobson a glossary of colloquial Anglo-Indian words and phrases, and of kindred terms, etymological, historical, geographical and discursive} (New York: Humanities Press, 1968), s.v. \textit{Kling}, who state that the Kalinga name has a Malay (Austro-Asiatic) origin and was used to designate the Telugu coast of the Bay of Bengal.
recognize the difference between voiced and voiceless sounds and a consequent indifference to the choice of stop to represent the sound.

The situation is even clearer in P which is later than the Aśokan edicts in that much more Sanskritization, harmonization and internal correction has taken place. Still however, a lot of words remain which are inversely voiced - i.e. intervocalic voiced consonants where they should be voiceless, or vice versa. In fact the almost equal number of these argues against a "natural" dialect cause, as direction is always towards simplification, i.e. lenition, not fortition. In an informal list of these voicing anomalies compiled by the author, the numbers are almost equal.\textsuperscript{1172} P has also "corrected" a lot of the "mistakes" appearing in the Aśokan edicts (like S vikṛta, "decorated" > Rum PE B, vigāda > P vikaṭa; S aṣṭan, "eight" > PE 7 S aḍha > P aṭha; S vraja, "cow-pen" > RE 6 D vaca (Gir K Dh Err )/vraca (Sh M) > P vaja; S rāja, "king" > RE 1 D raya (Sh) > P rājā), which are omitted from further discussion, as no conclusions can be drawn from them.

\textbf{Devoicing}

Although there is lots of evidence of dialects coeval with P that voiced intervocalic stops, we have no evidence of conterminous dialects that devoiced. So it is harder to explain the significant amount of devoicing in P on this basis, although Geiger attributes this as the main

\textsuperscript{1172} I have compiled an informal (and not exhaustive) list of voicing, devoicing glide lenition and elision anomalies showing changes from S to the Aśokan Pkts and P. The results show 68 instances of voicing, 63 of devoicing, 31 glide lenition, 15 consonant elision and 17 syllable elision (2 > 1).
reason (§38). Lüders, as noted, believed the devoicing was due to hyperpālisms (mechanical devoicing of a source dialect that regularly voiced intervocalic consonants). One might also argue that the devoicings were the result of influence from the Paiśācī dialect which regularly devoiced intervocalic stops, but the timescales are out of sync, as the putative hyperpālisms “arose much earlier than the Paiśācī spellings which are attributable to the written orthography, not the oral transmission.”¹¹⁷³ If the devoicings are not a dialect issue, then there are only two possible explanations: hypercorrectional mistakes in translation, or mistakes by speakers and/or scribes who were ignorant of the voicing/unvoicing differences; in the case of MISL or MI (e.g. Krorainic) speakers or scribes who lacked voiced stops in their phonological inventory, their predilection would be to notate it as voiceless, as that was the only notation possible in their native language. This perhaps cannot be proven, but it is a simpler explanation than hypercorrection which assumes that the scribe’s mistakes are based on unfamiliarity with the word; we shall see that many of these words are fairly common, so that hypercorrection is not necessarily an adequate explanation. We must also keep in mind the possibility that some of these words may have been borrowed from Dravidian or Munda languages and later Sanskritized through voicing intervocalics. In what follows I present some examples of words which reflect an inconsistency and confusion of voicing, which I suggest is due, to their non-IA

¹¹⁷³ See von Hinüber, Ältere Mittelindisch, §179: “Die Hyperpālismen entstanden erheblich früher als die Paiśācī-Schreibungen, die zudem der Orthographie, d. h. der schriftlichen und nicht der mündlichen Überlieferung zuzuschreiben sind.” For more on the provenance of Paiśācī, see §98-102. See also Oskar von Hinüber, "Pāli and Paiśācī as Variants of Buddhist Middle Indic," 68-69. Also available in Hinüber, Oskar v. 2009. Kleine Schriften, 512-13, where the author explains that the voiceless intervocalic stop orthography was used to express voiced stops as the voiced stops were used to express affricates (the examples the author gives as “affricates” - ꝓ, Ꝕ - are actually fricatives).
origin, and/or to the fact that scribes for whom MI was a second language could not discern some key consonantal voicing differences.

**S agalu/agaru/aguru, P akalu/akaru**

**S agalu** ("aloe wood and tree") is one such word that is believed to be borrowed from the Dravidian language group (< Tamil *akil*).\(^{1174}\) It often appears in P in a compound with *candana* which may also be of non-IA origin.\(^{1175}\) Jā. 6, 510\(^{14}\): *Gandhakena vilimpitvā agarucandanena ca* ("having anointed it with scents and with sandalwood and aloe"); Jā. 6, 144\(^{23}\): *akalucandanavilittā* ("anointed with sandalwood and aloe") with var. *aggalu-, agalu*, bu; Jā 4, 440\(^{23}\): *akalum candanañ ca* (var. *agalam*, bu *aggalam*, syā, ka); Mil 338\(^{13-14}\): *akalu-tagara-tālīsaka-lohitacandanānulitta-gatto* ("anointed with aloe, fragrant powder, ointment and red sandal unguent"); *Vimānavatthu* (Vv) 81\(^{18}\): *agaru-piyān-çandan-ussadāhi* ("anointed with aloe, panic seed and sandalwood"). The Sinhalese versions have *akalu* with an intervocalic -k- and the Burmese, Thai and Cambodian with a -g-. It looks like the word was derived from Tamil *akil* (which does not know a voiced -g-) and therefore Sinhalese preserves the earlier version, with the change to -g- done later to match what was considered the normal S spelling.\(^{1176}\) Since the word was indigenous to the Indic continent (the tree is native to the mountains of northern India where it was presumably first encountered by the IA immigrants), the different

\(^{1174}\) Mayrhofer, KEWA, 1, 17. Emeneau, DED #13.

\(^{1175}\) PED, s.v. Also DED #2448, s.v. Tamil *cāttu*.

\(^{1176}\) See Lüders §156: "Wie immer sind die Lesarten der singhalesischen Handschriften die ursprünglicheren, die birmanischen Gelehrten haben den Text verbessert." "The Sinhalese manuscript readings are always the more original, the Burmese scholars have amended the text."
orthographies do not appear to have anything to do with hypercorrection, but with its pronunciation in the native tradition.

S Jamadagni/ P Yamataggi

This is one of the ten inspired seers of old time, who composed the Vedic hymns. Their names are given at Vin 1, 245\textsuperscript{20-22}; D 1,243\textsuperscript{28-29}; AN 3, 224\textsuperscript{5-6}, 4, 61\textsuperscript{17-19} as follows: Aṭṭhaka, Vāmaka, Vāmadeva, Vessāmitta, Yamataggi (Yamadaggi), Angirasa, Bhāradvāja, Vāsetṭha, Kassapa, Bhagu. Brough called Yamataggi a “monstrosity” caused by hypercorrection: “It would seem that they [the redactors] had some awareness of the Prakritic tendency to voice the intervocalic voiceless stops of the literary language, and in attempting to combat this tendency, they occasionally overreached, and produced monstrosities such as Yamataggi for Jamadagni.”\textsuperscript{1177}

Norman points out that this situation resulted because of the existence of a local eastern dialect which changed \(-y- \rightarrow \text{-}j\text{-}\) (for example S mayura, “peacock” \(\rightarrow\) Pkt majura (Sh M)/majūlā (K J) in RE 1 G), and this scribe must have thought Jamadagni was from this dialect and hypercorrected accordingly.\textsuperscript{1178} But there are problems with this explanation. The word occurs twelve times in the P canon, always in the list of the ten famous sages, so it is hard to believe that the redactor was ignorant of what he/she was translating. Secondly the change of \(\text{-}j- \rightarrow \text{-}y\text{-}\) and \(-d- \rightarrow \text{-}t\text{-}\) obscures the meaning (“blazing fire”) in other words it is hard to believe that the redactor made these changes deliberately. It is far more likely that he/she heard Jamadagni as Yamataggi. Why? because he was MISL with Dravidian as his native language. In Dravidian,

\textsuperscript{1177} Brough, GDhp 249.
\textsuperscript{1178} Norman, “Buddhism and Regional Dialects,” 59.
there is no phoneme \( j \)-, so he heard the closest thing to it, the palatal glide \( y \)-; there is no phoneme \(-d\)- (it is an allophone of \(-t\)), so he heard \(-t\), and the conjunct \(-gn\) was probably already assimilated. He heard Jamadaggi and he transcribed Yamataggi, which was exactly what he heard. This process assumes of course, an oral transmission, as changes like this could not happen if there was a written exemplar. Once the PN had been transcribed as Yamataggi, it proliferated, eventually entered the written tradition, and stuck; as for the obscured etymology, the Buddhists were probably not interested in the meaning of the names of the Vedic sages - they are never mentioned in the अत्थकाठास or the तिकास and the name was therefore never corrected. The same situation probably obtains for the devoicing in S Agasti > P Akitti.\(^{1179}\)

Other examples

The compound \textit{ajagara} stands for a boa-constrictor, presumably because of its ability to ingest a small goat (\textit{aja} = goat; \textit{gara} = devour < \textit{ṣṛ}, “to swallow, devour”). In P it takes the form \textit{ajakara} with \(-g\)- > \(-k\)- in Jā 3, 484\(^{16}\) with Burmese variants \textit{aja(ā)gara ajarāgara}, and also occurs in Jā 6, 507\(^{2}\) as \textit{ajagara}. The Sinhalese version is probably the older reading with the Burmese a later correction to harmonize with the S. It could be viewed as a hypercorrection as Lüders does, or more simply as a confusion of stops on the part of a \textit{bhāṇaka} or scribe, for whom the difference was non-phonemic. The same may be true for S आपागः P आपकः (“river” >

\(^{1179}\) Lüders, \textit{Beobachtungen}, §123.
S *ap-gā*, “water-go”?) which has several different versions in the P with -g- and with -k- \(^{1180}\) and the following instances of devoicing:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>chagala</em>, “goat”</td>
<td><em>chakala</em> Lüders §128, Vin 3, 166(^{34}).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>agläsnu</em>, “tireless”</td>
<td><em>akilāsu</em> Lüders §124, Jā. 1, 109(^{14}).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vilagna</em>, “slender”</td>
<td><em>vilāka</em> Lüders §132, Jā. 5, 155(^{20}).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>parigha</em>, “iron bar”</td>
<td><em>palikha</em> Lüders §130, item #21, Chapter 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>paloga</em>, “decay, destruction”</td>
<td><em>paloka</em> Lüders §131, SN 4, 53(^{16}).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>vāgurā</em>, “net”</td>
<td><em>vākara</em> Jā. 3, 541(^{20}); <em>vākura</em>, Th 774-b. Geiger §39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>kusīda</em>, “lazy”</td>
<td><em>kusīta</em> Sn 68-b (akusīta-) Geiger §39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>mṛdanga</em>, “drum”</td>
<td><em>mutiṅga/mudinga</em>, DN 1, 79(^{13}), Geiger §39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>pradara</em>, “cleft”</td>
<td><em>patara</em>, Jā. 4, 32(^{21}), Geiger §39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>balbaja</em>, “species of reed”</td>
<td><em>pabbaja</em>, Th 27-b; <em>babbaja</em>, Vin 1, 190(^{1}), Geiger §39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>lāba/lāva</em>, “quail”</td>
<td><em>lāpa</em>, Jā. 2, 59(^{6}), Geiger §39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>bhṛṅgāra</em>, (^{1181}) “water-pot”</td>
<td><em>bhinkāra</em>, DN 2, 172(^{21}), Geiger §61.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1180}\) Ibid, §125-26.

\(^{1181}\) Kuiper, *Proto-Munda Words in Sanskrit*, 56 suggests a Proto-Munda origin for *bhṛṅgāra*. 
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sanskrit</th>
<th>English</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhṛṅga, “bee”</td>
<td>bhinka, “young of an animal in its property of being dirty, Vin 2, 201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>uraga, “snake”</td>
<td>P uraga, G uraka, GDhp vv. 81-90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aupapāduka, “arisen without cause”</td>
<td>opapātika, DN 1, 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sthagayati, “he covers,” sthagana, “covering”</td>
<td>thaketi, Vin 1, 48; thakana, Dh-a 4, 85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parigunthayati, “he surrounds”</td>
<td>palikutitha, “veiled,” Jā. 2, 92, Geiger §39.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lagati, “he sticks”</td>
<td>laketi, Mil 377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prājayati, “he drives”</td>
<td>pāceti, Dhp 135-b, Jā. 2, 122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prādur, “apparent”</td>
<td>pātu, (e.g. pātubhavati, &quot;it appears&quot;), Geiger §39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saṃsadi, “at the assembly”</td>
<td>saṃsati Jā. 3, 493, Geiger §39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedi, Cedika (PN)</td>
<td>Ceti, Ceta, Cetiya, SN 5 436, Geiger §39.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>upadheya, “pillow”</td>
<td>upatheyya, Jā. 6, 490, Geiger §39.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pīdhīyate, “is covered”</td>
<td>pithīyate, Th 872-b, Geiger §39.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

1182 This is probably not an example of devoicing but of differential translation from a malleable underlying form 
*pā(ā)yet(d)i*, See Item 52 in Chapter 9.
The word paloka ("decay, destruction") is derived from S *praroga (< pra + vrj, 'to break down,' S roga, "breaking up of strength") and in folk etymology is related to loka: lujjati kho, bhikkhu, tasmā lokotī vuuccati ("it falls apart, monk, therefore it is called the 'world'). The verb lujjati is the eastern form of S rujyate, "is broken." There is also another MI version in BHS, pralopa, with the same meaning ("destruction, annihilation"), suggesting that this is not simply a question of devoicing, but of elimination of voicing through a glide consonant or elision, i.e. the underlying form was actually *pral(r)oẏa, differentially interpreted. This suggests that the intervocalic -k- in -loka in this instance may be a glide consonant, as is found in G where the distinction between voiced and voiceless stops was lost. Here the word urago ("snake") appears as urako in GDhp 81-90, where, rather than standing for a devoiced stop, probably stands for a voiced velar fricative (Ɣ) or voiceless uvular fricative (χ). Whether the loss of voiced/voiceless distinction is due to natural phonological evolution (i.e. dialectal) or through the influence of speakers whose native dialect lacked voiced stops is impossible to tell, but undoubtedly the latter factor must have played a role. The confusion over palikha and parigha is also probably not a question of devoicing, but the result of an underlying form that eliminated the stops, as I discussed above in Chapter 8, items 21 (*pa(r)li'ā or *pa(r)liha). The other forms listed could be either the result of deliberate devoicing through hypercorrection or random mistakes on the part of speakers and scribes who had lost the voiced/voiceless distinction. The case for randomness is stronger based on the simplicity argument. If the mistakes were deliberate corrections, why were just these words corrected? i.e. how do we account for the

1184 Brough, GDhp §30.
1185 Ibid. See also Burrow, "The Dialectical Position of the Niya Prakrit," 427 where the -k- is equated with -g- = Ɣ.
large number of words in the same phonetic environment that were not hypercorrected? To say that all these words were unknown to the translators in their original form strains credibility, as some of the words are quite common. The most parsimonious argument is that these anomalies were random mistakes which were simply not corrected by later editors and harmonizers of the canon, who rationalized them through folk and/or scholarly etymological derivations or dialect idiosyncracies. Randomness also explains the almost equal number of words found that are devoiced vs. voiced, when voicing is by far the more common phenomenon in terms of directionality of linguistic change, and is also consistent with the random voicing/devoicing we find in the *Rg Veda* further, at least one of the above words (*akalu/akaru*) was devoiced because of its Dravidian source and the S voicing is in fact later. There may be other words like this one as well.

One other form of devoicing which may be partially due to the lack of a -v- phoneme in Tib and Munda is the change of -v- > -p- which is not very common in MI, especially at the time of P in the 3rd century BCE Much more common in MI is the lenition of -p- > -v-.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>avāṃnoti</em>, (&quot;he opens&quot;)</td>
<td><em>avāpurati/apāpurati/apāpuṇati</em>, Jā. 1, 634; 6, 37314; Vin 1, 531. Geiger §39.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1186 Bloomfield & Edgerton, *Vedic Variants*, see Chapter 2, P 26f

1187 Geiger §38.5. For some later examples in Cūlikāpaiśācī and Paiśācī, see Pischel §191.
Again, viewing these as hypercorrections by a not very knowledgeable scribe who mechanically back-formed -v- > -p- because the source dialect regularly changed -p- > -v- is one possible explanation. Considering how common some of these words are, however, the change more likely occurred because the phoneme -v- did not register with the bhāṇaka or translator, and the closest phoneme to it was chosen by default. We also find lots of examples in P of the alternation of -p- > -v- (kapi, kavi, “monkey”) which also suggests that the difference between the two was not heard. For example, the compound paroparāṇi (“high and low, far and near”) occurs in AN sutta 32 of the Burmese transmission, with variant in the PTS and Sinhalese readings of parovarāṇi. These kind of auditory confusions presuppose an

---

1188 AN 1, 1338. Part of the confusion may also be related to the words themselves. Is it para + upara ("situated below, under") or para + avara ("below, inferior")? See discussion in PED s.v. The word occurs in the Sn (v. 353-a) in three forms, parovaram, with Burmese variants varāvaram and varovaram.
oral transmission, which means they were well established in the source language before the canon was committed to writing in the first century BCE

P and BHS variants of other consonants also support this conclusion, - that in many instances voiced and voiceless consonants were not heard by the scribes as phonemic - as there are dozens of further examples in the writings of the interchange of voicing for no apparent reason:

ucchechāmi (Burmese) vs. ucchejjāmī (“I will destroy,” PTS and Thai and Cambodian ucchijjām) at DN 2, 72; kulūpaga interchanging with kulūpaka (“friend, dependent on a family”), AN 3, 13611, 25831; santhave (“acquaintance" < S samstava) with sandhave (Cambodian) in Sn v. 37-c; lañcam (“bribe”) with lañjam (Burmese) at Pj 2, 7224; kaŋgu (“millet”) a non-Aryan word, with kariku (Burmese) at Pj 2, 11226; samecca (“having understood,” PTS) vs. samajja (Burmese) in Sn 475-a; vatthugāthā “Introductory stanzas,” PTS) vs. vatthukathā (“introductory story,” Burmese) at Sn p. 1363; āviñjanto (“pulling”) vs. Burmese aviñchanto at Pj 2, 7517; Nātika (Burmese edition), name of a town visited by the Buddha in the MPN (DN 2, 935) vs. Nādika (in the Thai and PTS editions; also in the MPS, p. 162, §9.2); the river Kakudhā (Burmese) vs. Kakutthā (Sinhalese) also in MPN (at DN 2, 12828); avigopitam (“undisturbed”) in MPS (p. 420, §48.3) vs avikopitam in the Divyāvadāna (Divy, 303.28); tatuṭṭhya (“rising from that”) vs. tatutṭhya (Burmese) in Dhp 240-b (note that PDhp 160-b has tato utṭhāya (“rising thence”); and so one. Sometimes this interchange can cause semantic problems as at Pj 2, 2620 pāvacane dippamāne (“in the shining dispensation of Bhagavan Kassapa) vs. the Burmese pāvacane dippamāne (“in the amusing dispensation…”); or uppajja (“having been born,” Burmese) and ubbhijja (“having sprouted,” change of voicing and aspiration in all other...
recensions) in Dhp 340-b; and the words already discussed in item 52 of Chapter 9 above (page 401).
Chapter Eleven, Linguistic Diffusion

Drawing on the work of linguist Murray Emeneau and others, this section makes an attempt to describe the linguistic fabric that existed in ancient India - where a rich tapestry of indigenous and non-IA languages co-existed and mutually influenced each other, much more than has heretofore been appreciated. Because of the paucity of data, philologists of early Buddhism tend to ignore the impact of non-IA languages on Vedic and MI, especially in the areas of phonology and grammar; word borrowing is the only sub-field that has received some attention because of the work of Kuiper, Mayrhofer, Witzel and others. But the Indo Aryans did not arrive in a country that was without language, and indeed, initially at least, they were certainly outnumbered by the aboriginal Indians who spoke a variety of different Dravidian, Munda and Tibeto-Burman languages (and perhaps others).\textsuperscript{1189} As the last chapter has tried to show, the linguistic abilities of these peoples may have had a significant influence on the development and transmission of the IA languages and dialects, through linguistic diffusion.

\textsuperscript{1189} Deshpande, "Genesis of Rgvedic Retroflexion," 297: "Non-Aryans and non-Vedic Aryans were raised to the status of Brahmins and Kṣatriyas and the Rgvedic enemies such as the Paṇिः seem to have been absorbed in the Vaiśya caste. This makes one wonder if the descendants of the original Aryans were numerically not a minority in the mixed Aryanized society." See also H. S. Ananthanarayana, "Assimilation and Sandhi in MIA: A Case of Convergence between Indo-Aryan and Dravidian," in eds. B. Lakshmi Bai and B. Ramakrishna Reddy, \textit{Studies in Dravidian and General Linguistics, A festschrift for Bh. Krishnamurti} (Hyderabad, 1991), 258, who suggests that some sibilant geminates in MIA and NIA were not retained because of the "greater number of Dravidian bilinguals among the participants in the linguistic activity of Indo-Aryans who extended their language habit into the Aryan speech. Sibilant geminates are not native to Dravidian and no sibilant is reconstructed for proto-Dravidian."
Diffusion is a term from cultural anthropology meaning "the spread of elements of a culture or language from one region or people to another"; also, "the simultaneous existence of such elements in two or more places," per the OED. Linguistic evolution is when two languages or dialects are related by a common ancestor and they share words in common that are cognate, i.e. born from the same source; linguistic diffusion occurs when one language or dialect borrows from another - to which it is not closely related - and as a result share the same or similar phonological, syntactic, semantic or morphological features.\textsuperscript{1190} The first process - evolution - tends towards divergence and difference while the second towards convergence of language families. The India sub-continent is a "linguistic area" or "Sprachbund" which is a name for an area in which "languages belonging to more than one family show traits in common which do not belong to the other members of (at least) one of the families."\textsuperscript{1191} In Emeneau’s definition of the term with respect to South Asia, the common traits belong to the Indo Aryan languages (OI, MI, NIA) and Dravidian and Munda (and perhaps Tibeto-Burman), but are not shared by Indo Aryan’s closest cousin, Iranian. The mechanism which creates these shared features is extensive bilingualism. Emeneau calls the process "Indianization" of the IE component in the Indic linguistic scene.\textsuperscript{1192}


\textsuperscript{1191} M. B. Emeneau, "Linguistic Area: Introduction and Continuation," \textit{Language}, 54 (1978), 201. Also available in Anwar S. Dil, \textit{Language and Linguistic Area} (Stanford: Stanford University Press), 1. See also Campbell, \textit{Historical Linguistics}, 331 where "diffusion area, adstratum relationship and convergence area" are given as synonyms for linguistic area and Sprachbund. The latter term does not suggest any ideological or cultural unity.

The effects of bilingualism tend to be largely ignored by scholars of Buddhist philology. As demonstrated in the last chapter bilingualism can provide a cogent rationalization for the confusion over voiced and voiceless stops in MI dialects. The problem is that there is so little hard evidence in the canon itself and a complete lack of coeval data within the indigenous Indic traditions. It is certainly not that the compilers of the canon were unaware of the problem. Recall the phonological errors which would invalidate a kammavācā (page 110 above) - the confusion of aspirates with non-aspirates, nasalized vowels with non-nasalized vowels and voiced with voiceless stop - indicating that the redactors were well aware that some MI speakers (whether MISL or from a MI dialect which lacked some of these differentiations) made these mistakes. The most common of these errors, the interchange of voiced and voiceless consonants was however, allowed in the suttas - as literally thousands of variant readings exhibiting this phenomenon attest - probably because they were constantly made by so many

---

1193 The only article I am aware of suggesting an influence of a non-Aryan substratum on MIA is K. R. Norman, "Some vowel values in Middle Indo-Aryan," *Indian Linguistics*, 21 (1960), 104-7. Also available in *Collected Papers* 1 (Oxford: Pali Text Society, 1990), 21-24, where he suggests that variation in MIA between e and ī and o and ū may be due to the influence of a non-Aryan languages whose vowel values were not so fixed as in IA or included sounds which were intermediate between OIA e and ī, and o and ū. When these people adopted an IA language, they would have tended to retain their own vowel pronunciation. He also suggests (p. 23) that the loss of aspiration and voiced stops in the Niya Pkt is due to their absence in the native language of the populace, but in this case the native language is an IA one (Krorainic, see discussion above, Chapter Ten).

MISL speakers and MI speakers with restricted phonemic range. Non IA speakers are specifically mentioned in the Vinaya with reference to a monk who wants to leave the community. His resignation is not valid if he declares it in Aryan to a non-Aryan and the latter does not understand.\footnote{1195}

The confusion of voiced and voiceless consonants is only one of the potential effects of the Indianization of IA. There are many others, of which the least is linguistic borrowing from Dravidian and Munda into OI and MI. I say “least” because etymology and directionality are so difficult to prove and although some very significant work has been done in this area, “usually all the suggestions are equally ‘acts of faith,’ all having a certain degree of plausibility… it is always possible e.g. to counter a suggestion of borrowing from one of the indigenous language families by suggesting that there has been borrowing in the other direction.”\footnote{1196} This chapter will therefore not devote a lot of space to linguistic borrowing but instead concentrate on structural evidence which is of far more importance to demonstrate the imprint the native Indic languages have left on IA. Word borrowing has a “secondary evidential role.”\footnote{1197}

\footnote{1195}See von Hinüber, “On the History of the Name of the Pāli Language,” 79, from Vin 3, 27\textsuperscript{35}. See also page 112 above. The word for Aryan here is \textit{ariya} and the word for non-Aryan is \textit{milakkhu}.


\footnote{1197}Emeneau, “Dravidian and Indo-Aryan, 47; also available in Dil, \textit{Language and Linguistic Area}, 179.
Why is this important? When IA speakers entered the sub-continent, they did not enter a linguistic vacuum. There was already a rich indigenous culture in place, each native people with their own language and traditions, and the local inhabitants, at least initially far outnumbered the immigrants. Many of the Buddha’s first followers were brahmans, but at least as many or more were from the local tribes, the Sakyas, Mallas, Licchavis, Vajjians, etc. who would have spoken a local Indic language - Dravidian, Munda, or Tibeto-Burman - as well as MI. The conflict between the indigenous gaṇasarīgha republics of the tribes and the janapada kingdoms (Magadha, Kosala) is well documented and may also have been reflected in linguistic practice (see Chapter 12 on the meaning of the word munḍa).

Whether the Buddha himself spoke a non-IA language, will never be known; but we can be certain that there was significant and continuous mutual interaction between the language families, and if we can isolate how and what took place we can broaden our understanding of the linguistic landscape.

---

1198 Emeneau, “Linguistic Prehistory of India,” 282, also avaialbe in Dil, Language and Linguistic Area, 85.

1199 For the resentment of the gaṇasarīghas (authochtonous groups or of mixed IA-indigenous origin) towards the monarchies to which they were subject see item 30, Chapter 8 above (page 310). The conflict is shown very clearly at the beginning of the Mahāparinibbānasutta, where the Buddha tells Vassakāra, the emissary of King Ajatasattu of Māgadha, that he will not be successful in his war against the Vajjian republic and why. In the division of the Buddha’s relics after his parinibbāna, it is the tribes who get seven out of ten portions, two to Brahman converts and one bedgrudgingly given to King Ajātasattu of Magadha in order to avoid an armed conflict (The Mallas, in whose territory the Buddha died, received two portions, the Licchavis, the Sakyas, the Bulayas, the Koliyas, the brahman of Veṭhadīpa and King Ajātasattu each receive a share of the relics; the Moriyas receive the embers and the brahman Doṇa received the urn). Over each of these a stupa was built). See Dn 2, 164-67. For further discussion, see B. Levman, "Cultural remnants of the indigenous peoples in the Buddhist Scriptures," Buddhist Studies Review, 30.2, (2013), 154-58.
in ancient India and the nature of the interaction and transmission amongst and between the language families involved.

**Phonology**

The lenition of voiceless to voiced intervocalic stops is generally considered to be a normal evolutionary simplification process of OI > MI. In fact the process is apparent in the *Rg Veda* itself and it is often impossible to determine the priority of direction.\(^{1200}\) Loss of distinction of voicedness appears to be a pan-Indic trait whose genesis is found in Dravidian and Munda (and perhaps Tibeto-Burman) and was later adopted by IA speakers through bilingualism. We have already discussed the lack of phonemic voiced stops in some MI dialects and Proto-Dravidian (see page 478 above), where voiced stops are allophones of their voiceless counterparts, occurring voiced intervocically and before a nasal. The non-apical lax obstruents (= voiced stops) are also normally weakened intervocically to voiced fricative which is a phenomenon we have noted in G (*-th* > [\(\delta\)]) and the Niya documents. Apical lax obstruents weaken to taps or trills, which is also what we have seen in S *pravedayanti*, “they make known” > G *praverayadî* (GDhp 160-d).\(^{1201}\) Since this weakening of voiced stop > fricative does not normally occur in any other coeval MI dialect, one is tempted to attribute the cause to linguistic diffusion from Proto-Dravidian. The alternation of intervocalic -m- and -n- (and initial in Dravidian) is another phonological phenomenon which Dravidian shares with G (and other MI

\(^{1200}\) Bloomfield & Edgerton, *Vedic Variants*, see Chapter 2, P 26f.

dialects). Some scholars have also argued that simplification of consonant clusters in MI was influenced or caused by Dravidian phonological patterns, in which consonant clusters are highly restricted and two stops very rarely occur together.\(^2\)\(^{1202}\) This is also the case with Munda where two stops never occur together and double consonants are always N + stop or stop + L (liquid).\(^2\)\(^{1203}\)

In Munda, we have noted that the contrast between voiced and voiceless stops is neutralized in final position before a vowel (page 479 above) and free variation also occurs between voiced and voiceless stops word-initially and medially, which Kuiper calls “rhyme-words,” as, although the meaning is the same, the speaker is aware of the difference in voicedness, using it in a productive capacity to create sound variation.\(^2\)\(^{1204}\)

\(^{1202}\) For alternation of -\(m\)- and -\(n\)- see Zvelebil, ibid, 10. For consonant clusters, see Zvelebil, ibid, 12. Consonant clusters in Dravidian are restricted to homorganic nasal plus obstruent, geminates, and liquid or glide plus obstruent, liquid plus geminate or liquid plus nasal plus obstruent. Clusters in Dravidian are always hetero-syllabic (VC.CV), never tauto-syllabic as in Indo Aryan CCV (e.g. pra- \(kla\)). See also M. Andronov, "Dravidian and Aryan: from the Typological Similarity to the Similarity of Forms," Two Lectures on the Historicity of Language Families (Annamalainagar, 1968), 3. For discussion on the Dravidian influence on MI geminates, see H. S. Ananthanarayana, "Assimilation and Sandhi in MIA;," A Case of Convergence between Indo-Aryan and Dravidian," 256. “Although reduction of consonant clusters to geminates can very well develop in a language without external pressure, the fact that Dravidian had only medial plosive geminates or sequences of nasal and stop may have contributed to the development of geminates in MIA. Similarly, the presence of single initial stops in Dravidian may have been responsible for the reduction of initial consonant clusters to single stops in Pkts. It may be that the Dravidian bilinguals in Pkts effected such changes since they were not used to consonant clusters in their own languages.” Thanks to Prof. Alexei Kochetov for this reference and the reference to hetero- vs. tauto-syllabic consonant clusters.


Old Tib also has several peculiarities vis à vis IA. Aspiration is non-phonemic and all final stops are voiceless, even though written as voiced.\textsuperscript{1205} Although there is apparently a phonemic contrast between voiceless and voiced stops in Classical Tib,\textsuperscript{1206} for an IE trained ear, it is very hard to hear: the difference between voiceless -k- and voiced -g- sounds much more like a high tone, low tone contrast than a voicing contrast, which by some is regarded as an allophone, at least in the dialect of Lhasa, where the difference is not phonemic.\textsuperscript{1207} In the Tibeto-Burman languages of the Himalayan Region (including Ladakhi, a principal dialect of northeastern India), the phonemic contrast between voiced and voiceless stops seems to be neutralized in some dialects, for example, Tib bumo, “daughter” = Kāgate, po mo, Sharpa, pu mo and Bhoṭiā (Sikkim) pum; classical Tib -d = dialect -t in Tib bdun, “seven” > Kāgate, tüṯ tütin; or dos, “load” > Bhoṭiā > toi; classical Tib -g > dialect -k in Tib brgyad, “eight” > Kāgate ke.\textsuperscript{1208} Tib is a monosyllabic language with a complicated phonotactic structure, but there are no conjunct consonants within a word if the palatalized velars /kʱ/ and /khʱ/ and the prenasalized stops (in


\textsuperscript{1207} See DeLancey, S. 2003. "Lhasa Tibetan." \textit{The Sino-Tibetan Language}. G. Thurgood & R. J. LaPolla. London and New York: Routledge, 270, where the difference is not phonemic as Lhasa lacks a voiced stop. See also \url{http://www.learntibetan.net/grammar/alphabet.htm}, accessed June 2013, where both the ka (\textsuperscript{声}) and the ga (\textsuperscript{平}) sound seem voiced, the difference between them being in the tone (the first high and the second low).

\textsuperscript{1208} Bonnerjea, B. 1936. "Phonology of Some Tibeto-Burman Dialects of the Himalayan Region." \textit{T'oung Pao} Second Series, vol. 32, Livr. 4(1936), §1, 3, leaving out the numerous cases like Tib mig > Ladakhi mik, which are presumably orthographic (as these both end in glottal stop).
those dialects where they occur) are analysed as unitary segments;\textsuperscript{1209} between words, since the only permitted finals that are allowed are -\textit{b}, (sounds as -\textit{p}) -\textit{l}, -\textit{r} and the nasals (final -\textit{g} > ? and final -\textit{s} and -\textit{d} modify the preceding vowel), conjunct consonants with two dissimilar stops like IA never occur. Like the absence of most conjuncts in Dravidian and Munda, the Tib phonotactic structure may also have been a factor in precipitating the assimilation of IA conjuncts to geminates, so that bilingual speakers could both understand and speak the language more easily.

In G, by the time of the GDhp, the voiced and voiceless single intervocalic stops of the older language had coincided and were often replaced by the voiced consonant or an intervocalic -\textit{y}- sometimes written -\textit{ỹ}-, \textit{aliph}, -\textit{k}- or -\textit{h}-.\textsuperscript{1210} P too shows ample evidence of weakened or lost intervocalic consonants, most of which were however restored through Sanskritization (see above page 44). Others were retained in a random, haphazard fashion without any rationalization due to their phonetic environment. In the previous chapter I have argued that these errors in voicing may have been due in part to bilingual speakers who did not phonemically differentiate voicedness. The replacement of voicedness altogether by a glide or \textit{aliph}, is a further logical and natural development of the lenition trend, removing voicedness from the equation altogether and allowing the bilingual speaker to substitute the phoneme which aurally resonated for him/her. That there was only one single cause for this phenomenon is of course impossible to say; but the suggestion that a natural evolutionary process was accelerated by the phonological constraints of a significant bilingual majority or minority, is a compelling hypothesis.

\textsuperscript{1209} Scott DeLancey, "Lhasa Tibetan," 272
\textsuperscript{1210} Brough, GDhp, § 30, 38-9.
Retroflex consonants are not native to Indo-European or IA. There are several examples of retroflex consonants in the Vedas which are not phonetically conditioned (i.e. they are “spontaneous”), and although some have argued for an IE derivation for these forms, most now agree that they were imported into IA from (probably) Dravidian or Munda by areal diffusion. They are certainly proto-Dravidian and may be proto-Munda. In the 1920's Alfred Woolner noted the existence of Vedic words with medial cerebrals for which there was no Aryan derivation possible and suggests they may well be Austro in origin. Since then a lot more work has been done on retroflexion. In 1967 Kuiper suggested that bilingual speakers (presumably with IA as their first language) noted the phonemic contrast between dentals and retroflexes in the foreign language and interpreted the allophones of proto-IA in terms of the foreign phonemic system. Emeneau suggested the opposite, that S was transmitted at an early period primarily by speakers for whom it was a second language, their first language being Dravidian. Dravidian had contrasting dentals and retroflexes which OI did not possess; those allophones in OI which were close to the Dravidian retroflexes were assigned to the retroflex phonemes by Dravidian bilingual speakers in their native Dravidian system. Deshpande agreed with this analysis: “the origin of retroflexion lies not so much in the Aryans’ borrowing this trait from Dravidians in early times as in Dravidans’ adapting Aryan speech to

their native phonology.” The borrowed aspect of retroflexion would also account for the number of OI/MI words which occur in both retroflex and non-retroflex form: e.g. vattati/vaṭṭati, “to turn around;” sathila/sithila, “loose” (see page 420 above); attha/ṭṭha, “aim, purpose, meaning;” abhivuddha, abhivuddha, “grown,” etc. In Chapter 12 the social and linguistic history of one such non-Aryan retroflexed word (muṇḍa) will be examined in terms of its reference to the non-Aryan (i.e. indigenous) residents.

OI/MI api

In Vedic and P, api is an emphatic particle whose meanings are “essentially a calque of Dravidian *-um.” The same may also be said of the Tib yang/kyang/ang ((the consonant changes according to the ending of the word which precedes it). These usages are 1) “also, as well as,” e.g. aham api daṭṭhukāmo “I also wish to see.” 2) “and,” often in combination with ca, api ca. Emeneau says that “this is not a very strongly developed construction in competition with the enclitic ca ‘and.’” In fact, in S and in P, api or api ca is mainly adversative (“and yet, but, however, nevertheless”) in this usage: catunnaṃ māsāṇaṃ accayena āraddhacittā bhikkhū pabbājenti upasampādentī bhikkhubhāvāya, api ca m’ ettha puggalavemattā viditā” ti (“After

---

1214 Deshpande, "Genesis of Rgvedic Retroflexion," 297.
1215 For Vedic examples, see Bloomfield & Edgerton, Vedic Variants, §163-170. The word asamsattam, "not associating (with householders) in Dhp 404-a also has a Jain corresponding form asamsattam “not clinging” (to householders) in the Uttarajjhayāna per Charpentier, “zu Uttarajjhayāna 25,” 67-8, where the difference is primarily between dental forms in AMg and retroflex and aspirate in P. Charpentier feels that the Jain form is more appropriate.
1216 Emeneau, “The Indian Linguistic Area Revisited,” 218. See pages 199-218 for the complete discussion.
1217 Sn 685-d, quoted in PED s.v. api.
four months, having won the favour of the monks, they take (him) into the order they admit (him) to monkhood; but I recognize individual differences.)"\(^{1218}\) Tib yang has this meaning of “and, as well as.”\(^{1219}\) 3) concessive, “even, even though, although, even if.” This is probably the most common of the usages, e.g. Dhp 187-a&b: *api dibbesu kāmesu ratiṃ so nādhigacchati*, “he obtains no delight, even in the sensual pleasures of the gods.”\(^{1220}\) 4) a “totalizing” or “summing up” function, often following a numeral or, redundantly with sarva/sabba, sakala, samasta/samatta: dhammaladdhehi bhogehi hhammadhigatehi ekassa pi dadāmi, dvinnam pi dadāmi, tīṇam pi dadāmi, catunnam pi dadāmi, pañcannam pi dadāmi, channam pi dadāmi, sattannam pi dadāmi, aṭṭhannam pi dadāmi, navannam pi dadāmi, dasannam pi dadāmi, visāya pi dadāmi, timsāya pi dadāmi, cattālīsāya pi dadāmi, paññāsāya pi dadāmi, satassa pi dadāmi, bhiyyo pi dadāmi “…from the wealth which I seek and obtain rightly and acquire rightly I give to one, two, three, four, five, six, seven, eight, nin, ten, twenty, thirty, forty, fifty one hundred, or even more.”\(^{1221}\) 5) *api* used after an interrogative pronominal form to produce an indefinite phrase, like ko’pi, “whoever,” (or kaścit: *Te tato paṭṭhāya ekato bhūñjanti pivanti sayanti, vissāso thiro ahosi kenapi* (var. kenaci, yena) abhejjio, “From that day they ate, drank and slept together, their confidence was firm, they were not divided by anybody.”\(^{1222}\)

There are also several usages of *api* in OL/MI which are not mentioned by Emeneau: 1) use at the beginning of a sentence as a question marker: *api kiñci labhāmase* “What may we

---

\(^{1218}\) Sn p. 102^3^-^6^, Emeneau quote, ibid, 199. MW gives “even then, nevertheless notwithstanding” as a meaning for *api*, but not “and” by itself.

\(^{1219}\) See Lokesh Chandra, *Tibetan-Sanskrit Dictionary* (Kyoto: Rinsen Book Co., 2009), s.v. yang. Also Negi, *Dictionary*, 5628^-^29, where yang translates S ca, *api* and *api ca* in S *inter alia*.


\(^{1221}\) Sn p. 87^3^-^10^, translated by Norman, *Group of Discourses*, 57.

\(^{1222}\) Jā. 3, 11^9^-^10^.
obtain?" 2) used to mean “surely, indeed, for, yes”: *apāhaṃ puggalam addasaṃ*, “...for I saw the person...” 3) used with an optative verb in the sense of “perhaps, maybe, please may...”: *ap’ ettha mudu vindema, api assādanā siyā*, “Perhaps we shall find something soft here; perhaps there may be [something] sweet.” Whether these are reflected in Dravidian usage is not known, nor whether Munda has a comparable multi-purpose particle like Tib does.

None of the S structure is inherited “straightforwardly” from IE or even from Indo-Iranian and given the historical relationship bewteen the use of *api* and “-um in the two languages, Emeneau maintains that “there is no probable solution of our problem other than diffusion from Dravidian into Indo-Aryan.” Although his argument for Dravidian priority is not based on any solid historical data, the fact that a comparable particle is not found in S’s closest genetic relative - Indo-Iranian, is cogent.

**Echo Words, Onomatopoetics, Expresssives**

Echo words are also believed to be a pan-Indic trait, found in Dravidian, Munda, Tib and OI and MI which is not shared by other IE languages, like Iranian. They are a pan-Indic trait, defined by Emeneau as a construction where a basic word formulated as CVX is followed by an echo-word in which CV or C is replaced by a another phoneme and X remains the same and the meaning is “and the like,” e.g. *puli gili* “tigers and the like” in Dravidian, *acel pacel*

---

1223 Jā. 2, 44016.
1224 MN 3, 21019.
1227 Emeneau, “India as a Linguistic Area,” 8, also available in Dil, Language and Linguistic area, 114.
“abundance” in Santali, a Munda language, where it is known as an “expressive,”1228 and kharji barji “food” in Tib.1229 In the South Munda language Sora, the chief echo morpheme starts with m- but there is a wide variety of latitude allowed (Kuiper calls it “free variation on a large scale”).1230 In Santali there are several variational possibilities - repeating the element in an identical form, augmenting a consonant in the repeated element, and vowel mutation. The repeated item does not have an independent meaning but modifies the meaning of the first element.1231 Sylvain Lévi reported on this idiosyncrasy of the Munda language, whereby identical pairs and triplets were differentiated only by their first consonant which was extremely variable. He reports on ancient tribes that formed “twinned ethnics” (... ethniques pour ainsi dire jumelés, parfois même trijumeaux, “twinned ethnics so to speak, sometimes even triplets”),1232 named Kosala/Tosala, Aṅga/Vaṅga, Kaliṅga/Trilṅga Utkala/Metkala, Pulinda/Kulinda, Uṇḍa/Puṇḍa/Muṇḍa. These tribes lived in the same areas and had the same name except for the change of the first consonant; he suggested that the names referred to the identical tribal group and the variation that occurred was due to the nature of the Munda language.

Emeneau expanded his definition of echo words in 1969, calling them “Onomatopoetics,” while pointing out that “We are dealing only in the most marginal way with blatantly sound-imitative

1230 Kuiper, “Proto-Munda,” page 6. See also F. B. J. Kuiper, “Consonant Variation in Munda,” Lingua 14, (1965): 54-87. On page 55 Kuiper notes that Pinnow called these words Reim- und Schallwortbildungen and on page 57 he notes that it is a reasonable assumption that the words “belong together” and have “developed from the same original.” See also footnote 1204.
1232 Sylvain Lévi, “Pré-aryen et pré-dravidien dans l'Inde,” 56.
forms... the class denotes varied types of sensation, the impingement of the material world, outside or within the person, upon the senses not merely the five conventionally identified senses, but all the feelings, both external and internal."\(^{1233}\) This fits in well with the Munda notion of “expressives.” Emeneau identifies five classes of onomatopoetics: non-reduplicated with and without derivative suffix; identical reduplication with and without derivative suffix and reduplication with change of vowel, of initial consonant or both. Typically echo forms (in non-IA languages) are inseparable but of course we have no idea how these forms may have functioned in the 5\(^{th}\) or 4\(^{th}\) century B.C; they may have functioned both separately and together in the ancient texts. Certainly, some of these echo-forms probably originally had independent meanings before they were assimilated into a combined form and the meaning of one of the words was lost,\(^{1234}\) although others simply result from the change of the initial syllable. Some examples of onomatopoetics or echo forms in S and P are: \textit{gaggara} < S \textit{gargara} “whirlpool,” “roaring, cackling, caewing sound of geese;” \textit{bharabhara} or \textit{babhara} in P imitation of a confused rumbling sound; \textit{kilikiläyati} to “tinkle” < Tamil \textit{kilukilu} “to resound with noise;” \textit{kukkura} “dog;” \textit{sarasara} = “an imitative word,” “a rustling sound;” \textit{gaḷaḷaḷāyati} = \textit{gaggarāyati}, “crashes, thunders;” \textit{kaṭakaṭāyati} = \textit{taṭataṭāyati} (per PED), “to grind, creak, snap;” \textit{kalakala} = any indistinct and confused noise; \textit{kinikinika} = “sound of a small bell;” \textit{capucapu} = sound made when


\(^{1234}\) See Peterson, \textit{Grammar of Kharia}, 130-133, for some examples of echo-forms where the meaning of one of the terms has been lost. The repeated element can also appear before the underlying form itself and be separated from it, showing that “the complex unit is not a compound” (page 133).
smacking one's lips' \textit{cicci\-t\-\`{a}yati} = to hiss, fizz, sizzle (always combined with \textit{ci\-t\-\`{i}t\-\`{a}yati}); \textit{bubbula} and \textit{bubbula} < S \textit{budbuda}, “bubble”; \textit{mummura} < Skt \textit{murmura}, “crackling, rustling.”\textsuperscript{1235}

This is not to suggest, of course, that onomatopoeic-type words are not native to MI (and perhaps a language universal!); only that many of the repetitive forms found in OI/MI appear to have a structural similarity to those in Dravidian. There are also many forms in MI with similarities to echo-word type constructions, although not echo-words \textit{stricto sensu}, since more than just the anlaut and/or initial vowel is changing as in the Dravidian and Austro-Asiatic form. Von Hinüber identified some of the looser IA forms as a \textit{bedeutungsloses Füllwort}, “meaningless filler word” which he associated with the oral nature of the teachings, and they also may well be linked or influenced by the echo word phenomena. For example, in the formula $\textit{catt\-\`{a}ro 'me bhikkhave ariyava\-\`{m}s\-\`{a} agga\-\`{n}\-\`{a} ratta\-\`{n}\-\`{a} va\-\`{m}s\-\`{a}n\-\`{n}\-\`{a} por\-\`{n}\-\`{a} asa\-\`{m}ki\-\`{n}\-\`{n}\-\`a asa\-\`{m}ki\-\`{n}\-\`{n}apubb\-\`{a}…}$ which occurs several times in the \textit{A\-\`{n}guttara Nik\-\`{a}ya (AN)},\textsuperscript{1236} von Hinüber maintains that the last word ($va\-\`{m}s\-\`{a}n\-\`{n}\-\`{a}$) is meaningless.\textsuperscript{1237} Grammatically, all three words modify \textit{catt\-\`{a}rome ariyava\-\`{m}s\-\`{a} (“the four noble lineages”). The commentary derives the -\`{a}n\-\`{n}\-\`{a}

\textsuperscript{1235} Emeneau, Ibid, Appendix, 269-291.

\textsuperscript{1236} e.g., \textit{Ariyavamsasutta} AN 2, 027\textsuperscript{16-17}. “Monks, these four Ariyan lineages, reckoned as ancient, as of long standing, as traditional, primeval, pure and unadulterated now as then…” Trans. by F.L Woodward, \textit{The Book of the Gradual Sayings (A\-\`{n}guttara-Nik\-\`{a}ya) or More-Numbered Suttas, Volume 2 (The Book of the Fours)} (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 2001), 30. The three word phrase occurs several times (in singular and plural form) in the \textit{Ariyavamsasutta} (AN 2, 027\textsuperscript{16-17}) modifying \textit{catt\-\`{a}rome ariyava\-\`{m}s\-\`{a}} (“the four noble lineages”), three times in the \textit{Dhammapadasutta} (AN 2, 029\textsuperscript{4-21}) modifying the \textit{catt\-\`{a}rim\-\`{a}ni dhammapad\-\`{a}n\-\`{a}} (“the four factors of the doctrine”; AN 2, 029\textsuperscript{5}), and once in the \textit{Abhisandasutta} (AN 4, 245\textsuperscript{11-247}\textsuperscript{6}) modifying the \textit{pa\-\`{n}cim\-\`{a}ni mah\-\`{a}d\-\`{a}n\-\`{a}n\-\`{a}} (“the five great gifts,” AN 4, 246\textsuperscript{1}). It also occurs twice in the \textit{Abhidhamma (Kath\-\`{a}vat\-\`{t}thu, 341\textsuperscript{11} & 341\textsuperscript{21})} modifying the great gifts.

suffix from the verb “to know” so that aggañña means “to know as the first (earliest)” (aggā ti jānitabbā) and rattañña means “to know as going on for a long time” (dg̱haraṯam pavattā ti jānitabbā);¹²³⁸ the last compound vaṃsañña would mean simply “to know the lineage” (vaṃsā ti jānitabbā) which makes no sense in the context, since “the lineage” is in fact the modificatum.

Apparently the author has taken the second part of the compound ariy-vaṃsa and combined it with the second half of the descriptive compounds -aṇṇa to create a sonorous echo-type construction with the meaning “and the like.” Here the original form of the two words making up the phrase is clearly discernible, but the meaning has been changed to denote some aspect of longevity, related to the previous two descriptive phrases. In the Mahāparinibbānasutta (DN 2, 94³-⁵) and several other suttas throughout the Tipiṭaka we find the following stock formula describing the disciple community: sāvaka-saṅgho āhuneyyo pāhuneyyo dakkhiṇeyyo ariyal-karaṇīyo anuttaram puṇṇakhettam lokassa, (“the community of disciples is worthy of offerings, worthy of respect, an unsurpassed field of merit in the world”) where āhuneyyo, pāhuneyyo and dakkhiṇeyyo basically all mean the same thing, “worthy of a gift.” Von Hinüber considers pāhuneyyo to be a Füllwort; indeed, there is no change of meaning between the two words āhuneyyo and pāhuneyyo, and the pā- (< S pra- + ā-) prefix changing āhuneyyo to pāhuneyyo is similar to an echo word, with an intensification or distributive function. In the commentary āhuneyyo is glossed as āhulisaṃkhātaṃ piṇḍapātam patīgghetuṃ yutto (“fit to receive alms known as an offering”) and pāhuneyyo is explained by pāhunakabhattassa anucchaviko (“fit for the food of a guest”).¹²³⁹ There are many examples like this listed in the PED (s. v. ā 3(b))¹²⁴⁰

¹²³⁸ Mp 3, 45¹⁰-¹².
¹²³⁹ Mp 2, 35⁸⁹-¹¹.
where semantically alike words have been changed by exegesis to mean different things, like the omnipresent echo-pair *assasati-passasati* which both basically mean the same thing (“to breathe”), but have come to mean “breathing out” (*assasati*) and “breathing in” (*passasati*). Other examples include *āmodita-pāmodita* (“delighted”); *ākoṭita-paccākoṭita* (“flattened and pressed all around”); *ālokita-vilokita* (which both mean “looking” but have come to mean “looking forward and behind” in exegesis), and many others. Indeed when one begins to appreciate the extent to which echo-like pairs form a stylistic feature of *P*, it suggests reinterpreting as echo-pairs, such well-known cruxes as *accasāri-paccasārī* from the *Sutta Nipāta*. If one simply takes this as an echo-type construction, then the meaning immediately becomes clear: “That bhikkhu who has not transgressed and the like…” (*yo nāccasāri na paccasārī*).

Other prominent and/or common examples of forms that may have been influenced by the echo-word structure, adapted to the MIA (Middle Indo-Aryan) prefix system: in the *Mahāparinibbānasutta* (DN 2, 137) we find the following phrase describing the flowers from the Sal tree falling on the Buddha’s body, *okiranti ajjhokir anti abhippaki ranti*. All these words basically mean the same thing, “to sprinkle over.” The prefix *o-* (< S *ava*) has the sense of “down” whereas the prefix *abhippa- (< S *abhipra*) has the sense “completely”; however *ajjho-,*  

1241 The prefix *ā-* usually has the sense of “towards,” so *ā-śvasati* (> P *assasati*) should mean “breathing in,” but has come to mean “breathing out,” which is an ablative usage as in *ā + āgam* (“to go from” that is “to come”). The prefix *pra-* has the sense of “away from” so *praśvasati* (> P *passasati*) should mean “breathing out” but has come to mean the opposite. Buddhaghosa comments on the confusion in *Visuddhimagga* 271. He says that *assāsa* should mean breathing out and *passāsa*, breathing in, but that it is used in the opposite sense in the commentaries.

1242 SN v. 8-a to 13-a; see item #39, Chapter 8 above. Norman translates *accassāri* as “transgresses.” Brough prefers the sense of “transcended.” If indeed this phrase is an echo form, then the meaning would have to be the former.
which is presumably derived from the S prefix adhyava- adds no additional meaning and seem to be an echo-word type construction. In the MN Māratajaniyāsutta (MN 1, 334\textsuperscript{20}, also in the Saddhasutta, AN 5, 323\textsuperscript{19}) describing meditation, the formula jhāyanti pajjhāyanti nijjhāyanti apajjhāyanti (var. avajjhāyati) occurs, where the prefixes change and nothing else. Although Bhikkhus Ēnānāmoli and Bodhi in their translation try to give each of these an individual meaning (“… they meditate, premeditate, out-meditate, and mismeditate.”),\textsuperscript{1243} it is clear from the context that these verb forms are influenced by echo-word type constructions, simply meaning “they meditate and the like”; the commentary glosses these as “the words are strengthened because of the prefixes.”\textsuperscript{1244} This strengthening also occurs when a word is repeated at the beginning of a phrase, for emphasis (not really an echo word, but a sonic repetition device): in the Pottapadasutta the Buddha is talking about the various forms of coarse, formless and mind-made self (attabhāva), and says that these terms are loka-samañña loka-niruttiyo loka-vohārā loka-paññattiyo yahi Tathāgato voharati aparāmasan ti.\textsuperscript{1245} The second word in the loka- compound basically all mean the same thing, i.e. “name,” “designation,” “term” or “expression.” These echo-like compounds are a distinctive aspect of P literature, although not technically echo-words, (in that prefixes and words are changing, not only the anlaut and/or initial vowel as in a true echo-word), they appear to have been influenced formally by the echo-word construction. Moreover they are an integral part of the

\textsuperscript{1243} Bhikkhu and Bhikkhu Bodhi Ēnānāmoli, The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha, a Translation of the Majjhima Nikāya (Boston Wisdom Publications, 1995), 433. The authors admit in a footnote that “…the verbs individually do not have an established pejorative sense…” (1249).

\textsuperscript{1244} Ps 2, 418\textsuperscript{10-11}: pajjhāyantī ti ādīni upasaggavasena vaddhitāni.

\textsuperscript{1245} DN 1, 202\textsuperscript{8-9}. Translated by Walshe in Long Discourses as “these are merely names, expressions, turns of speech, designations in common use in the world, which the Tathāgata uses without misapprehending them” (169).
oral style of the *sutta*s, used for mnemonic value and for their expressive and persuasive function - based in part on the old propaganda principle that if one says it three times (in the last case discussed, four), it must be true.

Other Shared Features in the Indian Linguistic Area

The causative structure of Proto-Dravidian and NIA are very similar in that both contain a causative of causative (or double causative) structure, which was heretofore considered lacking in MIA. However, Edgerton argues that *-aya*- the causative stem is rendered causative of causative by the addition of *-āp* to *-aya*- > *āpay*a, e.g. P *ṭhāṭi*, caus. *ṭhapeti* (= *ṭhapayati*) and *ṭhapāpeti* (= *ṭhapāpayati*).1246 Two examples of this type of form are attested in the Aśokan edicts, in past participle form: *likhāpāpita* (“caused [someone] to have engraved) and *khānāpāpita* (“caused [someone] to have dug”) in PE 7.1247 The Munda system and Tib are both different and it is not clear that Dravidian has in fact influenced IA or whether the latter developed independently.

More convincing examples of pan Indic phenomena may be found in the absolutives and quotative marker. The absolutive (non-finite verb form) does not exist in Iranian and is believed

1246 Emeneau, “Dravidian and Indo-Aryan,” 41, also available in Dil, *Language and Linguistic Area*, 174. The Edgerton article quoted by Emeneau may be found in Franklin Edgerton, “Indic causatives in -*āpayati* (*-āpeti*, -*āvei*),” *Language*, 22 (1946), 94-101. An example from the Aśokan edicts may be found in Gir RE 1 A, *lekhāpitā*, where the meaning is "le roi enjoint aux autorités locales de faire graver la proclamation," ("The king orders his authorities to have the proclamation engraved") per Bloch, *Inscriptions*, 91, footnote 4.

to be derived from Dravidian.\textsuperscript{1248} In S it is formed by the addition of \textit{-tvā} to verbs without prefixes and \textit{-ya} to verbs with prefixes. In the Pkts, the \textit{-tvā} changes to \textit{-ttā}, although in P it is Sanskritized as \textit{-tvā}. Dravidian and Munda both have this feature as does Tib, which follows verbs with a particle \textit{nas}. Kuiper believes that since the Munda forms vary from north to south, they are innovations in Munda and copied from Dravidian.\textsuperscript{1249} The quotative marker in S is \textit{iti} (“thus”), which always occurs after the statement. Although there is a cognate form in Avestan (\textit{uith}), this usu. occurs before direct speech. In the Vedic writings it occurs in both locations with a strong predilection (30 of 36 occurrences) for after the direct quote. This is also a prevalent feature in Dravidian (where the particle in Tamil, for example, \textit{enru}, means “having said”). In Munda the form is the post-quotation form \textit{mente} (“by saying” in Mundari and Santali) or \textit{gamle} (“having said” in Sora), and in Tib the particle \textit{zhes}, which also occurs after the quote.\textsuperscript{1250}

The above is only a sampling of some of the more conspicuous features of the Indic linguistic area; there are many others: basic subject-object-verb word order; postpositions; goals of verb of motion, adverbial and infinitive complements which go in the object position; adjectives, genitive phrases, demonstratives and numerals which precede the noun they modify; qualifiers which precede adjectives; use of genitive for the verb “to have”; use of dative to express internal states of mind; caste system terminology similarities, and more.\textsuperscript{1251} The purpose of this chapter is not to try to cover them all, even cursorily, but only to introduce the reader to the linguistic complexity that existed in India before, during and after the time of the historical

\textsuperscript{1248} Emeneau, “India and Linguistic Areas,” 30; also available in Dil, \textit{Language and Linguistic Area}, 130.
\textsuperscript{1249} Kuiper, “Genesis of a Linguistic Area,” 96.
\textsuperscript{1250} Kuiper, ibid, 91-95.
Buddha. Linguistically scholars of early Buddhism tend to disregard the extensive cross-fertilization that was taking place between the IA and indigenous languages, because of lack of data or knowledge, or interest. This is not to blindly accept the directionality of diffusion, Dravidian > Ol/MI; indeed, some of the historical data is very sketchy and can be interpreted either way; to do full justice to this question would require another monograph at least as large as the present one.¹²⁵² But the mutual interaction in whatever direction is undeniable and it is impossible to understand complex issues like, for example, voicing phonology without considering the influence of the indigenous language groups. The same may be said for IA echo words and onomatopoetics, absolutes, quotative markers, causative structures, etc. It is not simply a question of lexical borrowing, which we know happened both ways. The native Indic languages have affected IA at a much more profound structural i.e. - morphological, semantic and phonemic - level, and no phonological study of the Buddhist literature is complete without taking these factors into consideration.

¹²⁵² Indeed the discussion continues to this day. For example, a recent article by E. F. Bryant, *Linguistic Substrata and the Indigenous Aryan debate*, in Johannes Bronkhorst, Madhav M. Deshpande eds., Aryan and Non-Aryan in South Asia, Evidence, Interpretation and Ideology, (New Delhi: Manohar Publishers and Distributors, 2012), 75 concludes that "the only truly compelling aspect of the entire Dravidian substratum theory is the non-Indo-Aryan nature of the words for the flora of North India."
Chapter Twelve, A Sample Case

How does one do this, i.e. “take these factors into consideration,” when there is no oral or written record in Dravidian or Munda of the Buddha’s teachings? One must proceed cautiously but with a mind open to the possibilities, and carefully examine the source material for any evidence of indigenous Indic influence on MI, an influence which, as we have seen in Chapter 11, was undeniably present, though now obscured or excised. Demonstration of word borrowing is one possibility, but I have already stated that this is often not convincing in and of itself. If, however, we can show significant traces of the non-IA culture preserved in some common IA words whose original (non-IA) meaning has been obscured through harmonization (standardization) and semantic narrowing, then we have made a start. The following study on the meaning of the words muṇḍa/muṇḍaka is a case in point.

Introduction

1253 I leave Tib out of the discussion as it is a very late translation - over a millenium after the Buddha died - from a fully Sanskritized written tradition which was itself several translation steps removed from “what the Buddha said.” Its usefulness is primarily to understand (through back-translation into Sanskrit) what written exemplar they had before them in Sanskrit or Sanskritized Pkt (when these were lost, as was often the case).

1254 This is an adaptation of a paper which appeared in the Canadian Journal of Buddhist Studies, 2012, 1-29. My special thanks to Dr. John Peterson of Leipzig University for his suggestions, corrections and revisions to a previous version of this paper. My thanks also to Dr. Mahinda Paliyawadana for correcting some mistakes and for several other helpful suggestions. Prof. Dr. Oskar von Hinüber has kindly provided me with his unpublished notes on the word muṇḍa (see reference below), for which I am also very grateful.
The meaning of the word *muṇḍa* and its *-ka* suffixed form *muṇḍaka* is a well-known crux in linguistic and P studies. In addition to its usual meaning of “bald” or “shaved” the word has many other additional denotations and connotations, including “empty,” “bare,” “unadorned,” “cropped,” “cut,” “lopped,” or “stripped,” “without horns,” “low,” or “mean,” “head,” “iron,” “blunt,” and others. It is the name of an Indian king, one of the seven great Indian lakes, the name of a people, tribe or ethnic group, a type of house, a type of spoke in a chariot wheel and a type of window. It is also a kind of torture and the word is associated with wrestlers, porters, ascetics, prostitutes and others (these latter meanings to be discussed below). It is also (in English) the name of a language group, originally named by Max Müller in the nineteenth century, according to Sylvain Lévi. Indeed, the word’s polyvalent meanings suggest a complex etymology and history, which so far has been impossible to unravel. This article will examine previous scholarship on *muṇḍa/muṇḍaka* and re-examine its meaning in terms of actual use in the P and BHS writings.


1256 Sylvain Lévi, Pré-aryen et pré-dravidien dans l’Inde,” *Journal Asiatique*, 103 (1923), 22. “On sait que le nom des Muṇḍa a été choisi par Max Müller pour désigner une famille de langues qui ont été fortement influencées par le dravidien, mais qui en sont originellement indépendentes, et qui sont apparentées à la famille mōn-khmer et aux parlers des tribus sauvages de la presqu’île malaise.” “One knows that the name of Muṇḍa was chosen by Max Müller to designate a family of languages which were strongly influenced by Dravidian, but which were originally independent and related to the Mōn-Khmer family and to speakers of the wild tribes of the Malaysian peninsula.” Quoting M. Risley, Levi says the word *muṇḍa* “signifie un chef de village.” According to the OED, the word Munda was first used in 1805, apparently to signify an ethnic group; it is both an ethnic group and a language family. Müller apparently coined the term Munda in a letter to Chevalier Bunsen on the Classification of the Toranian Languages per S. Bhattacharya, *Studies in Comparative Munda Linguistics*. (Simla: India Institute of Advanced Study, 1975),1-2, 5-6.
Earliest Appearance

The word is apparently not early Vedic in origin, as its first appearance does not occur until the Śāṅkhāyana-Āranyaka (perhaps 5th century BCE)\(^{1257}\) where it seems to have the meaning “bald” (pāṇḍuradarśanāṁ kāliṁ strīṁ muktakesāṁ munḍāṁ, “a pale looking, dark, woman whose hair has been removed, bald,” in 11,4)\(^{1258}\) and “head,”\(^{1259}\) used in a pejorative context:

\[
\begin{align*}
    \text{ṛcāṁ mūrdhānam yajuśāṁ uttamāṅgaḥ} \\
    \text{sāmnāṁ śiro ‘tharvaṇāṁ munḍamunḍam} \\
    \text{nādhīte ‘dhiīte vedam āhus tam ajñāṁ} \\
    \text{śīrāś chittvā ‘sau kurute kabandham} \| 1 \|
\end{align*}
\]


\(^{1259}\) This is the meaning of the word in Santali (“head end”), one of the Munda languages. See Paul Olaf Bodding, *A Santal Dictionary* (Oslo: I kommisjon hos J. Dybwad 1929-36), 341-42. On line: [http://www.aa.tufs.ac.jp/~mmine/india/Bodding2k/dic-srch.cgi](http://www.aa.tufs.ac.jp/~mmine/india/Bodding2k/dic-srch.cgi) (accessed May 2013). According to Hoffman, the first European scholar on Mundari, munḍa means a landed proprietor, rich man or village chief. See Rev. John Baptist Hoffmann, *Mundari Grammar and Exercises* (Delhi: Gyan Publishing House, 2010; originally published in 1905-1909), 7. The Mendas usu. call themselves Hōko or Hoṛoko; when they do use the word Munda for self-designation, it is always the second member of a compound (as in Kumpaṭmunḍa); see Hoffmann, *Encyclopaedia Mundarica* (Patna: Patna Superintendent, Government Printing 1930-1950), 2881. In Sinhalese (the indigenous language of Śrī Lanka where the Buddhist canon was first written down in the first century BCE), there is a cognate word (muṇḍu) which means “bare, uncultivated” (in relation to land) and a further word muṇḍuma with a derogatory sense, meaning “good-for-nothing,” or “wretched” (My thanks to Dr. Mahinda Palihawadana for the first reference and to Prof. Suwanda Sugunasiri for the second).
“He who does not repeat the Veda constantly, the head of the ṛc verses, the highest member of the yajur verses, the chief of the sāman verses, the principal head of the atharva verses - him they call ignorant; having cut off his head, he makes a headless body.” The word munḍa does not appear to mean “bald” here; it is being used more as a synecdoche for “head,” as is clear from the parallel structure of mūrdhānaṃ (head)…uttamāṅgaṃ (uppermost limb)…śiro (head) and munḍamunḍaṃ. The repetition of the word appears to be an intensifying āmreḍīta. In Pāṇini’s Aṣṭadhyāyī(3.01.21) the word also occurs with the meaning “bald.”

Previous Academic Work

Oskar von Hinüber calls the word munḍa a terminus technicus (technical term) meaning “bald shaven,” that is evidence of an old, eastern, non-Indo Germanic ascetic language, which has found its way into the Middle Indic texts.

Most scholars have agreed with von Hinüber’s conclusion that munḍa is non Indo-European (IE) in origin. Jean Przyluski derived it from the Santali word munḍla or munḍra (“having the hair on the head shaved or closely cropped; to crop the hair, to shave the head”); he notes how the

---


1261 Oskar von Hinüber, Das ältere Mittelindisch §72. “Als terminus technicus gehört das deō-Wort Munḍa ‘kahl geschoren’ nach Ausweis der Belege einer alten östlichen, nicht-indogermanischen Asketensprache an.” I thank Dr. von Hinüber for providing me with his (unpublished) “Notes on munḍa,” which expand on this conclusion.
first letter m- alternates with the labial b- in other Austro-Asiatic (AA) languages and the interchange of the vowels -a- and -u- in Malay (Malay būtak=bantun, "shaved"), which also occurs in IA (S bhāṇḍilaḥ, "barber," P bhandu = P, S muṇḍa, "bald, shaved"). Thomas Burrow also derives muṇḍa from various Dravidian words and connects it with S baṇḍa, ("maimed, defective, crippled") since initial m- and v- are often interchangeable in Dravidian. The scholar who has probably done the most research on the word is Franciscus B. J. Kuiper who calls muṇḍa and related words, "the most difficult word group;" he derives muṇḍa from the Proto-Munda language families, while acknowledging that a Dravidian origin is not disprovable. We shall return to Kuiper’s work later in this article.

Several attempts have also been made to derive muṇḍa from within the IE tradition, but they are not convincing. Paul Thieme derives it from the hypothetical form *ṃṛṃṣte > *maṇḍe ("to scrub, clean") > muṇḍa; Julius Pokorny from a hypothetical form *mel-d- > S mardati, mṛdnāti (to wipe, press, squeeze, crush); Paul Tedesco derives it from the S word vṛddha.

1265 Paul Thieme, "Indische Wörter und Sitten," Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morgenländischen Gesellschaft, 93 (1939), 133.
(<\textit{v}ardh, “to cut”);\textsuperscript{1267} and Giotto Canevascini connects it with the Latin word \textit{mundus}, (round ditch), with “spontaneous retroflexion” of \textit{-nd-} \textsuperscript{1268} But one of the great difficulties of an IE derivation is this very issue of retroflexion, which can not be so easily explained, i.e. spontaneous retroflexion - retroflexion in the absence of a phonetically conditioned environment - does not appear to be an IE phenomenon, but occurs as a result of borrowing (see discussion on retroflexion in Chapter 12 above, page 504f above). In the 1920’s Alfred Woolner noted the existence of Vedic words with medial cerebrals (including \textit{muṇḍa}) for which there was no Aryan derivation possible and suggests they may well be Austric in origin.\textsuperscript{1269} Since then a lot of work has been done on retroflexion by Murray Emeneau, Franciscus Kuiper and Madhav Deshpande, who have all concluded that retroflexion is not an IE or IA phenomenon, but an import from Dravidian or Munda by areal diffusion.\textsuperscript{1270} The word \textit{muṇḍa} is Dravidian or Munda\textsuperscript{1271} (AA) in origin.

A Note on \textit{muṇḍa/muṇḍaka}

\textsuperscript{1270} See references above, footnote 1212-1155 and discussion on page 504.
\textsuperscript{1271} Munda is the name of an Austro-Asiatic language group which is still spoken today in the Chota Nagpur plateau of north-eastern India, state of Jarkhand. To avoid confusion, the capitalized word “Munda” without italics and without diacritics is used to refer to the language group. The word Muṇḍa with diacritics and no italics refers to the tribal/ethnic group (see below), attested from at least the time of the \textit{Mahābhārata}. The word \textit{muṇḍa(ka)}, with diacritics and in italics refers to the word as actually used in the Old Indic and Middle Indic texts or as quoted in the academic literature.
The word *muṇḍaka* is identical to the word *muṇḍa* with the addition of a *kṛt-ka* suffix which is usually used to denote an agent, i.e. a person who makes [another] *muṇḍa*, or a “barber.” However, *muṇḍaka* never means “barber” in P, but simply “one who has been shaved,” either as a noun or an adjective - i.e. it is basically identical with the word *muṇḍa*. The -*ka* suffix can have a diminutive or pejorative connotation (and indeed this is sometimes the case), but not always so.\(^\text{1272}\)

**Earliest Middle Indic Appearance**

The earliest Middle Indic (MI) appearance of the word is in the *Sutta Nipāta* (Sn), a work generally considered to be amongst the oldest of Buddhist writings, so old that the commentary on it, the *Niddesa*, is also part of the canon; some of the *gāthās* may even go back to sayings of the Buddha himself.\(^\text{1273}\) The Sn reflects a very early time, before the *sarīgha* had been established, when the Buddha is often portrayed as a peripatetic monk, wandering alone, without monks accompanying him, begging for alms. In the *Vasalasutta*, the Buddha enters Sāvatthī to beg one morning. There a brahman, Aggikabhāradvāja was performing a sacrifice when he saw the Buddha approaching from afar and said, \textit{tatr' eva, muṇḍaka, tatr' eva samanaka, tatr' eva, vasalaka, tiṭṭhāhi}, “Stop there, shaveling; stop there, wretched ascetic,

---


stop there, outcaste.” Apparently the mere presence of a *muṇḍaka* - here translated as a “shaveling” - was enough to vitiate the power of a sacrifice. The Buddha then goes on to explain to Aggikabhāradvāja what a true outcaste is, concluding *na jaccā vasala hoti na jaccā hoti brāhmaṇo* (“not by birth does one become an outcaste, not by birth does one become a brahman”), but by one’s actions. Aggikabhāradvāja is convinced and goes to the Buddha for refuge. In this *sutta* the *muṇḍaka* is clearly associated with the *samanaka*, an ascetic from an indigenous renunciant tradition different than and opposed to the *brāhmaṇas* who followed Vedic sacrificial rules. The P canon’s omnipresent compound *samaṇabrāhmaṇa* (“ascetic and brahman”) attests to the existence of these two religious and cultural traditions in ancient India whose “opposition was eternal” like that of the snake and the mongoose, as the grammarian Patañjali pointed out (commenting on Panini). What does the word *muṇḍaka* mean here? Perhaps, “shaveling” as is usually translated, but as the text itself tells us, *muṇḍaka* is also a *samanaka*, an “ascetic,” and a *vasalaka*, an “outcaste.”

---


1275 Sn 136-a; translation ibid, page 17.

1276 That there was a “religion of Greater Magadha” different than and opposed to Vedism is the central thesis of Johannes Bronkhorst, *Greater Magadha, Studies in the Culture of Early India* (Leiden, Boston: Brill, 2007). For a discussion of the *samaṇa* tradition see pages 79f; see also Govind Chandra Pande, *Studies in the Origin of Buddhism* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass, 1974), 261. For more examples of the association of *muṇḍakas* with *samaṇas*, see below.

This might mean someone not part of the Vedic caste system (i.e. a “tribal”), but could also simply mean a low, mean, wicked or contemptible person. In the commentary, Buddhaghosa calls the *muṇḍaka kālakaṇṇī* (black-eared, perhaps a reference to the darkness of his skin), *asuddho* (impure, because he does not honour the gods and brahmans) and *ucchittha* (vile, rejected, because as an ascetic, he is not worthy of coming to this place).\(^{1278}\)

A similar situation is related in the *Sundarikabhāradvājasutta*, also in the Sn. Here a brahman who has performed the *aggihutta* sacrifice looked around for someone to share the remains of the sacrifice. He saw the Buddha seated at the foot of a tree with his cloak over his head and he went up to him to offer him the food. The Buddha uncovered his head and the brahman, thinking *muṇḍo ayam bhavam, muṇḍako ayam bhavan ti* (“The venerable one is shaven, the venerable one is a *muṇḍako*”)\(^{1279}\) wanted to turn back, but then the thought occurred to him that some brahmans are shaven as well (*muṇḍā pi hi idh’ ekacce brāhmaṇā bhavanti*) so he approaches the Buddha and asks his descent, i.e. whether he is a *brāhmaṇa* or a *samaṇaka*. The Buddha then instructs Sundarikabhāradvāja that the sacrificial cake is merited by conduct, not by caste and therefore in a repeated refrain says *Tathāgato arahati pūralāsām*, “A *Tathāgata* deserves the sacrificial cake.” \(^{1280}\)

\(^{1278}\) Pj 2, 175\(^{13-21}: \text{*kāla-kaṇṇī* muṇḍakasamaṇako *…’muṇḍo asuddho holi’ ti brāhmaṇānam dītthi, tasmā *’ayam asuddho, tena devabrāhmaṇaṇāpūjako na holi’ ti jīgucchanto muṇḍakā *ti āha. ‘muṇḍakattā vā uchchitttho esa, na imaṃ padesam arahati āgacchitun’ ti*}

\(^{1279}\) Norman, Group of Discourses, page 53. Sn p. 80\(^{8-10}\).

\(^{1280}\) ibid, page 54-5.
Again, it is not clear exactly what *muṇḍaka* means, for the brahman, seems to be contrasting *muṇḍa* as "bald" with *muṇḍaka* which has more of a pejorative meaning. Some brahmans were completely bald too, yet they were apparently not *muṇḍakas* - the former (brahmans) retained a small top-knot (*cūḍā* or *śikhā*) while the latter didn’t: however we know that for some *brāhmanas* who underwent tonsure, this was not always the case\(^{1281}\) and, as the commentator confirms this;\(^{1282}\) many brahmans were completely bald, with no top-knot; they were *muṇḍas*, but not *muṇḍakas*. The *muṇḍakas* were associated with the non-brahmanical, ascetic (*samaṇa*) tradition; they were outcastes (*vasalas*), apparently not part of the IA caste system.

**Tribal Group?**

There is one case in the P canon where the word *muṇḍaka* clearly refers to an ethnic tribal group:

\(^{1281}\) See for example, the *Baudhāyana Dharmaśūtra*, in Patrick Olivelle, *The Dharmaśūtras* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1999), 210.

\(^{1282}\) Pj 2, 4025-10: *muṇḍo ayāṃ bhavāṃ muṇḍako ayāṃ bhavan* ti sīse vivaritamatte va kesantam disvā “muṇḍo” tī āha, tato suṭṭhataram olokento pariṭtam pī sikhām adisvā hiḷento “muṇḍako” tī āha, evarūpā hi nesaṃ brāhmaṇanāmaṃ diṭṭhi; *tato vā* ti, yattha ṭṭhito addasa, tamhā padesā; *muṇḍā pī* ti kenaci kāraṇena muṇḍitasīsā pī honti.

"*muṇḍo ayāṃ bhavāṃ muṇḍako ayāṃ bhavan* tī. By this the text signifies that when he (the brahman) didn’t see any hair as soon as his head (the Buddha’s) was uncovered, said, “A shaven (person)” (*muṇḍa*). Then looking at him more closely, he did not see even a small top-knot, he expressed contempt for him and he said, “He is a *muṇḍako*! for such is the belief of these brahmans.

*tato vā* tī. This signifies that the brahman (wished to go away from that place), where standing, he saw (the Buddha).

*muṇḍā pī* tī. This means for some reason (some brahmans) are also shaven-headed."

I am indebted Dr. Mahinda Palihawadana for help in translating this passage. The phrase *kesantam disvā* I am reading as *kesaṃ na disvā*, at his suggestion.
Andhakā Munḍakā sabbe Kolakā sānuvindakā
ārā va Cīnaraṭṭhā ca āgacchanti mamaṃ gharamaṃ1283

One possible translation is, “The Andhakas, the Munḍakas (or the blind Munḍakas), the Kolakas and those who know them well, and those from afar, from the Kingdom of the Cinas come to my house.”1284 The Apadāna is probably one of the latest books in the canon. Nor is the reading necessarily very reliable, considering all the variants: Munakā for munḍakā, several variants for sānuvindakā and several for Cīnaraṭṭhā. However, the gist of the verse is clear and munḍaka, at least in this instance refers to a tribal group. There are many other instances in the P writings where munḍaka as “tribal,” or “outcaste” much better suits the context than munḍaka as “shaveling.” For example in the Ambaṭṭhasutta the brahman Pokkharasāti sends one of his students Ambaṭṭha to put the Buddha to the test. Ambaṭṭha deliberately insults the Buddha and his followers calling them munḍakā samaṇakā ibbhā kaṇhā bandhupādāpaccā “shaven little ascetics, menials, black scourings from Brahmā’s foot.”1285 The commentary

1283 Mary E. Lilley, The Apadāna of the Khuddaka Nikāya, Part 2 (London: Pali Text Society, 1927), page 359-2, gāthā 14. The editor capitalizes Andhakā, suggesting that she is interpreting it as a tribal group; however it is also an adjective meaning “blind.”
1284 The words sānuvindaka is translated as “together with those who know them,” taking the word as derived from sa-anu-vid and modifying Kolakā. However there are several variants for this part of the text (koṭṭhakāsānuvindakā, ...hānuvindukā, Kuṭṭhaganuvīṭṭhakā), suggesting that the transmission is garbled.
1285 munḍakā samaṇakā ibbhā kaṇhā bandhupādāpaccā DN 1 9015. Trans. by Maurice Walshe, The Long Discourses of the Buddha a translation of the Dīgha Nikāya (Boston: Wisdom Publications, 1995), 113. In the Tib Vināya (http://www.asianclassics.org/release6/flat/KD0001M2_T.TXT, accessed May 2013) this is also preserved, where the word munḍaka is translated as mgo reg (“shaved head”). The Ch translate the same passage as 毁形 (huīxīng) which means “deformity” and may indicate that they had a
makes the meaning of *muṇḍaka* clear: “the brahmans come from the head of Brahma, the warriors from his chest, the merchants from his navel, the servants from his knee and the ascetics from the back of his feet.” The *muṇḍakā samaṇakās* are the lowest of the low, well below servants in the social order, i.e. on par with the mixed castes and untouchables. This position is also re-iterated in the *Aggaññasutta* from the *Dīgha Nikāya* where Vāsetṭha, questioned by the Buddha as to the brahman’s verbal abuse, repeats the criticisms levelled against the monks, the brahmans claiming that the monks have renounced the highest class and gone over to the inferior class, which are the *muṇḍakas* and *samaṇas*.1287

The hostility between the IA immigrators and the indigenous tribal groups is well-known. Johannes Bronkhorst has written an impressive monograph on the hostility and differences between the two groups; he identifies *the samaṇas* with the indigenous peoples who lived in “Greater Magadha” (*i.e.* eastern north India) and practiced a religion and culture completely different word than *muṇḍaka* in their source document as *huǐxing* usu. translates S *vairūpya* (T01n0001_p0082b24).

1286 Sāv. 1, 25428-30: “*brahmañā Brahmuno mukhato nikkhantā, khattiyā urato, vessā nābhito, suddā jānuto, samañā piṭṭhi-pādato*” ti. Note the contrast with RV 9, 20, 12 where the *śūdra* is said to have been born from the feet of *Puruṣa*. In the Indian caste system, the only groups lower than the *śūdras* were the mixed castes and those who did menial work which rendered them “untouchable.”

1287 DN 3, 8114-20. *te tumhe setṭhaṃ vaṇṇaṃ hitvā hiṇam attha vaṇṇaṃ ajhupagatā, yadidaṃ muṇḍake samaṇake ibbhe kaṇhe bandhu-pādāpace. tayidaṃ na sādhu, tayidaṃ na ppatiṭūpaṃ, yaṃ tumhe setṭhaṃ vaṇṇaṃ hitvā hiṇam attha vaṇṇaṃ ajhupagatā, yadidaṃ muṇḍake samaṇake ibbhe kaṇhe bandhu-pādāpace ti.* “And you, you have deserted the highest class and gone over to the base class of shaveling petty ascetics, servants, dark fellows born of Brahma’s foot! It's not right, it's not proper for you to mix with such people!” Trans. by Walshe, *Long Discourses*, 407, who does not repeat the last phrase in this translation (“...it is not proper that you have deserted the highest class and gone over to the base class of shaveling petty ascetics, servants, dark fellows born of Brahma’s foot!”).
opposed to the Vedic belief system. \(^{1288}\) There is a large body of evidence in both the Vedic and P writings to support this view. In the *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* they are called “eastern demons” (*asurāḥ prācyāḥ*), \(^{1289}\) while the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa* describes a mythical/historical conflict between the *kṣatriya* sage Viśvāmitra and his sons who are displaced by his decision to adopt the Vedic *ṛṣi* Śunaḥśepa as his first born; those of his sons who refuse to accept his decision, he curses saying “Your progeny will receive these as their share: the Andhras, the Puṇḍras, the Śabaras, the Pulindas, the Mūtibas. Those living beyond the boundary are many; the descendants of Viśvāmitra are the most numerous of slaves.” \(^{1290}\) The Puṇḍras, Śabaras, Pulindas and Mūtibas bear Munda names, according to Michael Witzel\(^ {1291}\) and they inhabit the north-eastern, sub-Himalayan and Deccan areas which the IA immigrants are beginning to encroach on at the time of this text. \(^{1292}\) The Andhras were also a Deccan tribe, believed to be

\(^{1288}\) Bronkhorst, *Greater Magadha*. See footnote 1276 above.

\(^{1289}\) *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* 13, 8.1.5. For discussion see Munishwar Jha, *Māgadhī and its Formation* (Calcutta: S. N. Guha Ray at Sree Saraswaty Press Limited, 1967), 12.


\(^{1291}\) See Michael Witzel, "Substrate Languages in Old Indo-Aryan (Rgvedic, Middle and Late Vedic)," *Electronic Journal for Vedic Studies*, 5 (1999), 39. The Puṇḍras “is the name of a people regarded as outcasts in the *Aitareya Brāhmaṇa*. Their name occurs in the *śūtras* also. In the Epic their country corresponds with Bengal and Bihar,” per Arthur Anthony Macdonell and Arthur Berriedale Keith, *Vedic index of names and subjects* (London: Murray, 1912), 536.

\(^{1292}\) See Bimala Churn Law, *Tribes in Ancient India* (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Series No. 4, 1943). The ancient Puṇḍras are an eastern tribe in the sub-Himalayan foothills, who lived just south-east of Bihar (where the Buddha lived and taught) and east of Jarkhand, where present day Munḍas live, (278). The Śabaras, Andhras and Pulindas lived in the Deccan (172). The Mūtibas may also have been a southern tribe (173-5).
Dravidian speakers.¹²⁹³ Both these texts (the Śatapatha and Aitareya Brāhmaṇa) are pre-Buddhist in time.

In the P writings the conflict between the northwestern immigrants and eastern indigenous tribals is symbolized by the common samaṇabrāhmaṇa oppositional compound which represented the two opposing religious groups of 4th-5th century northern India.¹²⁹⁴ A most telling example of this conflict occurs in the Mahāparinibbānasutta, the story of the Buddha’s parinibbāna. The Buddha was himself from the Sakya tribe, yet for some reason he chooses to die in Kusinārā, which is one of the capitals of the Malla tribe. Like the Sakyas, the Mallas were one of the many sub-Himalayan indigenous tribes who were displaced by the Aryan immigrations. The Mallas want to keep all the Buddha’s relics for themsevles, and a war over the relics is only narrowly averted by the brahman Buddhist convert Doṇa. The relics are all divided up amongst seven tribes, with one portion being reserved for King Ajātasattu of Magadha, the only one of the IA janapadas (kingdoms) to receive a share; the rest go to the gana-sarīghas (tribal “republics”), the type of indigenous polity into which the Buddha was born: the Licchavis of Vesālī; the Sakyas of Kapilavatthu; the Bulayas of Allakappa; the Koliyas of Rāmagāma; the Mallas of Pāvā; the Mallas of Kusinārā.

Who are the Mallas who get not one, but two shares of the Buddha’s relics? They are a neighbouring tribe of the Sakyas whose name may well be cognate with the tribal name Munḍa.

¹²⁹³ Law, Tribes, 164. The Andhras speak Telugu today.
¹²⁹⁴ See footnote 1277.
Alfred Woolner was the first to point out the derivation of -lla from -ṇḍa and -dra, which makes its first appearance in Vedic times (e.g. gaṇḍa = galla, cheek; kṣudra = khulla, little).

The change from -a- > -u- before or after a labial is also very common. Malla = Muṇḍa may explain another curious word in the P Vinaya, munḍavatī, a term of insult directed against monks wearing a loincloth. Buddhaghosa explicates it in two ways: porters for the king and "a workman who is a wrestler (or member of the Malla clan) who, having bound on a loin cloth, wears it." In the corresponding Ch versions of this story, they transliterate the name Malla as 末羅 Mòluó (PB: mat-la), or translate it as 力士 lìshì (strong man), which suggests that the definition Malla = wrestler is simply a synecdoche of the eponym.

1295 Woolner, “Prakritic and non-Aryan Strata,” 67. Kuiper, Proto-Munda, 76-77, also points out the equivalence of the Munda derived word daṇḍa (S “stick,” < Santali daṇḍi, “bare stem, stalk” or Mundari daṇṭa, idem) and S dala, “stick.” The change of a cerebral phoneme -ḍ- to -d- (-t-), -r-, -r-, or -l- is very common in the Munda languages (page 6).

1296 R. Pischel, Grammar §104. e.g. S prathama > Pkt puḍhuma. See also Jātaka 41, where pādam-olamba (having caught hold of) is in the Burmese, but pādam olubba is in the Sinhalese, Thai and PTS version (Jā. 1, 241).

1297 Vin 2, 137; Cullavāga V, 29.

1298 Sp 6, 121215-16. saṃvēliyam nivāsenti ‘ti mallakammakārādayo viya kacchaṁ bandhītvā nivāsentī.

1299 大般涅槃經, Dà bānnièpán Jing, T01n0007_p0207b07. In fact, Law, Tribes, 259 suggests that “it is probably that the word ‘Malla’ denoting a professional wrestler was derived from the tribal name of this people.”
The first definite appearance of the Muṇḍas as a tribal group occurs in the Mahābhārata where they are allies of the Kurus in the great war.\footnote{1301} Here, in several variant readings, their name is also conflated with the Puṇḍras which points to the intriguing possibility that the early mention of the Puṇḍras in the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa as a marginal, outcaste tribe was also referring to the Muṇḍas.\footnote{1302} Phonologically the assimilation change from S-ṇḍra- > Pkt-ṇḍa- is quite common

\footnote{1301} For example: In Vishnu S. Sukthankar, The Āraṇyakaparvan, Being the Third Book of the Mahābhārata The Great Epic of India (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, 1942), Book 3, Chapter 48, p. 159, the Muṇḍas are one of many tribes attending a sacrifice, where they are listed along with several others:

hārahūṇāṁś ca cīnāṁś ca tukhārāṁ saindhavāṁś tathā
jāguḍān ramathāṁ muṇḍān strīrājyān atha taṅgaṇāṅṁ verse 21

"[I saw] the Hārahūṇas, the Cīnas, the Tukhāras, the Saindhāvas as well, the Jāguḍas the Ramaṭhas, the Muṇḍas, the Strīrājas [Amazonian women] and then the Taṅgaṇas [coming to the sacrifice]."

\footnote{1302} There is of course a distance of several centuries separating the time of the Aitareya Brāhmaṇa from that of the Mahābhārata. In the latter epic, there are at least two instances where the Puṇḍra tribes are mentioned, with the Muṇḍas as a variant reading. In Shripad Krishna Belvalkar, The Bhīṣmaparvan, being the sixth book of the Mahābhārata the great epic of India (Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Institute, 1947), Book 6 Chapter 52 verse 8-9, page 277-78, where the Puṇḍras/Muṇḍas form the left flank of the Kuru army; the Magadhas \textit{inter alia}, form the right flank:

māgadhāṁ ca kalīṅgāṁ ca dāśeraka gaṇaiḥ saha
dakṣinaṁ pakṣam āsāyā sthitā vyūhasya damśītāṁ
kānanāṁ ca vikuṇṭāṁ ca muktāṁ puṇḍrāviṣas tathā
bhṛdhabalena sahitā vāmaṁ pakṣam upāśritāṁ

"The Māgadhas and the Kalingas and the Dāśerakas together with their troops, formed the right flank, stood firm, armed in military array. The Kānanas and the Vikuṇṭas and the freed Puṇḍra [var. Muṇḍa] tribes [stood] in like manner, and possessed of great strength they occupied the left flank." The critical edition lists four witnesses where puṇḍra has the muṇḍa variant reading.

There is also another mention of the Puṇḍra tribe in Book 6, Chapter 46, verse 49, with a single variant reading of muṇḍāḥ for puṇḍrāḥ in the following text:

piśācā daradāś caiva puṇḍrāḥ kuṇḍīviṣaiḥ saha
maḍakā laḍakāś caiva taṅgaṇāṁ parataṅgaṇāṁ

"... the Piśācas and the Daradas, the Puṇḍras [var. Muṇḍa] together with the Kuṇḍīviṣas, the Maḍakas and the Laḍakas, the Taṅgaṇas, the Parataṅgaṇas..."
in MI (e.g. S \textit{paṇḍraka} > P \textit{paṇḍaka}, “eunuch”); dropping of an -\textit{r} after a -\textit{d} is attested at least from Asokan times in the third century BCE (e.g. \textit{caṃḍa} < S \textit{candra} in Pillar Edict 7).\textsuperscript{1303} However, while the change of initial \textit{p-} > \textit{m-} does not make sense in terms of the IA phonetics, the change of initial onset \textit{p->m} is quite characteristic of the AA language structure.

**Munda phonology**

In 1923 Sylvain Lévi reported on this idiosyncrasy of the Munda language, whereby identical pairs and triplets were differentiated only by their first consonant which was extremely variable. He reports on ancient tribes that formed “twinned ethnics” (... \textit{ethniques pour ainsi dire jumelés, parfois même trijumeaux}, “twinned ethnics so to speak, sometimes even triplets”)\textsuperscript{1304}, named Kosala/Tosala, Aṅga/Vaṅga, Kaliṅga/Triliṅga Utkala/Metkala, Pulinda/Kulinda, Uṇḍa/Puṇḍa/Muṇḍa. These tribes lived in the same areas and had the same name except for the change of the first consonant; he suggested that the names referred to the identical tribal group and the variation that occurred was due to the nature of the Munda language.\textsuperscript{1305} Kuiper points out that Proto-Munda made extensive use of varying initial onset gutturals, dentals and labials, making the words in effect synonyms.\textsuperscript{1306} In a 1948 article he gives extensive examples

\textsuperscript{1303} See Jules Bloch, \textit{Les Inscriptions d’Aśoka} (Paris: Société d’Édition "Les Belles Lettres," 1950), 172. Another interesting point is that the word for "a person having his hair cropped or shaved" is \textit{muṇḍra} in Santali, with the added -\textit{r}. See Bodding, \textit{A Santal Dictionary}, 342.

\textsuperscript{1304} Lévi, S. 1923. Pré-aryen," 56.

\textsuperscript{1305} Mayrhofer defines \textit{Puṇḍrāḥ} as “Name eines Volkes...vielleicht als ein austroasiatischer Name sowohl mit \textit{Oḍrāḥ} (Uḍra-, Uṇḍā- usw.) wie andererseits mit dem Namen der \textit{Muṇḍāḥ} zusammengehörig. See Manfred Mayrhofer, KEWA, vol. 2, 302.

\textsuperscript{1306} F. B. J. Kuiper, \textit{Proto-Munda Words}, 3-5.
of word variation, mostly from Santali, a north Munda language group with a strong base in the north-eastern part of present day Jharkhand - just south of the state of Bihar where the Buddha lived and taught in the fifth century BCE. Examples with a \( p- \leftrightarrow m- \) interchange at the beginning of the word include: \( macak' \) “to eat up, manage” \( \sim \) \( pacuk' \) “to eat up, finish, deceive”; \( mo\tilde{t}a \) “thick, fat, stout” \( \sim \) \( po\tilde{t}a, po\tilde{t}ma \) “having a protuberant belly” \( \sim \) \( pu\tilde{t} pu\tilde{t}u \) “swollen, prominent”; \( maka moko \) “well-developed, fat” \( miko, moko \) “chubby-cheeked” \( \sim \) \( piko poko \) “fat, chubby”; \( mak\tilde{r}e \) “wrong, perverse, awry” \( \sim \) \( p\tilde{a}k\tilde{r}e \) “one having a deformed leg”; \( monde, mode \) “musty, mouldy” \( \sim \) \( bode \) “muddy, dirty,” \( ponda \) “rotten”; etc.

While the interchange of \( p \) and \( m \) is not unheard of in IA languages (for example, the change from \( S \tilde{a}tma > Pkt \tilde{a}tpa \) in Ašoka’s Rock Edict 12), it almost never occurs in the anlaut (word-beginning) and in any case is the result of diachronic development; as an Austro-Asiatic language groups trait, onset variation appears to be a synchronic, productive form of derivation. In his 1959 monograph, Pinnow provides a very useful introduction to word formation in these groups, a) through the use of prefixes, infixes and suffixes; b) through root-shortening (the so-called “\( rapu'd \)” words where for example, Mundari \( rapu'd \), “to break” becomes \( po:t \) in Palaun, \( pv\tilde{t} \) in Mon and \( ra'b \) in Kurku; c) through reduplication; and d) through inner transformation and

---


1308 F. B. J. Kuiper, "Munda and Indonesia," Orientalia Neerlandica, A Volume of Oriental Studies (Leiden, 1948), 386-87. Other \( m- \leftrightarrow p- \) alterations at the beginning of a word are shown in Heinz-Jürgen Pinnow, Versuch einer Historischen Lautlehre der Kharia-Sprache, 370-71.

1309 See Jules Bloch, Inscriptions d’Ašoka, 124, line 29.
variation with onomatopoeic words, rhyme words and articulatory phrases (*Lautbild*). Although all the mechanisms which govern change are not clear, individual word variation is extensive: “The variation is contained within certain bounds that roughly speaking requires the preservation of the place of articulation velar, retroflex/dental and labial. The palatal row can interchange with the velar and retroflex/dentals. Stops change easily to semi-vowels (*b*-*w*), orals to nasals (*b*-*m*), voiceless to voiced (*p*-*b*), unaspirated to aspirated (*p*-*ph*), stops to laterals or vibrants (*d*-*l*-*r*). Very often the change is from oral + nasal to nasal + oral, e.g. *b*-*m*-*mb*, the so-called nasalization and pre-nasalization, a phenomenon which is not seldom encountered in other languages, whereas the function of it is always different.”

From the individual words secondary forms are created through “inner transformation” (innere Umbildung) resulting in dual forms which bring about a “nuancing of meaning” (Bedeutungsnuancierung). Murray Emeneau called these formations “echo-words,” a trait of the South Asia linguistic area which he believed was inherited from Dravidian or Munda speakers which had the meaning “and the like”; in Munda grammar books today, they are called “expressives.”

Although *punḍ(r)a-munda* never occurs together as a dual form, their phonological relation, especially in terms of Munda phonology is very close. This initial labial consonant variation also manifests in

---

1310 Heinz-Jürgen Pinnow, *Versuch einer Historischen Lautlehre*, 10-22. Palaun and Mon belong to the Mon-Khmer (or eastern) branch of Austro-Asiatic and are thus only distantly related to Munda.

1311 Ibid, 20; translated by the author. Kuiper also mentions pre-nasalization as a mechanism of word variation in his “Munda and Indonesian” article, page 381. If he is right then the pre-nasalization of *punḍra* by the addition of a nasal before *p* (*n+p*) would result in *m*: *n+p* > *np* > *mp* > *m* (the homorganic nasal). *n+ punḍ(r)a > munda*

1312 See Gregory D. S. Anderson, *The Munda Languages*, where they are called expressives in the following language groups: Gorum (413), Gtaʔ (741-743), Gutob (665), Ho (227), Juang (537), Keraʔ Mundari (184), Kharia (482-483), Kherwarian (230-231), Korku (288), Mundari (139-45), Remo (607-08), Santali (73-74) and Sora (360-62).
P (muṇḍa = bhandu, “shaven,” page 521 above), probably as a borrowing from Munda, and in Dravidian, where the word occurs in Tamil as moṭṭai, “bald, head,” as well as pōḻu, “baldness, shaven condition;” in Kannada as moṇḍa “blunt, maimed, deficient” as well as bōlu, “bald, the state of being shaved, a bare, leafless, treeless state;” and in Telugu as moṇḍi, “maimed, amputated, lopped, imperfect, blunt;” as well as bōḍa, bōḍi “bald, bare, hornless, cropt, tuskless.”

In trying to explicate the meaning of various P usages of muṇḍa/muṇḍaka, we should keep in mind the possibility that the words may also refer to the tribal/clan group, with their (putative) baldness, like the Malla’s legendary strength, being merely a synecdochical definition, i.e. the prominence of the part - i.e. baldness - standing for the whole - i.e. the tribe or clan - for such a long period of time that the true etymology of the term was forgotten. The use of the word muṇḍa as a toponym (Kaṇṇamunḍa, one of the seven great lakes in the Himalayas; Muṇḍanigama, a market town) and as a proper name (King Muṇḍa, grandson of Ajātasattu; Nāgamunḍā, a slave woman, mother of Vāsabhakkhatiyā who married Pasenadi, King of Kosala; Mahāmunḍa, a Buddhist lay disciple) suggests a long - even primordial - connection

1313 The m- words and definitions may be found in Burrow & Emeneau, Dravidian Etymological Dictionary, 349; the p- and b- words and definitions in Kuiper, Proto-Munda, 104. Kuiper believes that the Dravidian words are borrowings from Munda.
1314 Kaṇṇamunḍa as the name of a Himalayan great lake occurs throughout the commentary, for example, the Sumarigalavilāsini, 1, 1644-5: Kaṇṇamunḍa-Rathakāra-Anotatta-Sīhappāṭa-Tiyaggala-Mucalinda-Kuṇāladahe; it is also the subject of Kaṇṇamunḍapetavatthu (p. 4132-435). Muṇḍa-nigama (market town) is a place mentioned in the commentary to Dhp 382, Dhp-a 4, 1287, where Mahāmunḍa lived.
1315 The story of King Muṇḍa is told in the AN 3, 5721-63. The story of Nāgamunḍā is told in Jā. 7 (1, 13321) and Jā. 465 (4, 1445). For Mahāmunḍa see previous footnote.
with the geography, history and culture of ancient India. With this in mind, let us return to some other muṇḍa/muṇḍaka problematica in the P writings.

Pāli usages of muṇḍa/muṇḍaka

The words occur about 213 times in the P canon and commentary (aṭṭhakathā). Although there are a few instances where the words simply mean “shaven” (as, for example in the Dhammapada v. 264-a, na muṇḍakena samāṇo… “Not by tonsure, [does one become] a mendicant," or in the Theragāthā and Therīgāthā where monks and nuns describe themselves as “shaven,” muṇḍa),1316 most occurrences of muṇḍa/muṇḍaka are pejorative. The Buddha, for example, never uses the word himself; in the instances where he does describe himself as “shaven” he uses the word nivuttakeso (“whose hair has been removed”)1317 or kesamassum ohāretvā (“having shaved off hair and beard”).1318 There seems to be some attempt by the commentary to separate muṇḍa from muṇḍaka as in the example from the Sundarikabhāradvājasutta discussed above (page 526); another example of this distinction occurs in the Ghaṭīkārasutta (MN 2, 4611-12), where the brahman student Jotipāla replies to Ghaṭikāra’s suggestion of visiting the Buddha Kassapa with kiṃ pana tena muṇḍakena samāṇakena diṭṭhenā ti? (“What is the use of seeing that bald-pated recluse?”) and the

1316 Th v. 153-b, 414-b, 944-b, 998-b, 1118-a. Thī 32-b, 75-b, 183-a, 348-e
1317 Sn verse 456-b Sundarikabhāradvājasutta. The compound nivuttakeso is a bahuvrīhi (descriptive compound). The word nivutta comes from the Vedic root vap, (“to shear, to shave,” past participle of ni + ́vap = *nyupta > nivutta, which root occurs in the Rg Veda (e.g. 10.142 where we find vapta and vapasi); the word muṇḍa does not occur in the Rg Veda. This (vap) is also the word used in the Grhya ("household") sūtras for tonsure of the brahman child, e.g. Āśvalāyana Grhya sūtra, 1.17.10, āvapat.
1318 MN 1, 16330, Ariyapariyesanāsutta.
Commentator notes that Jotipāl speaks thus because of his immature understanding - It is appropriate to call someone muṇḍa, but muṇḍaka is a term of abuse. However there are lots of instances in the writings where muṇḍa is used negatively as well, as in the case of a criminal whose head is shaved before being executed; or bald-headed nuns called prostitutes by a bhikkhu who inadvertently receives the contents of one nun’s chamberpot on his head; and as a descriptor for the dog of Hell whose ears are sheared (kaṇṇamuṇḍa) and who lives by the eponymous lake, in the Petavatthu (42). There are also many cases where it is difficult to tell what the word means, as it seems to have a technical sense which does not relate very closely to the meaning “bald.”

Muṇḍa as an agricultural implement

In the Nandivisāla Jātaka 28, for example, we find the phrase muṇḍa-rukkha-daṇḍaka in the technical description of a brahman harnessing his bull Nandivisāla (the Buddha as a bodhisatta in another life) to one hundred carts: yugaṃ dhure niccalam bandhitvā ekāya koṭiyā

Nandivisālaṃ yojetvā ekam kotim dhurayottena palivethetvā (var. palivethetvā, Burmese)
yugakoṭīṇ ca akkāni pādaṇ ca nissāya muṇḍarukkhadaṇḍakaṃ datvā tena yottena niccalam

1319 Ps 3, 280: **muṇḍakena** saṃaṇakenā ti muṇḍaṃ muṇḍo ti saṇaṃ vā saśaṇo ti vattuṃ vattati. Ayam pana aparipakkaṇṭhā brāhmaṇakule uggahitavohāravaseṇ eva hīlento evamāha. Majjhima-paṭṭhāna-atṭhakathā, “It is fitting to call a bald person ‘muṇḍa’ or an ascetic ‘saṇaṇa’ but he [Jotipāl], because of his immature understanding, speaks this way, looking down [on him] because of terms/designations learned in a Brahman family.”

1320 The phrase *khuramuṇḍa karītvā* occurs in 11 instances, meaning “having caused his [the criminal’s] head to be shaved with a razor” prior to execution. (e.g. Susimasutta, SN 2, 128)

1321 Vin 4, 224: assanāmyo imā muṇḍā bandhakiniyo. “These bald (nuns) are not ascetics; they are prostitutes.”
bandhitvā ṭhapesi, evaṃ hi kate yugam etto vā ito vā na gacchati, here translated as “...he fastened the cross-yoke on to the pole; then he put the bull in on one side and made the other fast by fastening a smooth piece of wood from the cross-yoke on to the axletree, so that the yoke was taut and could not skew round either way.” The compound munḍa-rukkha-danḍakāṁ, “smooth piece of wood,” may also refer to a ploughing and/or transport implement used by the indigenous peoples (a special piece of wood as used by the Munḍas to fasten the cross-yoke to the axletree), whose meaning has been lost. Or it might refer to a kind of tree whose wood is being used for this purpose, either the Bengal madder or the east Indian Globe thistle (Sphaerantus Hirtus). If the writer was looking for the concept “smooth” here, why not use one of the commoner P terms (galita, likhita, sammaṭṭha, sanha, etc.) for this meaning?

Munḍa as a form of torture

In the Mahādukkhakkhandhasutta (MN 13), there is a reference to a special form of torture called a saṅkhamunḍika, translated as the “polished-shell shave,” which the commentary explicates as follows:

saṅkhamunḍikan ti saṅkhamunḍakammakāraṇaṃ. Taṃ karontā uttarottha-ubhatokaṇṇacūlikagalavātakaparicchedena cammaṃ chindītvā sabbakese ekato gaṇṭhim katvā

---

1324 Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi, The Middle Length Discourses, 182. MN 1, 8713.
“Saṅkhamuṇḍika is the bodily punishment of the saṅkha (shell) muṇḍa (“smooth,” “shaved,” or “practiced by the Muṇḍa people”)?; those who do this, having cut the skin by clipping round the area from the neck to the top-knot, both ears and the upper lip, tying all the hair together on one side, they twist it around and root it out. With the hair, the skin comes out. Then, having rubbed the skull with gravel and fat, washing it, they give it the appearance of a conch shell.”

The word muṇḍa could mean “bald” or “shaved” in this context; but it might equally refer to an ancient form of torture practiced by one of the indigenous peoples (or both meanings might be applicable).

Muṇḍa as a type of seat.

There is also such a thing as a muṇḍapiṭha, a “muṇḍa-seat.” What is this? In the Sekkhasutta (MN 53), the Sakyans are preparing a new assembly hall for its inauguration by the Buddha. They “prepared seats” (āsanāni paññāpetvā) which the commentary explicates as follows:

**pacchinabhittim** nissāya bhikkusaṅghassa pallāṅkapīṭha-apassayapiṭha-muṇḍapiṭhāni (var. maṅcapiṭhāni) paññāpetvā upari setapaccatharaṇehi paccattharāpetvā paccinabhittim nissāya

---

1325 Ps 2, 5822-27.
"...near the western wall they prepared a cross-legged seat, a bolster seat and a muṇḍa seat for the bhikkhu saṅgha, above which they spread out a white canopy; near the eastern wall for each of them they prepared high-backed kojavaka (seats) and they caused pillows filled with swan’s down, etc., to be placed (on them)...” What is a muṇḍa seat? It could mean “bare,” or “unadorned,” but not if the swan’s down pillows are placed on them (and it is not clear exactly where these are placed, whether just on the Sakyas’ seats or on the monks’ seats as well). The word kojavaka (var. kojava, "carpet") is apparently a technical term for the seat on an elephant’s back; perhaps muṇḍa-pīṭha refers to a type of seat used/manufactured by one of the tribal/ethnic groups?

---

1326 Ps 3, 191-5.
1327 Per the ṭīkā, Burmese edition vol. 2, p. 10. Mahāpiṭṭhikakojavake ti hatthipiṭṭhīsu attharitabbatāya mahāpiṭṭhikāti laddhasamaññe kojaveti vadanti. They say "carpets" which is a designation for high-backed (rugs) to be spread out on the backs of elephants." It is interesting that the ṭīkā defines the muṇḍapīṭham as yojanāvaṭṭeti yojanaparikkhepe which seems to be saying that a muṇḍa seat has the circumference of a yoke. See discussion above on muṇḍa-rukkha-danḍa (page 539). Although the author did not have access to the original, the ṭīkā is available in Dhammapāla, Majjhima Nikāya ṭīkā (Rangoon: Buddhāsāsana Samiti, 1961). Quotes from the ṭīkā are from the Digital Pāli Reader, chrome://digitalpalireader/content/index.xul?loc=m.1.0.0.2.0.0.t&analysis=mahaapi.t.thikokojavake; accessed May 2013.
Muṇḍa as an architectural term, circumvallation

In the Ambalaṭṭhikārāhulovādasutta (MN 61) the Buddha describes the behaviour of a royal elephant who “does his work” (kammaṃ karoti); this phrase is further explained in the commentary:

kammaṃ karoti ti āgatāgāte pavaṭṭento ghāteti (var. pāteti). puratthimakāyādīsu pana puratthimakāyena tāva paṭisenāya phalakakoṭṭhakamunḍapākārādayo pāteti tathā pacchimakāyena, sīsena…¹³²⁸

“‘He does his work’ means, that sallying forth, he destroys all comers. At the vanguard [of the army], etc. with the vanguard, he destroys the muṇḍa ramparts, etc., of the wooden gateway stronghold, which [has been built] for the purpose of defence.¹³²⁹

What is a muṇḍa rampart? The Ṭīkā suggests that it is both a wooden (phalaka, "made of wooden planks, a shield") storeroom/stronghold above the gate (koṭṭhaka) and the upper covering (uddhacchada) of the rampart (pākāra), used for a lookout and defence.¹³³⁰ We can learn more about it from a parallel term muṇḍaharummiya.

¹³²⁸ Ps 3, 127²⁰-²³.
¹³²⁹ I take puratthima, to mean “forefront” (see F. EdgertonBHSD, vol 2, s.v.purastima, p. 347), or “vanguard.”
¹³³⁰ Ṭīkā Burmese edition vol. 2, 60: Paṭisenāya phalakakoṭṭhakamunḍapākārādayo paṭisenāya attano ārakkhatthāya ṭhapite phalakakoṭṭhake ceva uddhacchadapākārādike ca. Digital copy available at chrome://digitalpalireader/content/index.xul?loc=m.1.1.0.0.0.0.t&query=phalakako.t.thakamu.n.da&para=7&analysis=appa.nihitato&frombox=0; accessed May 2013.
**Mundra as a type of house**

This compound is found in the *Abhisamācārikā-dharma-Vinaya* of the Mahāsāmghika-Lokottaravādin school, in BHS. Here the Buddha addresses the monks, telling them to find shelter during the rains and lists various forms of accommodation which are suitable and repairs that have to be made to make them habitable. The Buddha says *mundaḥarmmiyā pratisaṃskarttavyā: “mundaḥarmmiyas are to be restored.”* What kind of building is this? Buddhaghosa defines a *hammiya* as a *mundaḥacchadanapāsādo,* which may mean a “building with a *munda* (flat?) roof.” Horner translates as a house with a “sun-roof,” i.e. all the rooms have ceilings so that they are covered in; but over the whole or part of the uppermost rooms, although there are ceilings, there is no further outside roofing. This means that one can walk on the *upper* side of the ceiling with no roof over one.” This would appear to be a flat, rather than a domed roof. In another part of his commentary Buddhaghosa’s defines a

---


1332 Commentary to Vin 3, 200; Sp 3, 654-14-15.


hammiyagabbho, as an upper storey chamber on a flat roof or a chamber on a munḍa roof. The word seems to have the meaning of “flat,” but since a munḍahammiya seems to be an additional storey on top of an already flat roof, which itself has a terrace above it, it may be closer to the meaning “head,” (as in “head of a building”) that we have seen is one of the possible meanings of the word. Or it might refer to a form of architectural design and construction which originated with the Munḍa peoples. See also the commentary on Apadāna p. 44 where the phrase satipaṭṭhānam attālam (“mindfulness is your watchtower,” var. satipaṭṭhānamañḍalam, or "mindfulness is your pavilion") is explained by ‘te’ tuyha catusatipaṭṭhānam attālamañḍalacchadanaṃ, "the watchtower and pavilion roof of your four mindfullnesses, or var. āṭṭalamanḍacchadanaṃ, Burmese, "the munḍa roof of your four mindfullnesses”). Here munḍacchadana is equated with a watchtower type structure.

Munḍa as fenestration

Also in the Abhisamācārikā-dharma-Vinaya the word munḍa refers to a kind of fenestration or window:

… bhikṣunā munḍe vātapāṇe pātraṃ sthavitam tan dāni vātamanḍalikāye āgacchiyānam

1335 Sp 6, 1215.
1336 Sp 6, 1219-21. hammiyagabbho ti ākāsatale kūṭāgragabbho munḍacchadananagabbho vā.
1337 Apadāna-atṭhakathā, 286-5.
“A bhikkhu placed a bowl in/on a muṇḍa window and that bowl fell to the ground and broke when a whirlwind arose. It made a mess of pieces and when the gong was sounded for the rice gruel, he [i.e. the Buddha] washed his hands and entered the vihāra, and saw it.”

von Hinüber tentatively translates this as “the alms bowl was placed in a not closable window; when a whirlwind arose, it fell to the ground and broke.”

What kind of window is a muṇḍa window? Perhaps an “open” window with no shutters to close in a windstorm (as von Hinüber has suggested, in the sense of “bare” or “unadorned”)? or a type of design which is favoured by one of the indigenous tribes? Or both?

Muṇḍa as a chariot wheel-spoke

In the commentary to the Khuddakapāṭha’s Ratanasutta Buddhaghosa describes the wheel of a cakkavatta, a wheel-turning monarch:

---

1338 *Abhisamācārikā-dharma*, 101, 22b2. The word also occurs as vātāyane at 101, 22b5. See also Karashima, *Abhisamācārikā Dharmā*, 207, footnote 1: “Die Bedeutung des Wortes muṇḍa in diesem Kompositum bleibt unklar.”

“The navel is made of sapphires, a thousand spokes are made of the seven jewels, the rim of the wheel is made of coral, the link [axle?] is made of burnished gold, and after every ten spokes is one muṇḍa spoke, whose purpose is to make a sound by catching the wind, a sound which is like the sound of the five kinds of musical instruments, well and skilfully played.”

The word muṇḍa here could mean “head,” in the sense of “principal” and it could also mean “bare” or “unadorned,” in contrast to the other jewelled spokes; or it could mean something completely different, perhaps horizontal blade-like “spokes,” at ninety degrees from the others, with holes in them that “caught the wind” as the wheels revolved and sounded as described. We don’t know; however muṇḍa meaning “bald” or “unadorned” or “head” simply does not fit well in this context.

---

1340 The version quoted is from the Burmese edition used in the Digital Pali Reader at chrome://digitalpalireader/content/index.xul?loc=k.0.0.0.6.5.0.a&analysis=pavaa.lamayanemi&frombox=0. The PTS version is slightly different and for muṇḍāram has muddhāram (muddha + arāṃ); Mayrhofer, KEWA, vol. 2, 652, suggests that the classical form of muṇḍa, meaning “head,” may in fact be a Middle Indic form of S mūrdhan, “head.” See Pj 1, 1722-6.

1341 This is translated by Bhikkhu Nānāmoli, The Minor Readings (Khuddakapāṭha) The First Book of the Minor Collection (Khuddakanikāya) (London: Luzac & Company Ltd. 1960), 186 where muṇḍāram is rendered as “head-spoke.”
Conclusion

These are most of the usages of *muṇḍa/muṇḍaka* in the P and BHS writings. As we have seen, in many cases the word means “bald,” or “shaved,” and meanings of secondary derivation - “plain,” “unadorned,” etc. - are associated with the primary meaning. In many cases, but not all, the word carries an additional pejorative overtone. But there are yet several other contexts where none of these meanings are appropriate. The use of the word in proper names and places suggests an ancient connection with the geography and culture of north-eastern India, dating back to the indigenous peoples and their language, which pre-dates the Aryan immigrations of the late second and early first milleniums BCE. Because of its retroflex structure, we can be fairly certain that the word is non-Aryan and derives from either the Munda or Dravidian language groups. Phonologically, the former group is an especially compelling source, because of its propensity to interchange initial consonants at the place of articulation (*m-* > *p-* > *< b-*). We find several examples of this (*muṇḍa = puṇḍ(r)a*) in the *Mahābhārata* from the later part of the first millennium BCE and even within the P writings, which are much earlier. Here *muṇḍa* in the BHS version of the *Mahāvadanasūtra*, appears as *bhaṇḍu* in the P version.1342 The word also appears in several other contexts, in the *Vinaya* story of the bald

headed blacksmith (kammārabhaṇḍu) who joins the saṅgha against his parents' wishes; in the Jātakas, and many times in the commentaries. One may assume that, because of identity of meaning, the words muṇḍa and bhaṇḍu are cognate, and we have demonstrated above that muṇḍa and punḍ(r)a are also related, as are probably muṇḍa and malla. The variations in these words are all functions of AA internal phonological rules.

The word muṇḍa/muṇḍaka is associated with baldness, but also has the additional meaning of “low,” “mean,” “outcaste,” “low class,” etc., This meaning appears to stem from the word’s association with one of the eastern tribal groups that opposed and were displaced by the incoming Indo-Aryans. So, when the Buddha and his followers were being insulted as muṇḍakas, they were not only being called “bald mendicants,” but also outcastes with non-Aryan tribal affiliations, in the same way that the word Malla referred, not only to a wrestler, but probably also to a member of the Malla clan (see page 531). This helps to explain the polysemy of the word muṇḍa/muṇḍaka and especially some of the arcane terms used in agricultural, architectural, technical, etc., descriptions; the meaning “bald” or one of its secondary connotations, does not easily fit these contexts; the meaning "as used/built/produced by the Muṇḍa clan or tribe” is often more appropriate.

In cultural history, the use of an ethnic name as a racial attribute, where the name comes to signify one of the putative (often negative) characteristics of the group (i.e. a synecdoche), is

---

1343 Vin 1, 762ff, Jātaka 3, 221.5 (#306) 6, 53811 (#547). There are approx. 35 occurrences of the word in the commentaries. The PED suggests the word bhaṇḍu might be related to paṇḍu (=paṇḍa, “eunuch,” “impotent”), which Jacob Wackernagel, Altindische Grammatik, vol. 1, 116, 184 also connects with baṇḍa (“maimed,” “defective”), a word he claims is of foreign origin. See page 392.
quite common. Often the origin of the term is forgotten. How many people know, for example, that the word “gyp,” meaning “to cheat or swindle” comes from the name for the Romani people (the Gypsies); or that the verb “to jew down” meaning “to beat down in price” comes from the name for the Jewish ethnic group; or that the pejorative word “jock,” (“one characterized by excessive concern for machismo”) originally referred to the Scottish peoples? The evolution of meaning in language is a multifaceted phenomenon where social, political, historical and cultural strata interpenetrate and overlay each other in a complex tapestry; although we may not be able to unweave muṇḍa/muṇḍaka’s actual history of semantic development, we can understand - by carefully studying the context of its use the various strata of meaning in the word and uncover the richness of its genealogy.

The next chapter will illustrate a case where a popular S Mahāyāna text - the Lotus Sutra - contains dhāraṇīs (mnemonic formulas) in Ch which have been translated from a Pkt source, opening a unique window on the history and process of the transmission of this popular sutra, and confirming that the work itself was originally composed in Pkt and later translated into S. Here we are on more solid ground than with the history of the words muṇḍa/muṇḍaka where the meanings can only be inferred from contextual and other circumstantial evidence. Since we have a good understanding of Middle Ch phonology, we can fairly accurately reconstruct the dialect of the source dhāraṇīs that the translator was actually using, thus increasing our understanding of the transmission of the buddhavacana from India to China.

1344 American Heritage Dictionary, s.v. jock².
Chapter Thirteen, Transmission of the Dharma

Introduction

Most of this study is about translations of the Buddha’s teachings. Regardless of the early saṅgha’s position on translation (whether the saṅgha wanted the Buddha’s original words preserved and memorized exactly, utilizing his own terminology, or whether it allowed for translation into other dialects; see Chapter Four), almost from the moment Buddhism arose, there was a need to translate the teacher’s words into the different dialects and languages - both MI and non-IA - which made up the complicated fabric of ancient north-eastern India. Because of the popularity of this new dharma, the Buddha’s teachings spread quickly along existing trade routes into other countries and reached China probably early in the first millennium, where it was enthusiastically embraced. This chapter concerns the transmission of the Lotus Sutra into Ch, a work originally composed in approx. the first century BCE in Pkt or Sanskritized Pkt, and one that has a complicated textual history in MI and Ch. We possess three different MI recensions of the sutra, all fairly recent; two have been almost completely Sanskritized and the third and oldest, from Central Asia, still retains some Prakritic elements. There are six Ch translations (255, 286, 290, 335, 406 and 601 CE) of which only the third, fifth and sixth survive. Of these, the fifth (the second of the surviving witnesses), by Kumārajīva, is considered the standard.\(^\text{1345}\) So the Ch translations are much older than the MI manuscripts that we possess, and indeed when one looks at the proper names, technical terms and

dhāraṇīs (formulas for memorizing and retaining the dharma) of the Ch versions we find many Prakritic elements still preserved.\textsuperscript{1346} By understanding the phonology of Ch in the fourth and fifth centuries CE when Kumarajīva made his translation, we can learn much about the phonological structure of the Pkt they were translating from and go back centuries earlier in time to a time before the texts were Sanskritized. This chapter provides a fascinating insight into the translation process, from MI to Ch and from MI to S and all the errors, problems and confusions that inevitably find their way into the documents as they evolve over time.

The Transmission of the Dhāraṇīs of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra and Reconstruction of Kumārajīva’s Source.

Purpose of this Study

This study examines a particular instance of the transmission of Buddhist teachings over time, Kumārajīva’s transliteration of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra’s dhāraṇīs (Ch Chapter 26 & 28, S Chapter 21 & 26 ). By correlating and examining all the surviving textual witnesses for this particular transcription unique to Kumārajīva,\textsuperscript{1347} I hope to illuminate, 1) the nature of

\textsuperscript{1346} The word dhāraṇī is a multi-faceted term with many meanings, common to all of which is the notion of retention of the dhamma. The dhāraṇī formulas were expected to be memorized exactly in order to preserve their ritual efficacy; therefore they are particularly apt for the study of the transmission of the dhamma, as special care was taken with their memorization and transmission. For discussion and bibliography see pages 569-572 below.

\textsuperscript{1347} See Edwin G. Pulleyblank, “Stages in the transcription of Indian words in Chinese from Han to Tang,” in Klaus Röhrborn and Wolfgang Veenker, ed., Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien (Wiesbaden, 1983), 87: “The dhāraṇī of the SP, at least, must represent a fresh effort at transcription.”
Kumārajīva’s transliteration practice, 2) the main textual traditions, their differences, ambiguities and the nature of the transmission process, and 3) the underlying Middle Indic source transmission dialect(s) on which the Ch translation of Kumārajīva was based, and therefore explain why his transcription of the dhāraṇīs is so different from the existing S reflexes. The *Lotus Sutra* is a logical choice for two reasons: its self-reflexivity about its own transmission, and its rich manuscript tradition. A key enjinder of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* is its admonishment to “receive and keep it [the sūtra], to read and recite it, to preach it, to copy it and to make offerings to it.” This central message of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, i.e., securing its transmission to present and future generations and the accuracy of that transmission, is repeated so many times, one might argue it is *the* main theme of the sūtra. The text starts and ends with the concept of “mastering the dhāraṇīs,” which does not refer solely to “magic charms” as Hurvitz defines the term, but more germanely to memorizing and retaining the dharma (see discussion below). As a result the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* was copied thousands of times over the centuries, in a variety of Indic, Ch, Tib and other languages, and a rich manuscript tradition of over 60 have survived in S alone which are available for study. Because of the overwhelming importance of the

---

1348 Hurvitz, 263; all quotations in English of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīksūtra* are from Hurvitz.
1349 Ibid, 3. 皆得陀羅尼, *jiē dé tuóluóní*, “All had attained the dhāraṇīs.” T09n0262_p0002a03. See also Hurvitz, page 309: “incalculable, limitless bodhisattvas…attained the dhāraṇī…”
teaching as embodied in the text, an assiduous attention to detail in its transmission (i.e. memorization) was expected; in the Lotus *samādhi* ritual for example (法華三昧懺儀, *Fāhuá sānmèi chànyī*), a twenty-one day repentance ritual in the Tiantai tradition involving recitation of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, mistakes in the recitation were simply not permissible (不得謬誤, *bùdé miùwù*). But in fact, there is no uniformity amongst the Indic versions themselves, nor between these and the texts translated into Ch. In fact, the differences are often more striking than the similarities, especially when comparing the two earliest surviving Ch translations, - those of Dharmarakṣa in 286 CE and Kumārajīva in 406 CE - to the extant S MSS. This lack of correspondence, - and the fact that the S manuscripts are all fairly late - points to an earlier lost manuscript tradition on which the Ch translations relied. The Hurvitz translation, for example, has over fifty pages of variants (pages 317-370) detailing the differences between the Ch translation and the received S text. The differences amongst portions of the *dhāraṇīs* are especially striking, considering how important their exact duplication is said to be for ritual efficacy; here for example, are a few of the more glaring differences.

---


1353 There are many places in the canon where the Buddha talks about memorizing *buddhavacana*: in the *Dutiya Vinayadharasutta* (AN 4, 140²⁴), the monk is expected to know the teachings “chapter by chapter, down to the letter” (*suttaso anubyañjanaso*); the *Sugatavinayasutta* (An 2, 148²³-²⁵: *ye te bhikkhū bahussutā āgatāgamā dhammadharā vinayadharā mātikādharā te sakkaccam suttaṃtaṃ paraṃ vācenti*), “Those monks who are of wide knowledge, versed in the doctrines, who know Dhamma by heart, who know Vinaya by heart, - these dutifully hand on a text to another,” translated by E.M. Hare, *The Book of the Gradual Sayings*, vol. 2, 152. For other references see Alexander Wynne, “The Oral Transmission of the Early Buddhist Literature,” *Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies, 27*, number 1 (2004): 97-128.
differences between the received S version and Kumārajīva’s transliteration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kern &amp; Nanjio (K&amp;N)</th>
<th>Kumārajīva (as reconstructed in this chapter)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>citte carite</td>
<td>cire caride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jaye kṣaye aksaye aksine</td>
<td>chaye acchaye agghiye</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pratyavekṣaṇi</td>
<td>pa(c)cavecchaṇi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aksaye aksayavanatāye</td>
<td>aksara aksyatāya</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ukke tukke mukke</td>
<td>ukše mukše</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stuhe stuhe stuhe stuhe stuhe</td>
<td>tahe tahe tahe tuhe thuhe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prāpte</td>
<td>arate parate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anuvarte vartani vartāli svāhā</td>
<td>missing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Clearly, Kumārajīva had a different version of the dhāraṇīs than the ones represented in the later Kern & Nanjio edition. It is the nature of that different text and its transmission that is the concern of this chapter.

Text critical background.

---

1354 H. Kern and Nanjio B., Saddharma-Puṇḍarīka or The Lotus of the True Law (St. Petersburg: 1908-12), The dhāraṇīs are found as follows: #1: p. 396¹-397²; #2 398⁴-⁵; #3 399¹-²; #4 399⁸-400¹; #5 401²-³; #6 477¹-⁴ Dhāraṇīs 1-5 are in Chapter 21, dhāraṇī#6 in Chapter 26 Abbreviation = K&N. Chinese versions may be found at dhāraṇī#1 T09n0262_p0058b19 to T09n0262_p0058c03; dhāraṇī#2 T09n0262_p0058c14 to T09n0262_p0059a03; dhāraṇī#3 T09n0262_p0059a10 to T09n0262_p0059a11; dhāraṇī#4 T09n0262_p0059a18 to T09n0262_p0059a19; dhāraṇī#5 T09n0262_p0059b01 to T09n0262_p0059b04; dhāraṇī#6 T09n0262_p0061b19 to T09n0262_p0061b27
Scholars recognize three major recensions for the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra Indic text, Nepalese, Gilgit and Central Asian.  

The closest thing we have to a critical edition of any of these is K&N’s edition, which, however was based on only 8 manuscripts (7 Nepalese and 1 Central Asian) and does not include all variants. None of the Nepalese texts are earlier than the eleventh century; the Gilgit manuscripts date from the early sixth century and belong to a recension similar to the Nepalese; the earliest of the Central Asian manuscripts date from the fifth or sixth century as well. These manuscripts are linguistically earlier than the Nepalese and Gilgit recensions - composed before major Sanskritization had taken place - and contain hundreds of Pkt forms, some of which are detailed in K&N and Dutt’s later edition. In his exhaustive study on Sanskritized Pkt which he calls Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (BHS), Edgerton has established a time scale which confirms that the more Prakritisms a manuscript


[1356] Tsukamoto, Sanskrit Manuscripts, 9f.

[1357] Shoko Watanabe, Saddharmapundarika manuscripts found in Gilgit (Tokyo: The Reiyukai, 1972-75), xi.

[1358] Tsukamoto, Sanskrit Manuscripts, 24, Nalinaksha Dutt, Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasutrām with N. D. Mironov’s Readings from Central Asian MSS. (Calcutta: Asiatic Society, 1953), viii f., where he shows a number of correspondences between the language of the Central Asian MSS and P.

[1359] Kern and Nanjio, Saddharmapuṇḍarīksūtra, vi f; Dutt, Saddharmapuṇḍarīksūtra, xvii f. See also Seishi Karashima, "Textcritical Remarks on the Sanskrit Versions of the Lotus Stura," Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, I (1998): 49-68, for a list of Pkt words and forms in the S versions. See also Seishi Karashima, "Some Features Of The Language Of The Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra," Indo-Iranian Journal, 44 (2001): 207-30, which contains a list of Pkt forms from a Central Asian manuscript preserved in the Lushun Museum. These fragments are thought to date back to the fifth or sixth century.
contains, the earlier it is. As stated above (page 551), there are three complete Ch translations of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra*, one by Dharmaraksā in 286 CE; one by Kumārajīva in 406 and a third by Jñānagupta and Dharmagupta in 601. There is also a partial translation, the *Satanfentuolijing* (*Taishō*, 265) thought to predate Dharmaraksā. The earliest manuscript evidence we have of the Ch translations is from Dunhuang (fifth-tenth centuries). Tib has preserved several versions in the various Kanjurs which are presumed to date back to the early 8th century.

---

1360 F. Edgerton, *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary* (Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass Publishers, 1953, 1998), vol 1, xxv. Dutt, (page xvii) citing Lüders, Hoernle and Mironov (with no reference) agrees and gives the example of Central Asian mss. written in Upright Gupta script in the early 5th or 6th centuries containing more Prakritisms than those written in Calligraphic script of the 7th century. A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, *Manuscript Remains of Buddhist Literature found in Eastern Turketan Facsimiles with Transcripts Translations and Notes* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1916), xxxi, discusses the Northern and Southern canon and maintains that they were originally written in the "vernacular language of Magadha" which is of course the essence of Heinrich Lüders' thesis as documented in his *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des Buddhistschen Urkanons* (Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 1954). Another scholar to make this point, specifically about the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* is Dschi Hiän-lin (Ji Xanlin), "Die Umwandlung der Endung -aṃ in -o und -u im Mittelindischen," *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen aus dem Jahre 1944 Philologisch-Historische Klasse*, (1944), 139: "Ich glaube früher gezeigt zu haben, daß das Werk [Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra] ursprünglich in der Alt-Ardhamāgadhī abgefasst worden war, daß die Kashgar-Rezension [Central Asian] dem Original viel näher steht also die nepalesische, und schliesslich, daß die Alt-Ardhamāgadhī-Formen der Kashgar-Rezension in der nepalischen Rezension mit der Sanskritisierung nach und nach beseitigt wurden."("I believe to have shown earlier that the text was originally composed in Old Ardhamāgadhī, that the Kashgar recension was nearer to the original than the Nepalese and finally that the Old Ardhamāgadhī forms of the Kashgar recensions were gradually removed in the Nepalese recension with Sanskritization.")


It has long been assumed the Kumārajīva’s translation was based on the Nepalese/Gilgit recension, while Dharmarakṣa’s translation was based on the earlier Central Asian manuscript.\textsuperscript{1363} However, recent studies by Karashima have problematized this view. He has shown that not only Dharmarakṣa’s source text, but also Kumārajīva’s are based on manuscripts containing a lot of Pkt material and that in fact Kumārajīva’s translation agrees with the earlier Central Asian recensions in 409 instances vs. only 138 instances of agreement with the Nepalese/Gilgit recensions. The corresponding numbers for Dharmarakṣa’s translation are 622 agreements with Central Asian MSS and 230 with the Nepalese/Gilgit recensions.\textsuperscript{1364}

Therefore both Kumārajīva’s and Dharmarakṣa’s source texts are assumed to predate the existing S MSS, dating from a time before full Sanskritization had taken place. In this regard, a very useful text for this study - and one that confirms Karashima’s findings of the Pkt nature of the source documents at this time - is Kumārajīva’s translation of the arapacana syllabary in the \textit{Dazhidu lun}\textsuperscript{1365} where we find unique Prakritisms like 阿耨波陀 ǎ nòu bō tuó (PB: ?a-new-pa-

\begin{footnotesize}
\footnotesize
\begin{enumerate}
\item [{\textsuperscript{1364}}] Karashima, \textit{Textual Study}, 256 and 260.
\item [{\textsuperscript{1365}}] This rendering was done between CE 404 and 406, just before Kumārajīva began the \textit{Saddharmapuṇḍarīksūtra} translation. Étienne Lamotte, \textit{Le Traité de la Grande Vertu de Sagesse de Nāgārjuna (Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra)}, (Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon, 1944), called it the \textit{Mahāprajñāpāramitāśāstra} but it was known by various names in medieval China. For a discussion on the name see James A. Benn, "The silent saṃgha: Some observations on mute sheep monks," \textit{Journal of the International Association of Buddhist Studies}, 32, number 1-2 (2009), page 12-13, footnote 1. For the arapacana syllabary, see John Brough, "The Arapacana Syllabary in the Old \textit{Lalita-Vistara}," \textit{Bulletin of the School of Oriental Studies, University of London}, 40, No. 1 (1977), 86. Brough suggests that the list of head words which the syllabary represents "might have been in origin a mnemonic device to fix the order of the verses or paragraphs of some important text, by taking the first word of each. Thereafter, the mnemonic would have been further reduced to initial syllables where possible." (p. 94). For more information on the arapacana syllabary, see Richard Salomon, "New Evidence for a Gāndhārī Origin of

Given the rich and complex textual tradition, it is evident that there is no such thing as a single, monolithic Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra. There has not even been an attempt to create a critical edition (i.e. a reconstructed “original” text based on elements from all known sources); the complex tapestry of witnesses, multiple recensions and Sanskritizations suggests that any attempt to re-construct an Ur-text would be impossible. Yet, given the importance of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra in East Asian religious traditions it is a “sorry state of affairs” that we


1366 Edwin G. Pulleyblank, Lexicon of Reconstructed Pronunciation in Early Middle Chinese, Late Middle Chinese, and Early Mandarin (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1991). The abbreviation PB will be used before all transcriptions which use this system. Transcriptions are given in regular type, with italic type reserved for MI words and Ch pinyin. In pinyin transliterations I keep the syllables separate, for ease of reading, despite the fact that one word is being represented. When I consult Bernhard Karlgren’s transcriptions, I use Tor Ulving, Dictionary of Old and Middle Chinese Bernhard Karlgren’s Grammata Serica Recensa Alphabetically Arranged (Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis, 1997), abbreviation KG. “Early Middle Chinese” is the Ch codified in the Qieyun rhyme dictionary (601 CE), representing the Ch language of the fourth to seventh centuries CE as per Edwin G. Pulleyblank, Middle Chinese: a study in historical phonology (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1984), 3.

1367 The letter j = -jh- per Brough, GDhp §6a.
do not make use of “all available resources” when studying the text. Recently this lacuna in *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkaśūtra* studies has been partially rectified by Karashima’s partial publication of a trilingual edition of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkaśūtra* from all S, Ch and Tib sources.

From the Preface to Jñānagupta’s and Dharmagupta’s translation Michael Pye hypothesizes that Kumārajīva worked from a Kucha text which may well have been older than Dharmarakṣa’s source text. Pye arrives at this conclusion based on three factors: 1) material that was left out of Kumārajīva’s original translation and subsequently added, 2) the separate numbering of the Devadatta chapter and 3) the arrangement of the last seven chapters. Dharmarakṣa’s translation represents a later stage of the textual tradition, but at an earlier date. Other scholars have agreed with Pye on philological grounds. Although it may be impossible to confirm the absolute chronology of the underlying source documents, one fact seems certain: based on linguistic and text historico-critical analysis, both Dharmarakṣa’s and Kumārajīva’s source documents are earlier than the surviving Indic witnesses.

---

1371 Tilmann Vetter, "Hendrik Kern and the Lotus sūtra," *Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology*, 2 (1999), 133. The author points out a section in the first half of the fifth chapter where Kumārajīva’s version is shorter and more consistent than either K&N or Dharmarakṣa.
The Nature of the Source Dialect: Previous Work

The hypothesis that source documents for the Ch āgamas were written in Middle Indic, rather than S is not a new one. Scholars have been investigating this issue since the early twentieth century; their primary tool has been to examine Ch transliteration of Indic names and Buddhist terms in order to reconstruct the original transmission. In 1914, for example, Paul Pelliot (1878-1945) examined the Ch translation of the Milindapañha, and the transcriptions of the proper names therein. In his opinion the source document was Pkt; a name like S Kubjottara (P Khujjuttara) was rendered in Ch as Jiū chóng đān (PB: kuw-dzuw-tan), confirming that the name in the source document did not have the S conjunct -bj- but the Pkt form -jh-. Pelliot also believed that the Ch version preserved forms closer to the original Greek than those of the P text of the Milindapañha, possibly because of a Parthian or Indo-Scythian influence.

The name Menander (Μένανδρος), for example, appears in Ch as Mi lán (PB: mji/mjia-lan), which Pelliot reconstructs as *Milandi, maintaining it is closer to the original Greek word Menander than the P Milinda; the change -n- > -l- is frequent in central Asia and in the Pkt's and conforms to general laws of dissimilation in Indo European (IE) languages. Regardless of whether the change of two vowels between the Ch transcription and P is that significant, it is clear that Pelliot's primary point - that the Ch names indicate a Pkt not a S source document - is well made.

---

1373 For example, see Geiger, *Grammar*, §43.2, e.g. S enas > P ela ("fault")
1374 Pelliot, ibid, 384-85.
In 1915 Sylvain Lévi (1863-1935) examined the S remnants and three Ch translations of the *Mahāmāyūrīsūtra* (“Great Peacock”), which contains stories and *dhāraṇīs*, protecting practitioners from all sorts of harm, snakebites in particular. He examines how the names of 106 *yakṣas* contained in the *sūtra* are transliterated into Ch, in three transcriptions 1) early 6th century by Saṃghavarman, 2) late 7th century by Yi-jing and 3) early 8th century by Amoghavajra, showing changing translation practices over time and Prakritisms which are later Sanskritized. For example, Saṃghavarman translated the proper name of *yakṣa* Pūṇako as 分那柯 Fēn nà kē (PB pun-naḥ-ka), showing that in his source document, the *-ṛṇ-* conjunct had been assimilated to *-ṛṇ-*, as is typical of the Pkt. In his later transcription, Yi-jing Sanskritizes Pūṇako, by adding back in an epenthetic *-ṛ-*: 裨律 Pú lǜ ná (PB bo-lwit-nra/l nč:). Lévi notes that the Ch and Tib versions represent a state of the text prior to the surviving S manuscripts, since they contain Prakritisms which are later Sanskritized.

In 1916 Heinrich Lüders (1869-1943) examined three fragments of S texts found at Khadalik in Central Asia (part of the Hoernle collection). After comparing forms in the Central Asian MS like *sramsitavān, sramsayati* (“he did [not] slacken,” “[she] does not slacken) with corresponding forms *saṃṣritavān, saṃṣrakāṣayati* in the Nepalese (“he did not cling,” “[she] does not reveal,” with alternates *janayati, saṃmayati, praṣayati, all incorrect Sanskritizations per Lüders), he

---

1375 Sylvain Lévi, "Le catalgoue géographique des yakṣa dans la Mahāmāyūrī," *Journal Asiatique*, sér 11, vol 5 (1915), 41. Lévi notes that Saṃghavarman was a “demi-hindou, originaire de l’Indo-Chine” and Yi-tsing was “un pur styliste chinois instruit par un long séjour dans l’Inde.” (P 122).


1377 The character in Levi shows a radical 卐 on the left which I can’t find in any dictionary.
concluded that an earlier Pkt form *samsitavā* must have existed in an underlying form to account for these anomalies. He therefore concluded that both Nepalese and the Central Asian MSS of the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* must have a common source, maintaining that the original text was written in a language that had far more Prakritisms than either of the two versions; Lüders was inclined to believe that the original was written in a pure Pkt dialect which was afterwards gradually put into S. This dialect was a “mixed S” based on Māgadhī, according to him.\(^{1378}\) While many today would disagree with Lüders about the possibility of isolating an *Ur*-text, his comparison of MSS well illustrates the complexity, ambiguities and confusions inherent in the transmission process (within just the S texts, not to mention Ch), especially when there is a Pkt source involved; due to the flexible nature of the language (where conjunct consonants are simplified and intervocalic stops > -\(y\)-, -\(y\)- or > Ø, etc), it contains many homonyms.

In 1930 Friedrich Weller (1889-1980) examined the transliteration of Buddhist terms and proper names in the Ch translation of the *Pāṭikasutta* from the *Dīgha Nikāya* (DN #24). Here the name of a Licchavan general Ajita ("Unconquered") occurs (阿由陀 阿由陀, PB: ?a-juw-da or KG å-jeu-da),\(^{1379}\) where -\(j\) > -\(y\)-, -\(t\) > -\(d\)-,\(^{1380}\) along with names like Udena (憂園, Yōu yuán, PB:


\(^{1379}\) See footnote 1366.

\(^{1380}\) R. Pischel, *Comparative Grammar of the Prakrit Languages, translated from the German by Subhadra Jhā* (Delhi: Motial Banarsidass, 1981), §236; the change of an intervocalic stop to a glide (-\(y\)-) or a weakly articulated glide (-\(y\)-) or even its disappearance is quite common in the Pkts. For an example from one of the earliest Buddhist *suttas*, see K. R. Norman, "Four Etymologies from the Sabhiya-sutta,"
ʔuw- wuan) where -d- > Ø or -d- > -y-, and Anupiyā (阿蒱夷, Ā nū yí, PB: ?a-no-ji), where -p- > -y- which prove that the source document was not composed in S, although he did not specify which Pkt the forms might represent.\textsuperscript{1381}

At the end of his long career Ernst Waldschmidt (1897-1985) maintained,"... that the original \textit{Dīrghāgama} text translated into Ch was written in some kind of archaic Prakrit and not in S will hardly be contested."\textsuperscript{1382} He believed that it was probably translated from the north-western Pkt of G,\textsuperscript{1383} a hypothesis which Pulleyblank supported.\textsuperscript{1384} In 1932 Waldschmidt published a Central Asian S manuscript of the \textit{Mahāsamājasūtra} (DN #20 in P) together with a Ch translation which pointed to an underlying, more Prakritic version of the \textit{sūtra}. In the Ch transliterations he discovered many Prakritic forms, the most common being the ending in -\textit{u}

---

\textsuperscript{175} Also published in \textit{Collected Papers} 2, 151, where, for example, the earlier word \textit{virayo} can be confidently derived from two MI reflexes: in the P \textit{Sutta Nipāta virato}, and Mahāvastu \textit{virajo}. The voicing of -\textit{t} > -\textit{d} is also a common Pkt phenomenon, especially in G. See Brough, GDhp §33.

\textsuperscript{1381} Friedrich Weller, "Über den Aufbau des Pāṭikasuttanta ii) Übersetzung des Chinesischen Textes," \textit{Asia Major}, 5 (1930), 111: "Danach ergibt sich….mit völliger Sicherheit, daß die Vorlage der chinesischen Übersetzung nicht in Sanskrit abgefasst war."


\textsuperscript{1383} Ibid, 137.

\textsuperscript{1384} Pulleyblank, "Stages," 84. "The hypothesis… seems to make good sense in terms of the historical situation and has been supported by linguistic arguments by Bailey and Brough."
for the nom. and accus. masculine sing.,\textsuperscript{1385} which is also the case in the GDhp.\textsuperscript{1386} He also found lots of examples of interovocalic stop lenition (in the underlying source text, as transcribed in the Ch), another feature of GDhp: Vairocana (鞞樓耶那 Bī lóu yé nà, PB: pji/pjī-\textsuperscript{1\textepsilon}w-jia-na) = Vairoyana; tejo (提豫, tí yù, PB: dèj-jia\textsuperscript{2\textepsilon}) = *teyo; vācā (婆耶 PB: ba-jia) = vaya; -r- assimilation: Candra (栴大 Zhān dà PB: tɕian-dā/da\textsuperscript{2\textepsilon}h) = Canda; etc., all of which are also features of G\textsuperscript{1387} and many other Prakritic features.\textsuperscript{1388}

For some fifty years, not much work was done on this subject of Ch transliterations. The last thirty years, however, have witnessed something of a “renaissance” in this arcane sub-field of philology with studies by several important scholars: von Hinüber, Karashima and Boucher.

Von Hinüber’s research confirms that a G version of the Madhyamāgama existed as one of the translation stages for the Ch text. This is the only way to account for such forms as are found in the P Upālisutta like pabhinnakhalassa, “broken up the fallow spiritual wasteland”\textsuperscript{1389} which do not correlate with parallel S forms from the Central Asian manuscripts, prahīnakhilasya, “he

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[1385] Waldschmidt, \textit{Bruchstücke buddhistischer Sūtras aus dem zentralasiatischen Sanskritkanon}, 230. See also Dschi, “Umwandlung,” 121-44.
\item[1386] Brough, \textit{GDhp.}, §75.
\item[1387] Waldschmidt, \textit{Bruchstücke}, 231. For intervocalic stop lenition in Gāndhāri, see Brough GDhp., §28. For assimilation of -r- (which is sporadic per Waldschmidt, 232), see T. Burrow, \textit{The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents}, §37 and 38. Note that candra occurs in the GDhp as cadra and usu. appears in P as canda and in AMg as camda. In G -r- is usu. assimilated after a stop (kodha < krodha in GDhp 280), but sometimes it is kept (pridi < S prīti in GDhp 56, 224). For discussion, see Brough, §51. vācā as vaya occurs in several GDhp gāthās (53, 290, 291, etc.).
\item[1388] Waldschmidt, \textit{Bruchstücke}, as discussed on pages 231-234. To name a few: change of aspirated stops to -h- (abhikrāntā > transcribed in Ch as ahikanta); same, plus assimilation of -r- before -ś- (abhivaṛsa > transcribed in Ch as ahivaṣa); change of -ṣṭ- > -ṭṭ- (śreṣṭha > transcribed in Ch as ṣēṭha).
\item[1389] MN 1, 386\textsuperscript{3}. See discussion above page 371.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
who has abandoned the afflictions." The Ch text has 斷穢 duàn huī, ("given up impurity") which is a translation of the Central Asian text, but not the P. This suggests that the source document (underlying both the P and S) must have contained the word p(r)ahina or p(r)ahina ("abandoned") in G, with -bh- > -h- and the -nn- > n/ŋ, and no vowel quantity shown.\footnote{Oskar von Hinüber, "Sprachen des Buddhismus in Zentralasien," \textit{Vorträge des Hamburger Symposions vom 2. Juli bis 5. Juli 1981}, eds. Klaus Rohrborn and Wolfgang Veenker, Band 16 Veröffentlichungen der Societas Uralo-Altaica. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. (1983), 28-29.}

Another example von Hinüber adduces is the word pannadhaja ("whose flag is lowered") from the same \textit{sutta}, which has a Central Asian S reflex of parṇajaha, translated by Saṃghadeva as 慧生 huīshēng = *prajñā-jāta ("wisdom born"); a number of strange transmogrifications and misunderstandings have taken place that are probably due to the translators’ (S and Ch) not recognizing the word panna ("fallen") as the past participle of āpad.\footnote{Ibid, 29-32. Some of this misunderstanding is understandable as \textit{panna} = \textit{prajñā} in AMg (Pischel, \textit{Grammar}, §226). See also Klaus Mylius, \textit{Wörterbuch}, 413, s.v. \textit{pañña} = \textit{prajñā}. Brough, GDhp, also discusses this confusion in §45.}

In an important recent study, Karashima has gathered all the Prakritisms in Kumārajīva’s and Dharmarakṣa’s translations, line by line and has concluded that the Ch translations represent an earlier stage in the transmission process when the source Indic texts were more Prakritic in nature than the current surviving S witnesses.\footnote{Karashima, \textit{Textual Study}, 13, 274-75.} I will be drawing on this work further in my study of \textit{dhāraṇīs} below. Using data from Karashima’s study, Daniel Boucher examined Dharmarakṣa’s translation at a lexical level, pointing out various misunderstandings due to lack of expertise, dialect (phonological) confusion, script confusion and unresolved ambiguities (e.g. the practice of “double translation,” translating a word twice when it has more
than one meaning) and concludes that the source text was “a very mixed and layered
text...already in a hybrid language” which had a very complex transmission process. He does
not try to identify the dialect, although features of G clearly had an influence and the source
document may well have been written in Karoṣṭhi script. He calls for more studies that “unpack
the philological clues contained in these mongrel documents.”

Transcriptional Evidence and a Note on Methodology

This study will examine the dhāraṇīs from Chapter 26 & 28 of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra (S
Chapter 21 & 26) from the point of view of transmission and underlying source dialect. In many
ways the dhāraṇīs epitomize a central theme of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra; they are meant
to be carefully memorized and repeated (or written) exactly as transmitted - their ritual efficacy
depends on nothing less than complete accuracy. Due to the importance of memorization and
exact duplication repeated on almost every page of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, we may
assume that the transmission of the dhāraṇīs into Ch - through transliteration - received
especial care from Kumārajīva’s translation team. In fact, as the study will show, that is indeed
the case.

This study involves the use of transcriptional data and reconstructions of the phonetic structure
of Early Middle Chinese (EMC), based on Karlgren’s and Pulleyblank’s work. Many scholars

1393 Daniel Boucher, “Gāndhārī and the early Chinese Buddhist translations reconsidered: the case of
the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra,” Journal of the American Oriental Society, 118, no.4 (1998), 501-503 (for
the above quotes). For a recent study of Chinese translation practice, see M. Deeg, “Creating religious
terminology - A comparative approach to early Chinese Buddhist translations,” Journal of the
International Association of Buddhist Studies, 31 Number 1-2 (2008), 83-118.
have questioned the validity of this approach; Zürcher omits the use of transcribed names and
Buddhist technical terms from his study on “Late Han Vernacular Elements in the Earliest
Buddhist translations,” noting that their value is greatly reduced by a whole range of “obscuring factors” including 1) our ignorance of the source language, 2) distortion due to pronunciation by foreign missionaries, 3) the imperfect way the Ch scribes may have perceived the sounds, 4) the differences in S and Ch phonology which make correlation of sounds problematic and 5) primitive early translation attempts which were later subsequently refined.1394 This last objection
does not apply to Kumārajīva who had the benefit of two centuries of previous translators’
experience. He was also well aware of all the phonological issues involved, as his translation of
the arapacana syllabary from the Dazhidu lun shows (Appendix One); although there is
certainly no exact one-to-one correspondence between Indic and Ch languages, Kumārajīva
was aware of the ambiguities and developed means of dealing with them, as will be
demonstrated below. As for the source language(s), in the last thirty years there have been a
lot of advances in our understanding or the underlying Pkt s, as I have outlined above. This is
not to fully answer Zürcher’s objections - especially points 2) and 3) which are intractable;
however, that we can and do know quite a bit about EMC phonology is manifest in the works of
Karlgren, Pulleyblank and Coblin, and if we use the data judiciously as Coblin recommends,1395
using it to corroborate what we already do know from other sources (as Zürcher recommends),
– i.e. the phonological changes between Pkt and S, - then the results can be very revealing.

1394 E. Zürcher, “Late Han Vernacular Elements in the Earliest Buddhist Translation,” Journal of the
Chinese Language Teacher’s Association, 12.2 (1977), 179.
1395 W. South Coblin, A Handbook of Eastern Han Sound Gloses (Hong Kong: The Chinese University
A Note on Dhāranīs

The dhāranīs were chosen as a subject for this study because of their uniqueness i.e. they were not inherited from a previous translation, as Kumārajīva was the first to transcribe them and their importance within the context of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīksūtra as a whole. Their uniqueness reveals an authentic snapshot of the nature of Kumārajīva’s source document in early fifth century China and the nature of Sanskrit-Chinese transcription practices at that time; their importance suggests that the Kumārajīva and his translation team took extra special care in their rendering, to preserve their ritual efficacy.

The word dhāraṇī comes from the S root ṣḍhṛ (“hold, bear, preserve, keep”); a closely cognate word is dhāraṇā which means “memory” or “retaining.” It is “first and foremost the memorizing of the teachings of all the Buddhas.” The Tibetans render the word gzungs (“that which holds”) and the Ch 總持, zōng chī (“always holding”) or transliterate it 陀羅尼 tuó luó ní (PB: da-la-nri). The Saddharmapuṇḍarīksūtra opens and ends with statements of bodhisattvas who had “attained the dhāranīs,” and in addition the word 陀羅尼, tuó luó ní, occurs in Chapter 12 (the daughter of the dragon king Sāgara has “gained dhāraṇī”); Chapter 14 (“Hearing the

---


1397 See footnote 1349. dhāraṇīpratilabdha, K&N 211-12.

1398 Hurvitz, 183. dhāraṇīpratilabdha K&N 263-5.
dhāraṇī, he is delighted, / Then performs offerings, / Gains dhāraṇī...“);¹³⁹⁹ Chapter 18 (The man who listens to the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra “shall be able to be born in the same place as dhāraṇī-(pratilabha)bodhisattvas”);¹⁴⁰⁰ Chapter 23 (where the Bodhisattva Seen with Joy by all Living Beings declares “I have already contrived to understand the dhāraṇī of the speech of all living beings”);¹⁴⁰¹ Chapter 24 (“incalculable bodhisattvas also attained this samādhi and dhāraṇī”);¹⁴⁰² the dhāraṇī chapter itself, Chapter 26;¹⁴⁰³ and the final Chapter 28 which introduces the names of three dhāraṇīs (“Turning dhāraṇī, a dhāraṇī that can accommodate a million plus uses, and the dhāraṇī of skill-in-use of dharma sounds”).¹⁴⁰⁴ The contexts are all consistent with this meaning of memory and retention. Plus the dhāraṇī-like phrase 受持 (“to receive and keep”) occurs approx. 73 times throughout Kumārajīva’s Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra; memory is clearly a central theme of the sūtra.

Although the theme of dhāraṇīs = memory is explicit in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, the dhāraṇīs of Chapters 26 and 28 are primarily prophylactic and apotropaic in nature. Over time

¹³⁹⁹ Hurvitz, ibid, 204. so ca prahṛṣṭo bhavati śrūṇītvā prāmodyajātaśca karoti pūjām / supine ca so dhāraṇī prāpuṇoti K&N 291⁷-⁸.
¹⁴⁰⁰ Ibid 239. sa sattvastena protsāhena kuśalamūlenābhisamākṛtena dhāraṇiḥpratilabhdhairbodhisattvaiḥ sārdhāṃ samavadhānaṃ pratilabhate, K&N 350¹⁴-⁵.
¹⁴⁰¹ Ibid 271. sarvarutakauśalyadhāraṇī pratilabdhā, K&N 409⁴-⁵, also mentioned in K&N 42113: sarvarutakauśalyānugatāyā dhāraṇyāḥ pratilambho ‘bhūt.
¹⁴⁰² Ibid 282. gaṇanāsamatikṛṣṭānāṃ bodhisattvānāṃ mahāsattvānāṃ yeṣāṃ sarvarūpeśānāṃ samadheḥ pratilambho ‘bhūt, K&N 435¹³-¹⁵. Note that although Hurvitz translates "samādhi and dhāraṇī," there is no mention of dhāraṇī in the Sanskrit; however it is in the Chinese: T09n0262_p0056b19: 亦得是三味及陀羅尼, Yì dé shì sānmèi jí tuóluóní, "also obtained this samādhi and dhāraṇī."
¹⁴⁰³ Ibid 295-298.
several additional layers of meaning are associated with the word, leading to Hurvitz’s translation of the term as “magic charms” and Edgerton’s sole definition of dhāraṇīs as “magic formula.” Indeed the tendency to define the word functionally is evident from medieval times; in his commentary on Chapter 26, Tiantai master Zhiyi (538-597) defines dhāraṇīs in terms of 1) curing disease, 2) protection from evil and controlling demons 3) erasing bad karma, and 4) non-referentiality, i.e. one does not have to know what the words mean in order for the dhāraṇī to work. This predilection to limit the meaning of dhāraṇīs to “magic charms” has led one noted East Asian scholar to call it “surely one of the most misunderstood terms in the Buddhist lexicon.” In the last few decades a significant amount of scholarship has appeared which has concentrated on exploring the full breadth of meaning of the term, including works by Jens Braarvig, Richard McBride, Paul Copp and Ronald M. Davidson. While the first three scholars approach the discussion through the multiple connotations of the Ch word 持 (to grasp, keep, hold), Davidson argues for an even broader definition centred on the words “code/coding,” as vehicles for 1) memory (the dharma, past lives, mindfulness), 2) for

1405 Hurvitz, 3.
1406 Edgerton, BHSD, 284, s.v. dhāraṇī.
1407 釋陀羅尼品, Shi tuóluóní pīn, in 妙法蓮華經文句, Miàofǎ Liánhuájīng wénjù, T34n1718_p0146b29-146c26.
the sonic power of mantras for worldly or soteriological goals, 3) for the storage and communication of scriptures, 4) for addressing the deep structure of reality and 5) for ritual efficacy. All these levels of meaning are present in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, although the dhāraṇīs of Chapter 26 & 28 are primarily designed for ritual, protective purposes.

Linguistic Structure

The main body of this chapter is a discussion of the linguistic structure of all the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra’s dhāraṇīs. In what follows I list the S texts in the three traditions, grouping the Nepalese and Tib together in column #1 with all variants shown in brackets; here I also include Tib as separate items (marked “Tib”), but only when it differs from one of the Nepalese manuscripts, as is sometimes the case. Column #2 contains the Gilgit manuscripts. Column #3 is the Central Asian manuscripts, some of which are shown in K&N and Dutt and all of which are shown in Tsukamoto’s “Notes.” Column #4 shows

---

1411 Some of these variants are found in Kern & Nanjio, Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra; all are shown in Keishō Tsukamoko, “Hokekyō Daraniju no Oboegaki, Notes of Dhāraṇī-mantrapadas in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīka,” Hokke-Bunka Kenkyū, 4 (1978): 1-35. The various manuscripts in the Nepalese tradition are listed and described in Tsukamoto, Sanskrit Manuscripts. See footnote 1351.
1412 Taken from Watanabe, Gilgit Manuscripts.
1413 Op. cit. supra footnote 1411. These are, except for the Lushun Museum fragment, also available in Hirofumi Toda, Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, Central Asian Manuscripts, Romanized Text (Tokushima: Kyoiku Shuppan Center, 1981) and in Karashima’s Glossary which contains Lushun, (see footnote 1415). The Central Asian facsimile manuscripts are available in Institute for the Comprehensive Study of Lotus Sutra, Sanskrit Manuscripts of Saddharmapuṇḍarīka, Collected from Nepal, Kashmir and Central Asia, volume 11, 12 (Tokyo: Publishing Association of Saddharmapundarika Manuscripts, 1977) and the Kashgar manuscript in a facsimile edition in Lokesh Chandra, Saddharma-Pundarika-Sutra, Kashgar
Kumārajīva’s Ch translation taken from the Taishō, with variants shown in square brackets. The Ch characters are transcribed in modern pinyin, and further transcribed phonetically, as they sounded in Middle Chinese using PB or KG. Column #5 is a reconstruction of the source document text which Kumārajīva used, based on his transliteration. Column #6 is the meaning of the word, where known (or conjectured) and column #7 is a note on whether the word from the source document is S or Prakritic in origin, together with any short notes that might be applicable. Longer notes follow the relevant entries. Where an entry is blank, it is missing in the appropriate document. While the dhāraṇīs of the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra have been transliterated four times, the earliest is Kumārajīva’s. Dharmarakṣa translated the dhāraṇīs in his 正法華經, Zhèngfǎhuájīng (286 CE), but this is not a transcription. Jñānagupta and Dharmagupta also transliterated them in their translation 添品妙法蓮華經 Tiānpǐn Miàofā Liánhuájīng (601 CE); both of these are reviewed occasionally when they might be helpful in clarifying Kumārajīva’s practice and/or intention. In addition to these, there are three other transcriptions made by Jñānagupta, Xuanzang and Amoghavajra (early 7th to 8th centuries) which I have not referred to.

A Note on Vowel Notation

\footnotesize

Manuscript (New Delhi: International Academy of Indian Culture, 1976), which contains Bechert’s Foreward (footnote 1363).

\footnote[1414]{Takakusu Junjirō, Watanabe Kaigyoku and Ono Gemmyō, Taishō shinshū daizōkyō (Taibei: Xinwenfeng chuban gongsi, 1924-34; repr., 1974). With assistance electronically from CBETA.}

\footnote[1415]{These may be found in Seishi Karashima, A glossary of Kumārajīva’s translation of the Lotus sutra (Tokyo: The International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University, 2001), 380-392.}
The transliterations are not consistent with respect to vowel notation. Sometimes the EMC phonetic sound which PB transcribes as [i] is used to represent S/Pkt final -e and sometimes -i. The phonetic sound [ε] is used for S/Pkt -e-, -a- and -i-. I assume these variations reflect dialectical variations, idiosyncracies, allophones, etc. prevalent at the time the translations were done, which I have not tried to unravel. For derivational purposes, the consonants are much more important than the final vowel, which tends to be very variable in the dialects. Also, since long vowels were not notated in G and even Brāhmī, and Ch does not maintain the difference between long and short vowels, reconstruction of vowel length differences must be considered tentative at best. When I transcribe with long vowels in the source document, it is usually based on S parallels (e.g. Pkt nāḷi < S nāḍī) or accent/sandhi rules (e.g. Pkt kauśalyānugada < S kauśalya-anugata or S śamita-avi = śamitāvi).

_Dhāraṇī#1 spoken by Bhaiṣajyarājo 藥王(Yàowáng)_

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nepalese-Tibetan1418</th>
<th>Gilgit</th>
<th>Central Asian</th>
<th>Kumārajīva</th>
<th>Source Document</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Pkt or S &amp; Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>anye (atyē)</em></td>
<td><em>anye</em></td>
<td>安爾 ān ēr</td>
<td><em>anye</em> or</td>
<td><em>anye or</em> a(n)ñe1419</td>
<td>&quot;other(s)&quot;</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(PB: ?an-niē/)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1416 See for example the different endings in the nom. sing. in G which can be either -e, -a, -o or -u, per Brough §75, 76. The Sh RE’s show -a, -o and -e (Hultzsch, _Inscriptions_, xc). In GDhp §21, Brough notes that in G, -e in final position regularly appears as either -e, or -i. See also Fussman, "Gāndhārī," page 459, which notes "l’equivalence phonétique en finale de -e, -o et -a." See discussion below.

1417 Brough, GDhp., §20; K. R. Norman, "Buddhism and Writing," _A Philological Approach to Buddhism, The Bukkyo Dendo Kyokai Lectures 1994_ (Lancaster, 2006), 107. “In the earliest form of the Brāhmī script, double consonants were not written, and the marks for long vowels were frequently omitted.”

1418 Tibetan is only noted when it is different than the Nepalese recension which it generally mirrors.
In the Pkts, a glide following a nasal is assimilated (-ny- > -n̄-);\textsuperscript{1420} however the sound is virtually identical, so one can not be sure what word was in the source document. All forms ending in -e may be construed as an eastern Pkt nom. sing.\textsuperscript{1421} It may also be northwestern as there are lots of examples in nom. sing -e in the Shāḥbāzgarhī (Sh) and Mānsehrā (M) Ašokan rock edicts\textsuperscript{1422} and in the Niya dialect the original nom. ending was probably in -e, although it later changed to -o.\textsuperscript{1423} The word anye could also be nom. plural in S, P and other Pkts. While the meaning and syntax (if any) of these words and phrases is highly speculative, Tsukamoto\textsuperscript{1424} seems to interpret the -e forms as voc. sg. fem. which is possible for some words which are feminine (anye, “inexhaustible”; manyā, “nape of the neck”), but not for nouns like citta (masc.) or kṣaya (masc.), nor for words like carita that appear to modify them. These

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
\textit{anye} (\textit{mannē, mane}) & manye & 曼爾 màn ěr (PB: muanh niā’niī) & manye or ma(ŋ)ñe & “I think” & either (GDhp 283-c, mañath); DGan., mane. \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{1419} The brackets a(c)chaye simply indicate that the double consonants were often not notated in G or early Brāhmī. See previous footnote.
\textsuperscript{1420} Pischel §282; GDhp 260 aṅa < S anya; P aṅna < S anya; AMg anṇa < S anya.
\textsuperscript{1421} Lüders, Beobachtungen, page 10 and §1-11
\textsuperscript{1422} E. Hultzsch, Inscriptions of Asoka xc. For instance, jane in Sh Rock Edict (RE) 10 A \textit{vivade} in RE 6 F; devanapriye in RE 10, A, etc. Capital letters refer to location reference used by Hultzsch. See also Brough, GDhp., §76. See also Dschi, “Umwandlung,” 143, quoting Konow, who associates the –e dialect with the Mānsehrā dialects and the Niya Pkt.
\textsuperscript{1423} T. Burrow, The Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents, §53. The Niya documents represent the administrative language of Shan-Shan (north-west China) in the third century CE (page v, Introduction).
\textsuperscript{1424} Tsukamoto, “Notes,” page 4 & following.
would have to be loc. sing. or nom. sing. if stemming from an eastern Pkt. The verb *manye* ("I think," first person sing. of */man/)) is a much more logical meaning than "Oh! nape of the neck," voc. fem. sing (< S *manyā*, "nape of the neck"). In the translations that follow, I treat the -e endings as nom. sing. unless otherwise stated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>arau</th>
<th>mane (mane, mene, ane, amane)</th>
<th>mamane (nemane)</th>
<th>citte (citta)</th>
<th>carite (calite; Tib cirate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>parau (marau)</td>
<td>mane</td>
<td>mane</td>
<td>mamane</td>
<td>cire (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mo ni (PB: ma-nej')</td>
<td>mo mo ni (PB: ma-ma-nej')</td>
<td>mo ni (PB: ma-nej')</td>
<td>zhǐ lì (PB: tɕi'li' tɕi'-lej')</td>
<td>zhē[lì] li' di (PB: tɕia-[lì]li'-dej')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>?</td>
<td>mamane</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>cire (?)</td>
<td>caride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>either</td>
<td>either</td>
<td>&quot;long&quot;</td>
<td>&quot;behaviour&quot;</td>
<td>Pkt -t-&gt; -d-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The change of -t-> -d- seems to be the first unequivocal evidence that we are dealing with a source document which is (in part at least) in a Pkt form. Voicing of intervocalic consonants is a standard feature in G\textsuperscript{1426} and Pulleyblank notes that intervocalic -t- is "quite consistently" rendered by Ch -d- in the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra dhāraṇīs*.\textsuperscript{1427} We will see several other

\textsuperscript{1425} Nom. sing. (eastern Pkt nom. ending in -e); long -ā- not written in G. Could also be derived from *manas* (P *mano*, AMg *maṇa*, "mind") or *manā* ("zeal, devotion") in voc. sing. as per Tsukamoto, "Notes," 4.

\textsuperscript{1426} Brough GDhp §33.

\textsuperscript{1427} Pulleyblank "Stages," 86-88.
examples of this feature below, where the source document has Pkt forms and the extant Indo-Aryan (IA) reflexes have S words, like *idime* for S *itime*, *mādaṅgī* for *mātaṅgī*, *daṇḍavadi* for *daṇḍapati*, etc. The word *citte* is a puzzle as it appears to be representing a source word *cīle* (= *cīre*, “long?”). The character 隴 is always used to represent an -l- sound or a vocalic -r- or consonantal -r- by Kumārajīva, but here it may be a translation rather than a transliteration (*旨隴* = lit. “control one’s intention”). Jñānagupta & Dharmagupta have 質祇 *zhi dī* (PB: tɕit-tej = *citte*).

| same          | āme          | 除咿 *shē miē* (PB: čia-me)¹⁴²⁸ | āme (sources) *samitāvi* (samayitāriśānte, sameyitābhi,) | ōme (sources) *samitāvi* (samayitāriśānte, sameyitābhi,) | 除履多甥 *shē lū duō wēi* (PB: čia-li- tu-wuj’/jwei)¹⁴³⁰ | *samitāvi* | “puzzle” = *samitāvi* is a puzzle as it appears to be representing a source word *cīle* (= *cīre*, “long?”). The character 隴 is always used to represent an -l- sound or a vocalic -r- or consonantal -r- by Kumārajīva, but here it may be a translation rather than a transliteration (*旨隴* = lit. “control one’s intention”). Jñānagupta & Dharmagupta have 質祇 *zhi dī* (PB: tɕit-tej = *citte*). |  |
|---------------|--------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| *same*        | āme          | 除咿 *shē miē* (PB: čia-me)¹⁴²⁸ | āme (sources) *samitāvi* (samayitāriśānte, sameyitābhi,) | ōme (sources) *samitāvi* (samayitāriśānte, sameyitābhi,) | 除履多甥 *shē lū duō wēi* (PB: čia-li- tu-wuj’/jwei)¹⁴³⁰ | *samitāvi* | “puzzle” = *samitāvi* is a puzzle as it appears to be representing a source word *cīle* (= *cīre*, “long?”). The character 隴 is always used to represent an -l- sound or a vocalic -r- or consonantal -r- by Kumārajīva, but here it may be a translation rather than a transliteration (*旨隴* = lit. “control one’s intention”). Jñānagupta & Dharmagupta have 質祇 *zhi dī* (PB: tɕit-tej = *citte*). |

---

¹⁴²⁸ The character 隴 is not in Pulleyblank or Karlgren. It is also not in the *Guāngyùn shēngxi* (廣韻聲系), Song rhyming dictionary: http://ctext.org/library.pl?if=en&res=77357&by_title=%E5%BB%A3%E9%9F%BB. Accessed May 2013.
śameyitāvi, śameyitābhi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>śānte (sante)</th>
<th>śānte (śantai)</th>
<th>shānte</th>
<th>“peace”</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Dharmarakṣa translates these three words (same śamitāvi śānte) as 奉修寂然 fèng xiū jìrán, “Esteem & cultivate quiescence;” the word 奉 (“esteem, revere, respect”) is perhaps a translation for S śalita (“praised”). This would be the normal transliteration of 趙履多 shē lǚ duō (PB : cia-li-ta) i.e. with 履 representing the sound -li- as per PB and KG. In S&H\textsuperscript{1432} we find words like 體毘履 tipilū, (PB tʰiʃj-bji-l(r)i), S sthavira, “elder”, or 摩怛履迦 módālǚjiā (PB: ma-tat-li-kia), S māṭrkā, "summary, condensed statement of contents” where 履 = -r/-r- and 臂卑 履也 bibēilūyē, (PB pjiajk-pji/pjiš-li-jia’), pipiilikā, "ant" where it represents an -l-. How 履 came to represent the -m- sound is a mystery. Pulleyblank is also puzzled and suggests that it represents an “old reading of the character that has gone unrecorded in the dictionaries.”\textsuperscript{1433} In


\textsuperscript{1431} The compound  śamita-āvi.

\textsuperscript{1429} In all the S texts (K&N, W&T, Vaidya and Dutt) the word division is after -tāː i.e., samitā viśānte; other variants in the Nepalese-Tibetan tradition include samitā viśānte; samite viśānte;

\textsuperscript{1432} Edward Soothill and Lewis Hodous, A Dictionary of Chinese Buddhist Terms (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co, 1937). Abbreviation: S&H. This is also the sound (lǐ) given in the Guangyun.

\textsuperscript{1433} Pulleyblank “Stages in the transcription,” 100; see footnote 1347. The character is used for S syllables mi, me and vi as well as the normal ri and di. See also Coblin, Handbook, 155, # 43 where 履 is transcribed as lji from the 白虎通義 Baihu tongyi paranomastic glosses (first century CE).
Jñānagupta’s and Dharmagupta’s re-do of the *sūtra* two centuries later they transliterate *śamitāvī* as 撮寐多鼻 (PB: *siap-mi*<sup>3</sup>-*ta-bi*<sup>3</sup>), where there is no mistaking that the second syllable begins with *m*-.

Note also for this section of the *dhāraṇī* that all four versions of the S texts transliterate *śamitā viśānte* which is probably incorrect, as there is no such word as *visānte* in Pkt or S while there is such a compound as *śamita-āvi*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mukte</th>
<th>mukte</th>
<th>目帝 <em>mü di</em> (PB: muwk-<em>tej</em>&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;)</th>
<th>mukte</th>
<th>“liberated”</th>
<th>S (GDhp 92, 122 = <em>muto</em> for <em>mukta</em>). P = <em>mutta</em></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>muktatame</td>
<td>muktatame</td>
<td>目多履 <em>mü duō lū</em> (PB: muwk-<em>ta-mi</em>)</td>
<td>muktame</td>
<td>“most liberated.”</td>
<td>? but probably S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(muktataye)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>same</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>瞄履 <em>suō lū</em> (PB: sa-mi)</td>
<td>same</td>
<td>“constant”</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>avīṣame</td>
<td>avīṣame</td>
<td>阿瑋娑履 <em>ā wěi suō lū</em> (PB: <em>ʔa-wuj</em>-sa-mi)</td>
<td>avīsane</td>
<td>“equal”</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(asașame, Tib)</td>
<td>(asamasame)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>samasame</td>
<td>samasame</td>
<td>桑履娑履 <em>sāng lū suō lū</em> (PB: <em>saŋ-mi</em>-sa-mi)</td>
<td>samasame</td>
<td>“completely unequalled” 1434</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(asamasame)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1434 Alternately (instead of *sam-asame*) this may be parsed as a distributive repetition (*sama-same*) with a meaning of “equal in every way.”
The word *akṣaye* occurs later in the *dhāraṇī* where Kumārajīva transliterates it as 惡叉邏 è chā luó (PB: ʔak-tʂʰai/tʂʰɛː-la= aḵṣara), i.e., he captures the -ḵṣ- conjunct perfectly, as -k- is an allowed final in EMC. Why did he not do it here? With *kṣaye* and *akṣaye* he transcribes with a retroflex affricate sound ʈʂʰai- and with *aḵṣine* he uses a velar stop with a glide -gji-. G used the symbol ɬ to represent S-ḵṣ- and it had the value of a retroflex unaspirated fricative (ʈʂ or aspirate ʈʂ’)\(^{1436}\) which is how Kumārajīva transcribed it, i.e. with a sound usu. represented by

---

\(^{1435}\) It would be noted -kṣ- in G and -ch- in other Pkts. See discussion.

\(^{1436}\) For a full discussion see H. W. Bailey, "Gāndhārī," 770-75. See also Brough *GDhp.*, §16. Most Pkts used the notation -c(ch)- or -k(kh)- to represent S -kṣ- (brackets indicate that the doubled consonants were often not shown in Pkt). See also Dschi, "Umwandlung," 143, who makes the same point, that S kṣa changed in the west and northwest to cha and was represented in Ch by tscha. See footnote 1545 for further references. In G, -c(ch)- could also apparently be mistaken for a palatal fricative as in GDhp 12-b which has sötria ("learned in the Veda") paralleling Dhp 294-b and PDhp 47-b khattiye ("warrior..."
-\(c\)ch- in MI (as in chudām Gir, Rock Edict 9 < S kṣudra, “small, trifling;” or P which has both khaṇa and chaṇa as derived forms of S kṣaṇa “moment”). This is also the sound (发出 tʂʰai/ tʂʰɛ:) which Kumārajīva uses in his arapacana syllabary to represent S -kṣ-.\(^{1437}\) This suggests his source document was in G. The S word aksine was not transcribed as a retroflex fricative but as a voiced aspirated stop, pronounced and/or written aghiṇe in the source document - we have examples of this in P where -kṣ- > -\(c\)ch-, -(j)jh- as well as -(g)gh-. For example S kṣāyati > P jhāyati and ghāyati (“it is consumed”). khīṇa is the normal P reflex of S kṣīṇa, but jhīṇa also existed as a form, and possibly ghīṇa which is the same sound with [-back] > [+back].\(^{1438}\) It appears that the conjunct kṣ- could be pronounced several ways in Kumārajīva's time, according to its dialectical origin. As the language of Buddhism became more and more Sanskritized - by Xuanzang's time, for example in the seventh century when the language was almost wholly Sanskritized - the conjunct was always captured by a two character sound; but the fact that Kumārajīva sometimes transcribes it with a retroflex fricative alone, and sometimes with a stop followed by a fricative suggests that he was making a deliberate distinction according to his understanding of the word and its pronunciation.\(^{1439}\)

---

 caste” < S kṣatriya}; here the western ch- sound (= kṣ-) has apparently been heard or interpreted as a ś-sound.

\(^{1437}\) Taisho, Volume 25, Sūtra 1509 (大智度論, Dàzhì dù lùn), 0408c17. Here he uses the same word as an example: 叉耶 Chā yé (PB: tʂʰai/tʂʰɛ:-jia) < S kṣaya


\(^{1439}\) For transliteration of -kṣ by Xuanzang, see Shu-Fen Chen, "On Xuanzang's Transliterated Version Of The Sanskrit Prajñāpāramitāhṛdayasūtra (Heart Sutra)," Monumenta Serica, 123 (caḵṣṭḥ), 144 (lakṣaṇa), and 146 (kṣayo). The DDB and PB (p. 47) give the character 剹, shā (PB: tʂʰ a it/tʂʰɛ.t) as the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>śānte (śānte, sānta)</th>
<th>śānte</th>
<th>“peace”</th>
<th>either</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>samite (śamite, śamiti, samite, śami, sami, sanī; Tib śamito)</td>
<td>śame</td>
<td>“effort”</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhāraṇī (dhāraṇi)</td>
<td>dhāraṇī</td>
<td>“dhāraṇī”</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ālokabhāse (ālokābhase, ālokābhāse, ālokabhāsa, ālokāvabhāse)</td>
<td>āloka-bhaṣa</td>
<td>ālogabhāsa</td>
<td>“light of splendour” or “light and splendour.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

transcription character for S kṣa(t), 52 (2004), and 阿剎羅, ā shā luó (PB: ?a-tʃʰait/tʃʰːt-la) is an additional transcription possibility for akṣara, but one which Kumārajīva did not use, as there was evidently no standard for him to follow.

1440 Dharmarākṣa takes this as 觀察光耀, guānchá guāngyào, “observe the splendour” which is also possible.

1441 Hultzsch, Inscriptions 117; Bloch, Inscriptions, 141. Jauagaḍa is located in eastern India in Kalinga. Another instance of -k- > -g- occurs in a Ch translation of the Dhp 97 compound akataññū (“knowing the
\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
pratyavekṣaṇi, & apratyavekṣaṇi & \textit{pratyavekṣaye} & pratyavekṣaṇi & \textit{pratyavekṣaṇi} or \textit{pratyavekṣane}; (\textit{pratyav} \textit{vekṣaṇi}) \end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{p{4cm}|p{4cm}|p{4cm}|p{4cm}|p{4cm}|}
\hline
pratyavekṣaṇi & apratyavekṣaṇi & \textit{zhè pí chā nǐ} & \textit{bō} & \textit{inspecting, looking at} & Pkt
\hline
pratyavekṣaṇe; (\textit{pratyav} \textit{vekṣaṇi}) & \textit{pratyavekṣane}; (\textit{pratyav} \textit{vekṣaṇi}) & \textit{bji-tʰai/tʃʰeː-ni} & \textit{pac(c)a-vekṣaṇi} or \textit{pac(c)a-ve(c)chāṇi} & \textit{inspecting, looking at} & Pkt
\hline
\hline
\end{tabular}

\begin{tabular}{p{4cm}|p{4cm}|p{4cm}|p{4cm}|p{4cm}|p{4cm}|}
\hline
\textit{nidhiru nipibhi}, & \textit{viviru nipibhi}, & \textit{niviṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{niviṣṭe} & \textit{penetrated} & Pkt
\hline
\textit{nivita}, \textit{nipuru}, & \textit{niviṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{penetrated} & Pkt
\hline
\textit{nivīḍa}, \textit{viviru}, & \textit{niviṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{penetrated} & Pkt
\hline
\textit{nidhirucirciru}, & \textit{niviṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{penetrated} & Pkt
\hline
\textit{nidhiruviniciru}, & \textit{niviṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{penetrated} & Pkt
\hline
\textit{niniru}, & \textit{niviṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{penetrated} & Pkt
\hline
\textit{niniruviciru}, & \textit{niviṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{penetrated} & Pkt
\hline
\textit{ninirupiciru}, & \textit{niviṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{penetrated} & Pkt
\hline
\textit{nidhibhi} & \textit{niviṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{**rdiṣṭe} \textit{ni qie ti} & \textit{penetrated} & Pkt
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textit{pratyavekṣaṇi}

The -\textit{kṣ-} conjunct in \textit{pratyavekṣaṇi} is treated the same as in \textit{akṣaya} above, using a retroflex sibilant to express the sound. The -\textit{ty-} had become palatalized and changed to -\textit{cc-} as also uncreated") which is translated in the Ch version of the \textit{Abhidharma-jñāna-prasthāna-śāstra} as 不往知 (\textit{bù wǎng zhī}, "not knowing what is gone" or perhaps "knowing the not-gone," i.e. the dominion of death), indicating that the Ch redactor had the Pkt form \textit{agata-} in front of him/her, rather than \textit{akata-}. See Minoru Hara. "A Note on Dhammapada 97," \textit{Indo-Iranian Journal}, 35 (1992), 185.
occurred in P (pa(c)cavekkhana) and Gāndhāri and other Pkt's.\textsuperscript{1442} Although P and all the other Pkt's lost the \textit{-r-} in \textit{pr-}, Gāndhāri kept it (e.g. S \textit{pratyaya} > \textit{G. prace'ā} in GDhp 88-b), and in the NW Aśokan edicts of Sh and M it was sometimes retained and sometimes assimilated. Two and a half centuries later, when Sanskritization was much more prevalent, this conjunct was regularly represented by two characters, e.g. in Xuanzang's transliterated version of the \textit{Prajñāpāramitāḥṛdayasūtra}, where the \textit{pr-} in \textit{prajñā} is represented by two characters, one for \textit{p-} and one for \textit{-r-}, 鈥_CTX 朗 bō luó é rāng (PB: pat-la-ŋa-ŋiaŋ).\textsuperscript{1443}

\textit{nidhiru}

Pkt (attested in Mylius, \textit{Wörterbuch}, 332) has \textit{nivīṭthe}; the Central Asian MS has \textit{niviṣṭe}. Final EMC \textit{-s} had disappeared by this time in the north of China,\textsuperscript{1444} so it is unclear whether Kumārajīva could have captured it with the tools at his disposal, although presumably he could have inserted a character starting with an \textit{s-} to capture the sibilant sound. It does however look like Kumārajīva had a Prakritic source document based on other evidence. The large number of variant forms of the S word \textit{nidhiru} shows that there was a lot of confusion on this form, which

\textsuperscript{1442} See Pischel §280 and Coblin, \textit{Handbook}, 35: "It therefore seems safe to conclude that earlier dentals followed by \textit{y} had become palatalized in the underlying language(s) of the BTD texts." BTD= Buddhist Transcription Dialect(s).


\textsuperscript{1444} Pulleyblank, "Stages," 87.
may be attributable in part to the alteration of -dh- > < -v- which is not uncommon in Pkt.

Norman lists several examples of this in one of Buddhism’s oldest texts, the 《Sutta Nipāta》 and it is also present in the Mahāyāna texts. The S letter -r- cannot be pronounced by the Ch and is automatically changed to an -l- sound which also might further mutate to a retroflex t or d in the Pkt, although the change from -t- > -d- > -l- is far more common. The sounds -dra- and -la- are very similar and apparently were confused, judging by the many variants, nivita, niviḍa, etc.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>abhyantaraniviṣṭe</th>
<th>abhyantaraniviṣṭe</th>
<th>abhyantara</th>
<th>abhyantara</th>
<th>&quot;inside penetrated&quot;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(abhyantaraniviṭhe, abhyantaraniviṣṭhe, abhyantaraniviṣṭa, amyantaraniviṣṭe, abhyantaraniviṣṭa, abhyantaraniviṣṭa, abhyantaraniviṣṭa)</td>
<td>abhyantaraniviṣṭe</td>
<td>abhyantara</td>
<td>abhyantara</td>
<td>&quot;inside penetrated&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>阿便哆邏禰履剃 ā biàn</td>
<td>duō luó ni lǔ ti (PB: ?aj-bjianh-ta-laⁿ- nj'̄-li'- l^hj'̄)</td>
<td>1447</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1445 K. R. Norman, Group of Discourses page 157. vīra/dhīra, vaṃkam/dhamkam, avibhū/adhibhū, etc.
This also occurs in the Vimalakīrtisūtra, where in Chapter 9, 56a1, page 92, the manuscript reads avodigbhāga, and it has been changed in critical edition to adhodigbhāga. See Study Group on Buddhist Sanskrit Literature, Vimalakīrtinirdeśa, A Sanskrit Edition Based upon the Manuscript Newly Found at the Potala Palace (Tokyo: The Institute for Comprehensive Studies of Buddhism, Taisho University, Taisho University Press, 2006).

1446 Pischel, Grammar, § 238, 240. In the Aṣokan edicts, for example we find S ḍuli written as duṇḍi (“turtle”) in Pillar Edict 5 B (Allāhābād-Kosam) and S mahilā written as mahīḍā (“woman”) in Gir RE 9 C. For other examples see Bryan Levman, "Aṣokan Phonology and the Language of the Earliest Buddhist Tradition," Canadian Journal of Buddhist Studies, Number 6 (2010), 66.

1447 The character 嘙 is not found in PB or KG. The 反切 spelling given in the Taisho is 多可 or 都餓 which I transliterate as “ta” as both 多 and 都 have the EMC phonetic value of “ta” or “to.” However,
Hurvitz transcribes the second word in this compound as *niviṣṭe*, same as the immediately preceding *niviṣṭa*, but it is not clear why Kumārajīva spells it differently this time, using 履 (usually signifying the sound /li/, but also used for /vi/ and others) for the second syllable where before he used 履 (-bjī;- i.e. nεj'-vi'-tʰεjʰ vs nεj'-bjī-tʰεjʰ). It certainly suggests a difference in the source text spelling, which is not immediately apparent. Jñānagupta & Dharmagupta transcribe 傌鼻瑟? (nεj'-bjih-śit) which seems to be an attempt at transcribing *niviṣṭa*.

Coblin, *Handbook*, identifies this character as a retroflex -ḍ- reconstructing EMC phonetic value "ḍje" (page 164, #210), based on Xu Shen's work (2nd century CE) in the 說文解字, *Shuōwén Jiězì*, an early Han dynasty Chinese dictionary. If indeed the sound is voiced, this would be further evidence of a Prakritic influence (which tends to voiceless intervocalic consonants). In his later "Compendium," Coblin gives ㄆ as *Qieyun* tā (page 119, sub entry 0001).

---

1448 See footnote 1433.

1449 The character 傌 is neither in PB or KG; Coblin, "Compendium," p. 219 entry 0307a, gives it a *Qieyun* value of /nĩ/ and an ONWC value of *nii*. It is in Kumārajīva's syllabary for *sta*; see Appendix one, page 707.
There are two traditions here, *abhyantarapāriśuddhi* ("complete purification inside") and *atyantapāriśuddhi* ("perfect purification"). Kumārajīva has followed the second one. Coblin’s comment\(^{1450}\) that dentals followed by a -\(y\)- were palatalized is not true in this instance, where the -\(y\)- has simply dropped off. It is clear that Kumārajīva could have represented the -\(ty\)- conjunct if he wished as -\(t\)- was a permitted final and he had characters like 閼延 (PB: ?at, jian-), but did not use them. In G -\(ty\)- usually changes to a -\(c\)- (*kṛtya* > *kica* in GDhp 48), but also sometimes the -\(y\)- is just dropped as in this instance (e.g. GDhp 263 *maṇuṣa* < S *mānuṣya*, or the future tense in G which regularly changes the -\(sy\)- > -\(s\)- as in GDhp 301 *payeṣidi*, "he will collect"). This also happens in other Pkts, for example, in AMg. where Skt *pratyeka* > *patteya*.\(^{1451}\) This also occurs in the Aśokan edicts, e.g. Rock Edict 5 B in Gir (Gir) and Shāḥbāzgarhī (Sh) where S *kalyāṇa* > Gir *kalāṇassa* and Sh *kalaṇasa*.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pāraśuddhe,</th>
<th>a-tan'-ta-</th>
<th>mutkule</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pariśuddhe, Tib atyantapāriśuddhi, atyantabheriśuddhi)</td>
<td>pa- lejँ-cuँ-</td>
<td>(utkūle, utkule, ukkule, utkūla?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{1450}\) See footnote 1442.

\(^{1451}\) Pischel, *Grammar*, §280.
If the *m*- in the anlaut of the first *mutkule* is taken as the accus. sing. of the previous word *pāriśuddhim*, then the *utkule mutkule* phrase would agree with the Ch and the Tib (which has *utkule mutkule*). The Ch version accords with the Gilgit manuscript (and some of the Nepalese) which preserve the older non-Sanskritized form (the Pkt -*kk*-), which was later Sanskritized to -*tk*-. The final -*ut* was permitted in EMC and Kumārajīva had access to logographs like 芈(PB: *mut*-) which suggests that he did not have this in his source document. The meaning is not clear; *utkula* means “an outcaste” whereas *uktūla* means “sloping up, high” and long syllables were not notated in G. *mukkule* could simply be a euphonic -*m*-, often introduced in the Pkts as a substitute for *sandhi*, i.e. *ukkula ukkule* would be the normal connection between two nouns,
one of which ended in -e and the second beginning in another vowel (u-), but with the loss of sandhi rules this could become ukkule-mukkule.\textsuperscript{1452}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>vavatisambhave</th>
<th>araḍe (arate, asaḍe; Tib araṭe)</th>
<th>araḍe</th>
<th>阿羅隷 ā luō li (PB: ?a-la-lêj\textsuperscript{h})</th>
<th>arałe</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Pkt -ḍ- &gt; -l-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>araḍe</td>
<td>paraḍe (parate; Tib paraṭe, maraṭe)</td>
<td>paraḍe</td>
<td>波羅隷 bō luo li (PB: pa-la-lêj\textsuperscript{h})</td>
<td>parałe</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pkt -ḍ- &gt; -l-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A common change from S to Pkt is -ḍ- > -l-\textsuperscript{1453} and we may be fairly certain that this is what has happened here as Kumārajīva had specified the character 茶 as the transliteration for ḍa in his translation of the arapacana syllabary,\textsuperscript{1454} which character he could have used if his source document had araḍe or paraḍe, as in the S. But he uses 隷(lī) instead, which he only uses to represent the vocalic liquids or consonants. Change of ḍ- > -l- is very common in P\textsuperscript{1455} and also occurs in the Aśokan edicts.\textsuperscript{1456} In the language of the Niya Documents (G), the letter -ḍ- was either pronounced as a voiced retroflex fricative (= z), as an -r-, or as an -l-, in the case of loan-\textsuperscript{1452} Geiger, Pāli Grammar, §73.2
\textsuperscript{1453} Pischel, Grammar, §240. This has happened since Vedic Times. See Edgerton & Bloomfield, Vedic Variants §270.
\textsuperscript{1454} Taisho, Volume 25, Sūtra 1509 (大智度論, Dàzhì dù lùn), 0408b26. See page 706.
\textsuperscript{1455} Geiger, Pāli Grammar, §35
\textsuperscript{1456} S edaka > elakā (“ram”) in Pillar Edict 5 C.
words incorporated into Khotanese Saka,¹⁴⁵⁷ which may have been one of the languages
Kumārajīva (a Kuchean) spoke, Kucha being on the north side of the Taklamakan Desert and
Khotan on the south, presumably with constant interchange between the two caravan
destinations. The meaning of araḷe/parale is uncertain. Dharmarakṣa seems to associate it with
turning (無有迴旋, 所周旋處, wúyǒu huí xuán, suǒ zhōuxuán chǔ), but it is not clear where he
gets this derivation. Jñānagupta & Dharmagupta’s transliteration is similar to Kumārajīva:頞邏
第鉢邏第, àn luó dì bō luó dì (PB: ṭat-laʰ-dej’, pat-laʰ-dej’), preserving the -l- sound.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sukāṅkṣi (sukākṣi, sukākṣi, sukākṣe, śru-kākṣi)</th>
<th>**kākṣi</th>
<th>首迦差 shōu jiā chà (PB: ṭu-w-kia-tṣʰai/tṣʰɛːʰ)</th>
<th>&quot;swift wish&quot; or sukā/ăkṣi</th>
<th>Pkt &lt; S kaṅkṣā</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Here again Kumārajīva uses a single sound (the character 差, a retroflex fricative) to represent
the conjunct -kṣ-. It is not clear why he didn’t use the character 叉 as in aksaya above, but both
appear to be almost identical phonetically (叉 = PB: tṣʰai/tṣʰɛː; 差 = PB: tṣʰaiʰ-tṣʰɛːʰ).¹⁴⁵⁹ The
compound śukā/ăkṣi (śukā/ă(c)chē) could also come from śuka-aksi ("eye of a parrot") which

¹⁴⁵⁷ Burrow, Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents, §18.
¹⁴⁵⁸ Before a double consonant the vowel in Pkt would always be short (Geiger, Pāli Grammar, §5)
although it had the value two morae. This probably means that the form Kumārajīva had in front of him
was śukāchi, or śukacchi, but not śukācchi with both double -cch- and long -ā-. In AMg. this word
appears as -kaṁkhā (P -kankhā, both with short -a-) which shows the eastern change -kṣ- > -(k)kh-;
however other words like AMg. kaccha ("forest" < S kakṣa, show the western form -kṣ- > -(c)ch-). See
also footnote 1545.
¹⁴⁵⁹ The superscript –h indicates aspiration in the departing tone. See abbreviations.
makes no sense in this context. It is much more likely that it derives from \textit{śu-kāṅkṣā} (“swift wish), where the -\textit{nī-} was omitted in the source document, as a long, open syllable was automatically nasalized in G and the nasalization was often omitted in the written script.\footnote{Fussman, “Gāndhārī,” page 478}

Dharmarakṣa translates as 其目清净, \textit{qí mù qīng jìng} (“their eyes are pure”) taking the compound as derived from S \textit{śukra-akṣi} which is not supported by any of the versions (which would have been spelt \textit{sukkākṣi}, with a double -\textit{kk-} to account for the conjunct), although Tib (and Kern’s “K” MS) has \textit{śrukākṣi}, which might point to \textit{śukra-akṣi} (“pure eye”) by metathesis (\textit{śruka-akṣi}).

\begin{tabular}{|l|l|l|l|l|}
\hline
 & \textit{yogakṣeme} & & & \\
\hline
\textit{asamasame} & \textit{asamasame} & 阿三[摩]磨三\newline\textit{履 ā sān}\newline\textit{[mō]mō sān}\newline\textit{lū} (PB: ?a-
\textit{sam}[ma]ma-
\textit{sam-mi} & \textit{asamasame} & “equal to the unequalled”\footnote{So translated by Dharmarakṣa 等無所等, \textit{děng wú suǒ děng}.} & Pkt or S \\
\hline
\textit{buddhavilokite} & \textit{buddhavilokite} & 佛[陀]驮毘吉\newline\textit{利裘帝 fó}\newline\textit{[tuó]tuó pí jìlì}\newline\textit{zhī dì} (PB: but-[da]da-
\textit{bji-kjt-li̯̊?-} & \textit{buddhavikīṣṭe} & “Buddha destroyed” & Pkt or S \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
The character 袋 (zhī) is not found in PB or KG. Hurvitz transliterates as buddhavikliṣṭe, and analogous characters with the same radical (製) suggest a ʨiaŋh pronunciation which would almost fit (although a palatal sibilant instead of a retroflex one); however the meaning does not seem apt for a dhāraṇī, unless we are to take this in a Chan sense, i.e. positively (but of course this would be an anachronism). The clear S meaning (buddhavilokite, “Buddha seen”) is more appropriate. Dharmarakṣa renders 覺已越度, jué yǐ yuè dù, “awakening to transcendence” so it is not clear what he was translating, but certainly not vikliṣṭe. Jñānagupta & Dharmagupta have 勃地鼻盧吉, bó di bí lú jì? (PB: bêt-diⁿ-bjiⁿ-lo-kjit-) transcribing bodhi-vilokite (“enlightenment seen”). The compound buddhavikliṣṭe could have either a Pkt or S source, as Gāndhāri probably preserved the -ṣṭ- conjunct. In the Aśokan edicts the conjunct -ṣṭ- is preserved in Gir (e.g. tīṣṭamto, sesṭe in RE 4 F ).

---

1462 This is the closest character I could find to what is shown in the Taishō, notated as [羊*(句-口+瓦)]. However this character is missing the 句-口, and I don’t know what the phonetic value might be (or the pinyin).

1463 Brough, GDhp §60. There is some confusion on this point. In the GDhp words like S śreṣṭha, drṣṭa are transcribed as ʂetha, dĩtha, although Brough thinks they should be transcribed šeṣṭa, diṣṭa with the conjunct preserved. The problem is the Kharoṣṭhi letter ʈha which Brough has transcribed as -ṭha- but probably represents -ṣṭa-. See discussion in section §18. Burrow, however, says that in the Niya Documents -ṣṭ- is assimilated to -ṭh- (Language of the Kāroṣṭhi Documents, 20), and Richard Salomon treats it in this fashion as well in Gāndhāri Rhinoceros Sūtra, 88.

1464 The capital letter refers to the section marking in Hultzsch, Inscriptions, where the citation can be found.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dharmaparikṣite (dharmaparikṣite)</th>
<th>dharma-parikṣite</th>
<th>速[摩]差波利差帝 dá [mo]mó bò lì chā dì (PB: dat- mo/ma-pa-li-tɕʰai/tɕʰa-tɕʰ). Note P dharma vs. S dharma.1465</th>
<th>dharmaparikṣite or dhammapari(c)chite</th>
<th>&quot;the dharma investigated&quot;</th>
<th>Pkt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>samghanirghoṣani (saṅghanirghosani, samghanighasani, samghanighasani, samghanisamghani, saṃghaniḥsaṃghasani)</td>
<td>samghanir-ghoṣani</td>
<td><strong>ghanir-ghātani</strong> 僧伽涅瞿沙 sēn gjiā niè qū shā nī (PB: saṃ-gia-net-gua- săi/še:-nej')</td>
<td>samghanirghoṣani</td>
<td>&quot;The sound of the assembly;&quot; &quot;the silence of the assembly.&quot;1466</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nirghoṇi (nirghoṇi, nirghoṣani)</td>
<td>nirghoṣani</td>
<td>saṃghani</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1465 Per Coblin 1983, 248, no. 173 曇摩 tán mo (PB: dam/dam-ma) was the eastern Han transcription of dharma, which Kumārajīva inherited.

1466 Translated by Dharmarākṣa as [令]合眾無音, [Líng]hézhōng wúyīn “the silence of the Saṅgha”
The ks- conjunct in S dharmaparīkte is rendered as a single retroflex fricative (差) as in the previous compound śukā/ā(çı). It appears that saṃghanirghoṣaṇi was in the source document, as Kumārajīva has taken pains to translate the actual -rgha- conjunct, using an EMC character with final -t. This is a standard method of indicating an -r- as he does below with sarva and other common words (e.g. 蔬婆, PB sat-ba < S sarva), so presumably he had a source text with the conjunct -rgh- which indicates a S or Sanskritized text. The word nirghoṣaṇi can either mean “noisy” or “without noise” (< S nirghoṣa, “noisy” or “silent.”).

However as the consonant -r- > Ǿ in most PktS (but not always in G), \(^{1467}\) this compound could also have a Pkt source. Note that the word saṃgha occurs without change in some PktS (e.g. P sarīgha, AMg. saṃgha, Aśokan Minor Rock Edict I, D, samghe), and in GDhp as sağa, where, per Brough, the letter -ǵ- represents the sound of -ng-. \(^{1468}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>bhayābhayaviśodhani</th>
<th>bhayābhaya-</th>
<th>bhāsyābhāsyā</th>
<th>bhāsyābhāsyā</th>
<th>“pure speaking”?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>bhayābhayaviśodhani</td>
<td>viśodhani</td>
<td>śuddhi;</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhayābhayadhanī,</td>
<td></td>
<td>śodhanī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bhayaśodhani, Tib</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(PB: pa-ći’a-)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1467}\) See discussion below in dhāraṇī#6, s.v. saṃghanirghātani, page 620.

\(^{1468}\) With a macron also over the ǵ (which does not show up on the program I am using). See GDhp v. 102 and Brough §8.

\(^{1469}\) Karashima Textual Study, 360. He transliterates as EMC bwā-śja-bwā-śja-śju di
The Ch spells out a word closest to the Central Asian manuscript; however the character 舍 is usually used by Kumārajīva to represent the palatal ś, not the retroflex ʂ as Karashima suggests (e.g. in the mantra of chapter 28 where 舍 represents the palatal -ś- in *daṇḍakuśale*).

This would give us "bhaśyābhaśyaśodhi" which doesn't make sense; it is probably just an alternate form as we find both bhaśadi, bhaśati and bhaṣadi used in G. Dharmagupta transliterate跋耶跋夜輸達泥, ｂá yé bá yè shū dá ní (PB: bat-jia-bat-jaḥ-cue-dat-nē) KG: puā-ja- puā-ja-...) which seems to transliterate bhaya. Dharmarakṣa has "What one states is very clear; be contented." The -ṣy- or -ṣy- conjunct suggests that this part of the source document was written in S, as all the Pktś would show -ṣy- > -ʃ/s- assimilation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mantra (mantra)</th>
<th>mantra; manitre</th>
<th>曼哆邏 màn duō luó (PB:muana-&lt;ta-la) P manta</th>
<th>mantra</th>
<th>&quot;mystical verse, sacred formula&quot;</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

This is the first time that Kumārajīva has used what Xuanzang was later to name 二合音, erhé yīn or “two combined sounds” to represent a conjunct consonant. This might also be the addition of an epenthetic vowel (i.e. *mantara*) which is quite common in the eastern Pktś (e.g. 1470 See DG, s.v. bhaṣadi (British Library Kharoṣṭhī Fragment), bhaṣati (Niya tablet) and bhaṣadi (GDhp 114, 201, 202).

1471 T09n0263_p0130a18-19, 所說[鮮]解明而懷止足, suǒ shuō [xiān] jiě míng ér huái zhī zú.
Pkt ariya < S ārya, “noble”; Pkt radaṇa < S ratna, “jewel”), however the MI word *mantara or *mandara (= German Mandarin)\textsuperscript{1472} is not attested. Since there is a Pkt form of this word (P = manta), we can assume that Kumārajīva was at pains to capture the full three consonant conjunct which presumably he had before him.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
mantrākṣayate & mantrākṣaye & mantrākṣayate & चाययताए & Skt \hline
(mañtrākṣaye, mantrākṣaye, mantrākṣare; Tib mantrakṣayate) & mantrakṣayā & चाययताए & mantrākṣayata or मन्त्रत्राए & (mantra) Pkt (-kṣa-yata) \hline
\end{tabular}

The Ch compound clearly ends in -ta, not -te like most of the S versions and is “correct S” for “mantras” (voc. pl.) “rule!” (2\textsuperscript{nd} pers. pl. imperative). Dharmarakṣa has 盡除節限, jìn chú jié xiàn, which Karashima correlates with this section and translates as “one clears away segments and limits completely.” He suggests that Dharmarakṣa’s source document read matra or mātra (“measure, size”) and -nt- > -t- in the Prakritic form that Dharmarakṣa had before him.\textsuperscript{1473} This

\textsuperscript{1472} Manfred Mayrhofer, KEWA, 578. The word Indara for Indra appears in the Mitanni-Hittite treaty, c. 1350 BCE, in Norman, “Dialect variations,” 1; also in Collected Papers 7, 1, but this is probably due to the cuneiform writing system.

\textsuperscript{1473} Karashima, Textual Study, 236-37.
seems unlikely as nasals before stops are usually retained in Pkt, and the word *matra* occurs in the GDhp 17, 164, representing both its masculine (*mātra*) and feminine (*mātrā*) forms. The Pkt for *mantra* would be closer to the P *manta*. Dharmarakṣa seems to be saying that the use of mantras “eliminates limitations,” paraphrasing *mantrākṣayata* in terms of the result, which is typical of his translation approach to this *dhāraṇī*. The second word in the compound (*-kṣayata*) is treated the same as *kṣaye* above, using the retroflex fricative for the S conjunct which is the sound it has in G and other Pkts. Jñānagupta & Dharmagupta translate 曼怛邏憩夜, *màn dá luó qì yè* (PB: muanʰ-tat-la-kʰia⁵-jia⁵) which sounds like an alternate Pkt form (*-kkhaya or -khyaya*) for *-kṣaya*, found in P and AMg., where *kṣ-* > *(k)kh-*.

| route (uta, ta) | route | route | [卸]郵樓哆 | uruta | ? | either |
|-----------------|-------|-------| [xiè]jóu lóu duō (PB: [ziaʰ]wuw-lew-ta) |
| rutekauśalye | rutekauśalye | rudakauśalyā | [卸]郵樓[多]哆 | urutakauśalya | ? | S |
| (rutakauśalya, krutakauśilye; Tib rutakauśale) | (mahāruta-kauśalye) | 僧舍略 [xiè]jóu lóu [duō]duō jiāo shē lüè (PB: [ziaʰ]wuw-lew-) |
While *rute* and *rute kauśalya* have a clear meaning (“sound” and “sound and well-being”), the addition of the prefix *u*- is a puzzle, not present in any of the non-Ch reflexes. It might be a Pkt form of *ava*-, but *avaruta* is not attested either. Notice that the Central Asian reflex has a voiced intervocalic *-d-*, while all the other forms, including the Ch have a voiceless dental (if indeed *duō* represents such, which is not clear).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>akṣaye</th>
<th>akṣaya</th>
<th>akṣaye</th>
<th>akṣara</th>
<th>“imperishable” or “syllable”</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>〈akṣaše, akṣaya〉</td>
<td>〈akṣaše, akṣaya〉</td>
<td>〈akṣaše, akṣaya 〈luó (PB: ak-tɕʰai/tɕʰɛː:-l) 〉</td>
<td>〈akṣaše, akṣaya 〈luó (PB: ak-tɕʰai/tɕʰɛː:-l) 〉</td>
<td>〈akṣaše, akṣaya 〈luó (PB: ak-tɕʰai/tɕʰɛː:-l) 〉</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Again Kumārajīva’s transliteration stands apart from the S reflexes, all of which have a different word, which has the same sense (“undecaying”) as one of the meanings of *akṣara*. We have seen above that Kumārajīva transcribed *akṣaye* as 阿叉裔, ā chā yì (PB: ?a- tʃʰai/tʃʰɛː:-jiai), omitting the *-k-* in the conjunct and treating it as one retroflex fricative sound; yet here he chooses to treat it as a conjunct, so it seems self-evident that he is trying to spell out the S

---

1475 See von Hinüber, *Das ältere Mittelindisch*, §139. The character 阿 may simply represent a strong initial *r*- per Prof. Max Deeg (private communication).
1476 See footnote 1447.
1477 Karashima *Textual Study*, 360 transliterates as EMC ?āk tʃha lā (*akṣara*)
word akṣara. The Pkt form of this word is akkhara (P and AMg.), and there was probably a form *acchara, although not attested (as AMg. accha < S akṣa, “eye” is attested).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>akṣayavanatāye (akṣayavanatāya, akṣayavanatāyā, akṣayevatāyaiva; Tib akṣavartāyā, akṣavartānatāya, akṣavarhāyā)</th>
<th>akṣayavanatāya (akṣavanatāya)</th>
<th>**tāya 贰叉冶多冶 è</th>
<th>akṣayatāya</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>S</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>akṣayavanatāya</td>
<td>(akṣavanatāya)</td>
<td>chā yě duō yě (PB: ?ak- tʂʰai/ tʂʰɛ: -ja'i'-ja'i')</td>
<td>akṣayatāya</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All the S reflexes repeat the first word (akṣaye-) in the next compound (i.e. akṣaye akṣayavanatāye); however Kumārajīva changes akṣara to akṣaya (akṣayataya or akṣayatāya), while still preserving the dual consonants in the S -kṣ- conjunct. Hurvitz omits this word in his transliteration. The compound may be an oblique form of the Pkt akṣaya-tā ending (“condition of, state of imperishability”).

| vakkule (vakule, vakkula, vatkule, vaktula, vakkusa, valoḍa valoka, valota valoka.; Tib | | | | | |

---

1478 Hurvitz, 296.
<p>| | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>valorā)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>valōḍa (valoka, vale, valot, valota)</td>
<td>balo</td>
<td>abale</td>
<td>阿婆盧 ā pó</td>
<td>avala</td>
<td>“weak”</td>
<td>Pkt b-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>阿婆盧 ā pó</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>萊 (PB: ?a-ba-lo)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amanyanatāye</td>
<td>amanyanatāya</td>
<td>amanyanatāya</td>
<td>阿摩若([任]</td>
<td>amanyanatāya</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(amanyanatāya, amanyanatāyā, amanyanatāyai, amanyatāye, amanyatāya, amanyavanatāye, amanyavanatāyai)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svāha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hurvitz transcribed 阿婆盧 as avaru with a footnote saying that the S has nothing to correspond to this, but he was unaware of the Central Asian version, which the Ch matches, with the normal change Pkt of -b- > -ν-. Dharmarakṣa has something similar: 永無力勢 Yōng wúlì shì, “one forever lacks strength.” The last compound amanyanatāya recapitulates the beginning (anye manye) in terms of sonic echo, if not in meaning. The member of the compound -nata, appears to be the past participle of नम (“to bow”), i.e. nata, in the dative case, which is often used as an infinitive form; if one takes manya- as S “appearing as, thinking oneself to be" then

1479 Karashima Textual Study, 360 transliterates as EEMC ?ā bwā lwo (abalo)
1480 For -p-/-b- > -ν- see Pischel §199, 201; Brough GDhp §34. See note on character 婆 below under dhārāṇi# 6.
1481 Karashima Textual Study, 237.
one may construe the meaning of the compound *a-manya-natāya*, as “homage to the non-appearance [of an I],” but this is fanciful at best, although Dharmarakṣa has something similar: 無所思念。Wú suōsī niàn, “lack of thought.” Better to take it as a recapitulatory sonic echo of the *dhāraṇī* beginning (*anye manye*).

In this first *dhāraṇī* we have sixteen forms that could derive from either a Pkt or S source document, sixteen that derive from Pkt and eleven from S.

*Dharāṇī* #2, spoken by Pradānaśūro 勇施(Yǒng shī)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>jvale (jvāle)</th>
<th>jvale</th>
<th>jvale</th>
<th>[座]痤隷</th>
<th>jale or jvale</th>
<th>“flame”</th>
<th>Pkt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>[zuò]cuó li. (PB: [dzwaⁿ]-dzwa-lejʰ)</td>
<td>mahājale or mahājvale</td>
<td>“great flame”</td>
<td>Pkt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

mahājvale (mahājvāle)  | mahājvāle | ma*'||* | 摩诃痤隷 mo hē cuó li (PB: ma-ya-dzwa-lejʰ) | mahājvale | “great flame” | Pkt |

The difficulty here is determining what sound the character 痣 represents, a single letter *j*- or a conjunct *jv*-.* The fanqie (誓螺, shì luó, PB: dziaji³-lwa) suggests a single letter pronounced “dza” which is similar to Kumārajīva’s transliteration of *ja* in the *arapacana* alphabet, i.e. 閭（= PB:
KG transliterates 座 as dz’uā. Tsukamoto suggests Kumārajīva’s transliteration = jale which is the Pkt form of this word (e.g. AMg. = jala). The character 座 (PB: dzwa) does suggest a slight labialization of the affricate dz-; however, since Jñānagupta & Dharmagupta transliterate as 涉礦犁 shè pó lǐ (PB dzip-ba-li), i.e. using two characters to capture the jv- in S, it appears that they thought Kumārajīva’s transliteration was Pkt and Sanskritized it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ukke (utke, ukte; Tib ugge)</th>
<th>ukke</th>
<th>u<strong>k</strong></th>
<th>郁枳 yù zhǐ (PB: ?uwk-tɕiâ/tɕi’; KG: juk-tɕie)</th>
<th>ukše</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tukke (bhukke, tukte, gukke)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mukke (mukaye)</td>
<td>mukke</td>
<td></td>
<td>目枳 mùzhǐ (PB: muwk-tɕiâ/tɕi’)</td>
<td>mukše</td>
<td>?mukta</td>
<td>“liberated”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is a puzzle. As Brough points out, “the regular correspondence of the three Indian [i.e. G] sibilants with the Ch is striking,” yet here we have a palatal -š- with a velar k- which never happens in S or any of the Pkts that I am aware (although in the Aṣokan edicts, the Kālsī rock edicts use the sibilants ʃ and ș where they are “phonetically and etymologically impossible.”)¹⁴⁸⁴

¹⁴⁸² Taisho, Volume 25, Sūtra 1509 (大智度論, Dàzhì dù lùn), 0408c10.
¹⁴⁸³ Tsukamoto, “Notes,” 19. For AMg, see Mylius, Wörterbuch, 286.
¹⁴⁸⁴ Hultzsch, Inscriptions, lxxii. Could mukše represent a Tocharian influence (Kumārajīva’s native language), where velars > palatals before i, or e. (Adams, Tocharian, 40-43)? muk-ke > muk-še? I thank Prof. Alexei Kochetov for this suggestion.
This of course might be a simple interchange of -ś- for -ṣ-, but Kumārajīva has not shown any “sloppiness” in transliterating before. If he was trying to capture a kṣ sound in the source dialect, why didn’t he use the character 叉(PB: tʂʰai/tʂʰɛ:) which he used in kṣaye and akṣaye above? Karashima suggests a derivation of ukke from S ulkā (“a meteor, fire-brand, torch”). The rendition by Jñānagupta & Dharmagupta is clearly Pkt 郁雞目雞, yù jī mù jī (PB: ʔuwk-kɛj muwk-kɛj) with a possible derivation < S mukta/mukti. A possible explanation for Kumārajīva is that he was transcribing from a Pkt where (m)ukta was pronounced (m)uk ə or (m)ukza (i.e. as a fricative, as is the case in G), which sound he tried to capture with this character(枳).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ade (atrā, ata, adā)</th>
<th>aṭe</th>
<th>阿隷 ā li (PB: ?a-la-jei)</th>
<th>aḷe</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Pkt -d- &gt; -l-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>adāvati (Tib: aṭavati, atāvati)</td>
<td>aṭāvati</td>
<td>阿羅婆第 ā luó pó di (PB: ʔa-la-ba-dej)</td>
<td>ṛavade</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pkt d- &gt; -l- -t- &gt; -d-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See discussion under arāde parade above. The meaning is not clear. Tsukamoto suggests three possible derivations from ada (“eating”), ādi (“beginning”) and from the root vāt (“wander about”), but none of these are convincing, because of lack of context. Dharmarakṣa’s “translation” of this section appears to be 順來[當]富章 shǔn lái[dāng] fù zhāng, whose

---

1486 See Brough, GDhp, §43a.
1487 Karashima, *Textual Study*, 360, transliterates as EMC ʔa-leyi which he suggests represents *aṭe or *aḷe < ade.
1488 Karashima ibid, 360 transliterates as EMC ʔa-là-bwâ-die, representing *alâvadi or *alâvadi.
meaning is unclear to me ("Follow, come and accept the chapter")? Karashima correlates 順來 ("one comes obediently") with ṛḍe < Skt ṭa ("to wander about") and 鈴章 ("a piece of writing about wealth") with ṛḍavati < Skt āḍhya-pāda, but the derivation of the latter is questionable.\(^{1490}\)

| nṛtye (nṛtye, nṛtya, nṛtyo; Tib ṭṛye) | nṛṭte | nṛte | 湛隦[剔]第 niè li [tījīdi] (PB: nēt-lej[h]-[lēj[h] ]-dej) | nṛde | “dance” | mixture |
| nṛṭṭavati (nṛṭavati, nityāvati, nityāvati, nityavati, nrdyāvati, tīḷavati; Tib trṭyavati) | nṛṭṭavati | nṛṭāva** | 湛隦多婆第 niè li duò pó di (PB: nēt- lej[h]-ta-po-dej) | nṛtavade | “characterized by dancing” | mixture |

While the preservation of the vocalic -r- indicates a S derivation (as none of the Pkts kept the vocalic -r-), the voicing of the voiceless dental, -t- > -d- in -vade is a definite Pkt feature.

Dharmarakṣa translates as 悅喜欣然, yuèxǐxīn rán ("happy, joyful"), which seems like a gloss on nṛde in its meaning "dance" (< S nṛṭta).

\(^{1490}\) Karashima, ibid, 237.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>itti (itti)</th>
<th>itti</th>
<th>yi (PB: ʔji-dri-ni)</th>
<th>itti</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>probably Pkt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>viṭṭini (viṭṭini; Tib viṭṭ)</td>
<td>viṭṭini</td>
<td>wei yi (ni)ni (PB: wuj-dri-ni)</td>
<td>viṭṭini</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>probably Pkt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ciṭṭini (ciṭṭini, niṭṭini)</td>
<td>ciṭṭini (bhīṭṭini, viṭṭāni)</td>
<td>zhī yi (ni)ni (PB: tāi-dri-no)</td>
<td>ciṭṭini</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>probably Pkt</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The double retroflex -ṭṭ(h)- is a common Pkt form derived from S -ṣṭ(h)- which is how Karashima derives it;\textsuperscript{1492} there are, however lots of native S words with the double retroflex consonants (e.g. paṭṭa = “cloth”; kuṭṭa = “breaking, bruising,” etc.), so the evidence is not conclusive as to the source dialect. The meaning, as interpreted by Dharmarakṣa is 住此, 立制永作, Zhù cǐ. lì zhì yǒng (zhù)zuò (“remains here, establishes, rules, and always acts.”), who also takes the words as derived from S āṭhā.\textsuperscript{1493}

\textsuperscript{1491} Neither of the characters 拆 or 梁 are in PB or KG so I have used the fanqie (女氏反) for the transliteration. Per the Guangyun, its sound is nǐ.

\textsuperscript{1492} See Pischel §303-4. Karashima, Textual Study, 237, derives -ṣṭ- > -ṭṭ- > -ṭṭ-.

\textsuperscript{1493} Karashima, Textual Study, 237.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>( nṛtyani ) (( nṛtyini,) n( ṛ)ti, n( ṛ)ti, ( nṛtye, nṛti, nṛṭṭini, nṛṭṭi, nṛṭṭir,) n( ṛṭ)ir, n( ṛṭ)iri, n( ṛṭ)i, n( ṛṭ)i, ku( ṛṭ)i)</th>
<th>( nṛti)</th>
<th>( nṛti)</th>
<th>( nṛti)</th>
<th>( nṛt)i</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>Pkt -( t)- &gt; -t- or (-t)( t)-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( nṛtyāvati ) (( nṛtyavati,) v( ṛtyaviti,) t( ṛtyāvati, ku( ṛti))</td>
<td>( nṛttyāvati )</td>
<td>( nṛtyāvati )</td>
<td>( nṛtyāvati )</td>
<td>( nṛt)i( v)ate</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pkt ( t)- &gt; -t- or (-t)( t)-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svāha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The “dri” sound is used by Kumārajīva for the retroflex -\( ṭ\)-,\(^\text{1494}\) as was the case with the previous entry (伊緻柅= ٳ\( t\)\( t\)). The last word 涅隷墀婆底婆底 (\( nṛṭṭi\)\( v\)ate) differs from the previous treatment 涅隷多婆第 (\( nṛt\)avade) by only two characters, 多= ta and 第= \( d\)\( j\)h, suggesting that Kumārajīva’s source had a change here, as we have noted, although Hurvitz transcribes them the same.\(^\text{1495}\) The vocalic -\( ṭ\)-, as mentioned above, points to a S original, but von Hinüber suggests this is a Sanskritization.\(^\text{1496}\) The meaning seems to be related to S \( \sqrt{\text{nṛt}} \) (“to dance”), however Dharmarakṣa translates 無合無集, \( wú hé wú jí \) (“no unification, no gathering”).

\(^\text{1494}\) The character 畳 may also designate a retroflex -\( ṭ\)- but I have been unable to find another example where Kumārajīva uses it for such; in his \( \text{arapacana} \) syllabary he uses 荐(PB: \( d\)\( o\)) for retroflex -\( ṭ\)- and 吴 (PB: \( t\)\( r\)\( i\)\( t\)/tr\( e\)::) for retroflex -\( t\)\

\(^\text{1495}\) Hurvitz, 296.

\(^\text{1496}\) Quoted in Pulleyblank “Stages in the transcription,” 101. “…they should be derived from an original text having \( naf\)-, the -\( t\)- being due to a part-Sanskritization…”
In *Dhāraṇī* #2 most of the words have a Prakritic source. Ten are Prakritic in origin (including three “probably”), two are questionable and two show elements of both Pkt and S

*Dhāraṇī* #3 by Vaiśravaṇa 毘沙門 (Pishāmēn)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>taṭṭe (bhaṭṭe, bhaṭṭa, taṭṭe)</td>
<td>vāṭṭe</td>
<td>那[利或犁]梨 nā [li]lī (PB: na'-li/lih)</td>
<td>nāle</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pkt -ṭ- &gt; -ḷ-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vanaṭṭe (nanaṭṭe, tunaṭṭe, tunaṭṭo, vanaṭṭe, vanatta, naṭṭe; Tib tanaṭṭe)</td>
<td>nunaṭṭe (kunaṭṭe)</td>
<td>阿那盧 ā nā lū (PB: ?a-na'-lo)1498</td>
<td>analo</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pkt -ḍ- &gt; -ḷ-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1497 The first character has no digital equivalent; it consists of 少 on top of 免. It is not in PB or KG, but Coblin, "Compendium" has it (p. 264, sub entry 0472) and he transliterates it as “probable Qieyun nēu,” and ONWC *nou. He notes that it is fairly common in ONWC texts.
All the above words show a change from retroflex dental to a retroflex -ḍ- which is typical of the Pkts, so one may assume the S forms have been Sanskritized at a later date and Kumārajīva’s source document represents an earlier iteration with the Pkt -ḍ-. This change also occurs in G where, in the language of the Karoṣṭhi documents, -ṭ- and -ḍ- become -ḍ- (a spirant or fricative); Brough represents this sound as [ʂ] or [z] or as -r- which the Ch translators would have heard as -r-. This dhāraṇī is translated cryptically by Dharmarakṣa as

\[\text{svāha}\]

---

1468 Karashima, *Textual Study*, 1992, 238 < *analo* or *analo* EMC ʔā-nā-lwo = Dharmarakṣa 無量 wú liàng (“measureless”)

1499 Karashima, *Textual Study*, 360, transliterates as ʔā lji…nā lji: kju nā lji; he also reconstructs an original -ḍ- sound: *ale...nali kunalī* or *ale...nali kunali.*


1501 Burrow, *The Language of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents*, §18. At present in the North-West intervocalic ḍ is represented by ɾ which may have been the ancient pronunciation (which the Ch would have heard as ʃ). Also, in loan words from Khotan, the ʃ or ʤ usually appear with ī.

1502 Brough, GDhp, §42, 42a, 42b.
“wealth is tamed, game is without game, without measure (is) without wealth, - how (can there be) wealth?” 1503 All six words in dhāraṇī in point to a Pkt source document.

Dhāraṇī#4 by Virūḍhaka 持國天王(Chí guó tiānwáng)

| agañe (Tib agano) | agañe | agañe | 阿伽橾 ā jia mì (PB: ?a-gia-nēj’) | agañe | “without a multitude” | either |
| gane (gana; Tib gano) | gane | gane | 伽橾 jia mì (PB: gia-nēj’) | gane | “flock, troop, multitude” | either |
| gauri (gori) | ghorī | gori (ghori) | 瞿利 qū lì (PB: guō-lī) | gori | “shining, brilliant” (< S gaura) or “frightful, awful” (< S ghora) | either; Pkt -au- > -o- |
| gandhāri | gāndhāri; gāndhāri | 乾陀利 gān tuó lì (PB: kan-da-lī) | kan-dhāri | name of a people < S gāndhāri | Pkt -g- > -k- |

1503T09n0263_p0130b09. 富有調戲無戲，無量無富何富, Fùyǒu tiáoxì wú xì, wúliàng wú fù hé fù. Karashima, Textual Study, 238, translates “One richly has (Ridicule. No ridicule)…No riches. What is richness?” However this does not seem to be a sentence, but simply a group of words mirroring the dhāraṇī. I thank Prof. Max Deeg for the suggested translation above.
Both PB and KG transliterate 乾 with a voiceless velar stop k-, suggesting kandhāri in the source document, or at least an interpretation of the initial g- as voiceless. This may be due to the fact that the Kuchean language (Kumārajīva’s native language) “ignored the difference between voiced and voiceless consonants,” but this fact is inconsistent with the fairly consistent practice of changing voiceless stops > voiced stops as noted above. Although Brough mentions that the -nd- conjunct usually changes to -nn- (written -n-, as in S vindati > G vinadi), in the Aśokan inscriptions we also find -ndh- > -dh- and also retained, as in the Northwestern Rock Edicts: RE 5 J Mānsehrā has gadharana and Shāhbāzgarhī has gaṃdharanaṃ for the name of the Gandharan peoples. In the Pktś in general a nasal before a stop is usually retained, but in the language of the Kharoṣṭhi documents, loss or assimilation of the nasal before a stop is sporadic, as in the case of the Aśokan edicts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>candaļi</th>
<th>candaļi</th>
<th>candaļi</th>
<th>(梅)旃陀利</th>
<th>candaļi</th>
<th>proper name</th>
<th>either</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(candaři; Tib</td>
<td>candaļi</td>
<td>candaļi</td>
<td>(zhan)zhān tuó</td>
<td>candaļi</td>
<td>proper name</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>candaļi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>li (PB: tɕiān-da-li)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1504 Pelliot, “Les noms propres,” 402, footnote 1, and Burrow, Language of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents, viii, who says the same thing about the language of the Niya Documents (i.e., Krorainic, “it was devoid of voiced stops”). Shan Shan was on the south side of the Karim basin in NW China and Kucha on the north side (within 200 kms of each other).

1505 Pischel, Grammar, §272.

1506 Burrow, Language of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents, §45. In P as well this phenomenon occurs as in abaddho (“unbound”) and abandho (idem) in Sn v. 39.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>mātaṅgi</th>
<th>mātaṅgi</th>
<th>mātaṅgi</th>
<th>摩蹬耆 mā dēng</th>
<th>mādaṅgi</th>
<th>proper name</th>
<th>Pkt -t- &gt; -d-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(mātagi; Tib mātiṅga)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>q/ (PB: ma-dēng-gji)(^{1507})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pukkasi</td>
<td>pukkasi</td>
<td>pukkase</td>
<td>omitted</td>
<td></td>
<td>“indigo plant”</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(pukkasi, pokkasi, pākkasi, puśkasi)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saṃkule</td>
<td>saṃkule</td>
<td>jā(ṃ)gu(li)(^{1508})</td>
<td>常求利 chāng qiú lì (PB: dzian-guw-li)(^{1509})</td>
<td>jānguli</td>
<td>“snake charmer”</td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(jaṅguli; Tib kule)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(vrūsala, vrūsasi, vrūsasili, vrūṇasi, vrūhi, vrūla, kuśali vrūhi, dula; Tib vrusale, vrūṣali)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{1507}\) Pulleyblank gives the phonetics of 摩蹬 as deŋ in “Stages in the transcription,” 88. The character is not in PB.

\(^{1508}\) Reconstructed by Karashima, *Textual Study*, 238.

\(^{1509}\) Karashima, ibid, 360, EMC: zjang gjēu lji-.
Although -r- is usually assimilated in the Pkts (e.g. S vrajati > P vajati), it is not always assimilated in the north-western Pkt G, nor the language of the Niya Documents,\textsuperscript{1510} so the dialect of the source document for vrusūni could be either Pkt or S.

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
sisi & agasti & 額底 è dí (PB: ?at-tʃi) & atte & either. \\
\hline
svāhā & svāhā & & & \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

Dharmarakṣa translates dhāraṇī #4 as 無數有數, 曬黒持香, 凶呪大體, 于器順述, 暴言至有。

Wúshù yǒushù, yào hēi chí xiāng, xiōng zhòu dàti, yù qì shùn shù, bào yán zhī yǒu.

(“Innumerable are the numbers. Sunshine and darkness hold perfume. A terrible curse is the main thing. By one’s abilities, arrange and tell. Cruel words. Supreme existence”). Beyond the obvious meaning correlations (無數= agaṇe, 有數 = gaṇe, 曬 = gor), the rest is obscure. Of the ten words in this dhāraṇī, all except two could be from either a Pkt or S source.

\textit{Dhāraṇī#5} by the rākṣasyaḥ 羅剎女 (Luóchà nǚ)

\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
itime 5x & itime & itime & 伊提履 yī tí lǚ (PB: ?ji-dej-li’) & idime 5x & Pkt -t- > -d- \\
\hline
nime 5x & nime & nime & 泥履 ní lǚ (PB: neʃ-li’) & nime 5x & either \\
\hline
ruhe 5x & tṛruhe & & 樓醯 lóu xī (PB: ləw-xi) & ruhe 4x & either \\
\hline
stuhe (haste) & stahe (tṛstahe) & stahe & 多醯 duō xī (PB: ta-x) & tahe 3x & Ptk. s- > Ø \\
\hline
\end{tabular}

\textsuperscript{1510} Burrow, Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents, §36. See also GDhp words like bramaṇa, praṇa, etc.
Dharmarakṣa gives various fanciful renditions of the above words which don’t correlate very well with any S or Pkt words: The itime sequence corresponds to於是於斯於爾於氏, yūshī yūsī yú ěr yú shì (“In this, in this place, in the therafter, in the clan”); the nime sequence to極甚無我無吾無身無所俱同, jí shèn wúwǒ wú wú shēn wú suǒ jù tóng (“no I, no self, no body, no object together”);已興已生已成, yǐ xìng yǐ shēng yǐ chéng (“already rising, already growing, already becoming”) perhaps correlates with ruhe (< S víruh, “to grow”); the remainder (而住而立, 亦住嗟歎, 亦非消頭, 大疾無得加害, Ér zhù érlì, yì zhù jiē tàn, yì fēi xiāo tóu, dà jí wú dé jiāhài, (“both live and stand, also to polish and praise, also not to extinguish remnants (?), not to get a severe illness, not to harm”) presumably correlates with stuhe or haste (< ṣthā, "to stand" or ṭuh, "to pain" or ṡtu, "to praise" ?) but exactly how is not clear. The voiced -d- in idime (when all the other witnesses have the voiceless -t-) suggests a Pkt source for this word and the s- > Ø in the last three forms also confirm a Pkt source, although the consonant is aspirated only in the last word. Nevertheless in the north-west Pkts the initial st- is generally preserved,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5x</th>
<th>tṛstasahe</th>
<th>εj) 3x</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>兌醯</td>
<td>dōu xī (PB: tew- xeji)</td>
<td>tuhe 1x</td>
<td>Pkt s- &gt; Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>兌醯</td>
<td>tù xī (PB: tʰɔh- xeji)</td>
<td>thuhe 1x</td>
<td>Pkt s- &gt; Ø</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1511 See footnote 1497. The character consists of 少 on top of 免 which Coblin gives the possible phonetic value ONWC *nou which, is no more explanatory than the aspirated stop value for 免(tʰɔh).
1512 Karashima, *Textual Study*, 239 derives this from nir me, “without me.”
1513 The general rule in the Pkts is that when a sibilant occurs before a stop, the sibilant is assimilated and the stop is aspirated (e.g. S stana > P thana). See Woolner, *Introduction to Prakrit*, §38.
a form like *tahe* (when all the other witnesses have *stahe*) may suggest derivation from a different Pkt. In this last *dhāraṇī* of Chapter 26 (Chapter 21 in the S), all but two of the sequences appear to have a Pkt source document.

In total for this chapter, we have the following

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dhāraṇī</th>
<th>Pkt</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>Either</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dhāraṇī* #6 by Samanatabhadra 普賢 (Pǔxián)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><em>adanḍe</em></th>
<th><em>adanḍe</em></th>
<th>阿檀地 <em>ā tán di</em> (PB: ?a –dan-dīh)</th>
<th><em>adanḍe</em></th>
<th>&quot;without a staff&quot;</th>
<th>either</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(adaṃdo, ādanḍe; Tib sudanḍe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>danḍapati</em></td>
<td><em>danḍāpati-</em></td>
<td>檀陀婆地 <em>tán tuó pó</em></td>
<td><em>danḍavadi</em></td>
<td>&quot;lord of Pkt -p-, -b-&quot;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1514 Burrow, *Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents*, §49, except in cases with the root *śthā*, which *tahe* may be. See GDhp 209 *stuka-stoka.*
Per his syllabary (Appendix One) Kumārajīva regularly uses the character 婆 for ba- and bha-initially and -va-intervocally (e.g. Sà pó, PB: sat-ba < S sarva, “all”; 火婆夜 huō pó yè PB: xwa’-ba-jiaʰ < S hvaya < ṭvhe, “to call”) and this has been his practice in the dhāranīs, e.g. 阿羅婆第 ā luó pó dì (PB: ʔa-la-ba-dej’), representing āḷāvati, above. For this group of words Dharmarakṣa has 無我除我, wūwō chú wō, “no I, removes the I” > which Karashima is suggesting be corrected > 無杖除杖, wū zhàng chú zhàng, “no staffs, removes the staffs.”1517

For daṇḍāvartani he suggests another correction 因我 yīn wǒ > 回杖, huí zhàng, “swings

| (daṇḍāpatira, adaṇḍāpatira, Tib daṇḍāpati) | vate | dī (PB: dan-da-ba-diʰ) 1515 | the staff* | > -v-, -t > -d-
| daṇḍāvartani (daṇḍāvarttani, daṇḍavartāni, daṇḍavarttani, Tib daṇḍāvartani) | daṇḍavarte daṇḍāvartani | 檜陀婆帝 tān tuō pó dī (PB: dan-da-ba-tejʰ) | daṇḍavate | “lord of the staff,” or “turning the staff” < S vāvrt, “to turn” | Pkt |

---

1515 Karashima, Textual Study, 363 transliterates as EMC ʔa-dān-di-dān-dā-bwā-di < *adaṇḍe daṇḍavadi < adande daṇḍapati.
1516 See Kumārajīva’s arapacana syllabary (Appendix One) where 婆=ba becomes -v- intervocally. For -p- /-b- > -v- see Pischel §199, 201; Brough GDhp §34 (“regular development -p-, -b- > v”)
1517 Karashima Textual Study, 246
around a staff." Jñānagupta & Dharmagupta have the same as Kumārajīva through this dhāraṇī and appear to have copied it from the latter.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sanskrit</th>
<th>translation</th>
<th>note</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>daṇḍakuśale</em> (daṇḍakuśala, daṇḍakuśalini)</td>
<td></td>
<td>either</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>daṇḍasudhāri</em></td>
<td><em>daṇḍasudhāri</em></td>
<td><em>daṇḍasudhare</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sudhāri</em></td>
<td><em>sudhāri</em></td>
<td><em>sudāre</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>sudhārapati</em> (sudhārapate, sudhāripati) sudhārimati</td>
<td><em>sudhārapati</em></td>
<td><em>sudhārapati</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>buddhapaś-yane</em> (-paśyani, -paśyana, -paśyati, paribuddha paś-</td>
<td><em>buddhapaś-yane</em></td>
<td><em>buddhapaśyane</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1518 Ibid, 246.
The conjunct -śy- is usually assimilated to -ś- in G and all the Pkts.\textsuperscript{1519} It is not clear whether the -i- in ġiān transliteration is meant to represent a glide or simply a diphthong. In the examples above (śānte = (PB : ġiānte)), it certainly does not represent a glide and KG represents it phonetically by śiān where -i- is defined as “the subordinate vowel in a diphthong.”\textsuperscript{1520} It is reasonable to assume, therefore that Kumārajīva’s source document had -paśane, not -paśyane. Jñānagupta & Dharmagupta copy Kumārajīva. Dharmarakṣa has 見諸佛, jiàn zhū Fó, “seeing all Buddhas.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dhāraṇi</th>
<th>dhāraṇi</th>
<th>sarvadhāraṇi</th>
<th>sarvadhāraṇi</th>
<th>“turning of all dhārāṇī”</th>
<th>both for sarvadhāraṇi, Pkt for āvatani</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>āvarṭani</td>
<td>āvarṭani</td>
<td>āvarṭane</td>
<td>āvarṭane</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(sarvadhāraṇi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āvarṭani,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhāraṇi</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āvarṭtani,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhāriṇam</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āvarṭtani,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dhāriṇī</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>āvarṭtani,)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1519} See GDhp 5, 106, 108, etc., paśadi < S paśyati; Burrow, Language of the Kharoṣṭhī Documents, §41.
Woolner, Prakrit, §49.

\textsuperscript{1520} Ulving, Dictionary, entry #6688 on page 340, and page 13 for definition of -i-. 
Kumārajīva and previous translators use the character 萨 to represent the sound sat- in bodhisattva (*i.e.* 菩薩), but Kumārajīva also seems to use it for the sounds sar- as in *sarva* (薩婆, sà pó, PB: sat-ba; see *arapacana* syllabary Appendix One, s.v. *sa*). Since the normal G reflex of this word is indeed *sarva* (with *sava* also used), this is probably the word in the source document and of course *-r* is not a permitted final in EMC, so he represented it this way. Later translators used three characters to capture the conjunct *-rv*-sound (*e.g.* Xuanzang's 薩囉縛 *sà luó fù* (PB. sat-la-buak *sarva*). The use of 萨 for the sound *sar*- suggests that the last word in the compound *āvatani*, did not have the *-rt-* conjunct shown in the Indic versions, as Kumārajīva does not use a character ending in *-t* (a permitted EMC final) but the character 婆 (PB: *ba* = Mi *va*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>sarvabhaśyāvartane</th>
<th>薩婆婆沙阿婆多</th>
<th>sarvabhaśāvatani</th>
<th>“turning of all language”</th>
<th>Pkt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>蕆尼 sà pó pó shā</td>
<td>a pó duō ní (PB: sat-ba-ba- şai/ şε:-ʔa-ba-ta-ni)</td>
<td>“turning of all language”</td>
<td>-şy- &gt; -ş- -rt- &gt; -t-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There are a few cases where Kumārajīva’s source document agrees with the Central Asian Manuscripts and not the S (*e.g.* *bhaśyabhaśya*- in *dhārānī*#1) This is one of them, where there is also no S reflex. Unfortunately many of the *dhārānīs* in the Central Asian Manuscripts are missing. Dharmarakṣa has 行眾諸說 *xíng zhòng zhǔ shuō*, “put these meany teachings into practice.”

---

1521 Chen, “Xuanzang,” 129.

Another example of the character 婆 = Pkt -va- intervocally. The character 叉 represents a retroflex fricative sound (not the S conjunct -k- and -ṣ- sound (-kṣ-) as discussed above in dhāraṇī#1 (s.v. akṣaye).

1523 see von Hinuber, *Das ältere Mittelindisch*, §297 and §113 indicating a variation between -u- and -aṃ- in Pkt. This is a feature of MI nasalisation.

Dharmarakṣa seems to translate these last two as “bring the assembly to an end” if we allow Karashima’s proposed emendation of 蓋迴轉 > change to 善迴轉.\textsuperscript{1525} The character 涅 (PB: nē) is used by Kumārajīva to represent a nir- or nr- sound (see samghanirghoṣani or nṛtye above in dhāranī#1), as the character 薩 (PB: sat) is used to represent a sar- sound, which probably indicates a S or Sanskritized source document. Most Pkts assimilate the -r- before a stop, but in Gāndhāri, it is more often the case that the -r- remains, so this case is ambiguous;\textsuperscript{1526} the lenition of -t- > -d-, however occurs only in Pkt.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>dharma-parīkṣite (saddharma-parīkṣite; Tib dharma-parīkṣita, dharma-parīkṣiti)</th>
<th>dharma-parīkṣite</th>
<th>saddharma-suparīkṣite</th>
<th>asamge</th>
<th>阿僧祇, ā sēng qī (PB: ʔa- sēng-gjiə /gji)</th>
<th>asamgha or asamghya</th>
<th>“without calculation”</th>
<th>Pkt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

\textsuperscript{1525} Ibid, 247.

\textsuperscript{1526} Burrow, \textit{Language of the Kharoṣṭhi Documents}, §37. See also GDhp 24-c, 254-c, 255-a, \textit{artha} < S \textit{artha} where other Pkts (e.g. P, AMg) have \textit{attha}. 
What does the character祇 represent? KG transcribes as ğiə\(^{1527}\) which suggests a -ghyi(a)-sound in Middle Indic. In G saṃkhy- appears as sagh- with the voicing of the stop, dropping of the anusvāra and of the glide (GDhp 68-c saghaʻi = S saṃkhyāya = P saṅkhāya “having examined” < S saṃ+ ũkhyā, “to reckon, calculate,” nominal form saṃkhyā, “calculation, reckoning”). So the source document word is asaṃghya which shows the Pkt change of -kh- > -gh- but appears to preserve the glide -y- after the stop which is not a feature of the Pkts.

Dharmarakṣa renders無央數, 計諸句三世數等, Wú yāng shù, ji zhū jù sān shì shù děng, “infinite numbers; calculates phrases; is equal to the number of three periods”\(^{1528}\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>samgāpagate</th>
<th>僧伽[婆]波伽地, sēng jìā [pō]bō qié di, (PB: səŋ-gia-[ba]pa-gia-di(^{3}))</th>
<th>samghāvagadi</th>
<th>“leaving the samghā”</th>
<th>Pkt - p- &gt; - v-; -t- &gt; -d-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>tṛ-adhvasamga-</td>
<td>帝繫阿惰僧伽兜略 di lì ā duò sēng jiā dōu liūê (PB: tṛ(^{3})-Iš(^{3})-ʔa-dwa'/dwa(^{h})-səŋ-gia-te w-liak)</td>
<td>tradhvasamgha-tulya</td>
<td>“equal to the samgha’s path to the stars”</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{1527}\) Ulving, Dictionary, entry #2607, page 213.

\(^{1528}\) Karashima Textual Study, 247. His notes: saṃga *samghā < Pkt saṃkhā < saṃkhyā (“numeration”) -mg-/-mgh- < -ṃkh- < -ṃkhy-
Kumārajīva deliberately preserves the vocalic -ṛ- which drops out in all Pkts. including G.

Hurvitz transcribes this word as *tiryādhasamghātulya*,¹⁵²⁹ but consonant + 隼 has been used above in *dhāraṇī*#2 to represent the sound *nr*- sound (涅隼第, *niè li di*, for *nrde*), so it is more likely he was representing the S word *ṭr*- in the Central Asian document.

| 阿羅帝[波]婆羅帝 ā luō di [bō]pó luō di (PB: ? a-la-teği–[ba]pa-la-teği) | arate parate¹⁵³⁰ | “dull” (arata); parata | “absoluteness” = paratā | either |

This seems to be an echo of the pair from *dhāraṇī*#1 (*arale paralē*), but the last character in each is different, representing a -ṭ- sound in every other transcription (e.g. 羯帝= *śānte*). Hurvitz transcribes with a retroflex *araḍe paraḍe¹⁵³¹* but Kumārajīva specified the character 荃 for -ḍ- in the syllabary (Appendix One).

| sarvasamgha 薩婆僧[+地]伽 | sat-ba [+di] sēŋ | sarvasamgha “the whole saṃghā” | either |

¹⁵²⁹ Scripture, 307.
¹⁵³⁰ Karashima, Glossary, 391, leaves out 阿羅帝 and transcribes 婆羅帝 as part of the the last compound (-prāpte); however the character 羯 is always used as a separate syllable, not as part of a conjunct in all the transcriptions above. Tsukamoto, “Notes,” 34, transcribes -pratte and has a question mark for 阿羅帝.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Particulars</th>
<th>Illustrative Transliteration</th>
<th>Sanskrit Transliteration</th>
<th>Meaning</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>samatikränte</td>
<td>sān mó dì qié</td>
<td>三摩地伽蘭地</td>
<td>“surpass”</td>
<td>Pkt -k- &gt; -g-; -t- &gt; -d-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sarvadharma-suparikṣite</td>
<td>sà pó dá [mo]mó xiū</td>
<td>薩婆達[摩]磨修</td>
<td>sarvadharma-suparikṣite or -supari(c)chite</td>
<td>Pkt 剃 =retroflex fricative like 叉 (see aksaye above; -kṣ- &gt; -(c)ch-)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The \textit{kr}-conjunct is usually dropped in Pkt (including G), but it also sometimes remains as in Sh atikrataṃ (RE 8 A).

In \textit{dhāraṇī}#6, there are eighteen items with a Pkt source, seven with either and one with a Sanskritic source. The Grand Total\textsuperscript{1533} for all the \textit{dhāraṇīs} is

\textsuperscript{1532} Representing the character [少/兔] from the Taisho (\textit{shǎo} on top of \textit{tù}).

\textsuperscript{1533} These numbers count chart entries, not words, except in cases where one word of a compound can be demonstrated to show a different derivation than another as in \textit{svavadhāraṇi āvatani} where the first
The Reconstructed Dhāraṇīs

We may now with some confidence reconstruct the source document dhāraṇīs which Kumārajīva had in front of him when he transliterated into Ch:

1) a(ñ)ñe ma(ñ)ñe mane mamane cire caride śame śamitāvi śānte, mukte muktame same avisame samasame chaye a(c)chaye a(g)ghiñe śānte śami dhārani ālogabhāsa pac(c)ave(c)chani nivi(t)te abhyantaranivi(t)te a(t)tantapārišu(d)dhi u(k)kule mu(k)kule arale parale śuka(c)chi asamasame buddhaviklište dhammapari(c)chite samghanirghoṣati bhāsyābhāṣyāśodhi mantra mantrā(c)chāyata uruta urutakauśalya aksara akṣayatāya avala amanyatāya

2) jale mahājale ukše mukše ale alavade nrde nṛtavade i(t)tiṇi vi(t)tiṇi ci(t)tiṇi nr(t)tiṇi nr(t)tiṇate

3) ale naše nunāše anaḷo nāḷi kunāḷi

karmadhāraya (descriptive compound) could derive from either S or Pkt, but the second derives from a Pkt source.
4) agaṇe gaṇe gori kandhāri caṇḍāli mādaṇgi jaṅguli vrūsuni atte

5) idime idime idime idime idime, nime nime nime nime nime, ruhe ruhe ruhe ruhe, tahe
tahe tahe tuhe thuhe

6) adaṇḍe daṇḍavati daṇḍavate daṇḍakusale daṇḍasudhāre sudhāre sudhāravate
buddhapāśane sarvadhāraṇī-āvatani sarvabhāṣāvatani su-āvatani saṃghavari(c)hani
saṃghanirghādani asaṃghya saṃghāvagadi ṛṭadhvasaṃghatulya arate parate
sarvasaṃgha samadigrandi sarvadharmasupari(c)chite sarvasatvarudakauṣalyānugada
siṃhavikriḍite.

Discussion

The numbers show that in 105 items (words and compounds) analyzed, the *dhāraṇīs* had a Pkt item in the source document in about 53% of the cases with a S one in 12% of the cases (with the remainder being either or indeterminable). The Pkt : S ratio is approx. 4.38 : 1 (57 : 13) which is higher than the ratios Karashima found in his study between agreement/disagreement with Central Asian manuscripts (2.2 for Dharmarakṣa and 2.7 for Kumārajīva). While these ratios are comparing different things, they do show that Kumārajīva’s source document had much more in common with a Pkt source document, than a S one and Karashima’s conclusions - that Kumārajīva’s translation is closer to the Central Asian manuscripts which are known to be more Prakritic in nature - point in the same direction. The high Pkt : S ratio may also indicate that the *dhāraṇīs* received especial care in their transmission in an attempt to guarantee their

\[\text{Karashima, Textual Study, 254 and 257.}\]

\[\text{For a partial list of Prakritisms in the Central Asian manuscripts, see K&N, vif; Dutt, xixf.}\]
accuracy and efficacy. Since we know that the more Prakritisms a manuscript contains, the earlier it is,\textsuperscript{1536} we may safely conclude that Kumārajīva’s source document was earlier than the manuscripts of the Nepalese and Gilgit traditions, which are almost wholly Sanskritized. Heinrich Lüders, as mentioned above (page 563), believed that the “original” text of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra “was written in a pure Prakrit dialect which was afterwards gradually put into S”\textsuperscript{1537} We have argued that an original text of the Saddharma-puṇḍarīkasūtra is unrecoverable, because of the complexity of the transmission; however, that Kumārajīva had an earlier, more Prakritic text in front of him than the surviving S witnesses, is certain.

In addition to the large number of Prakritisms discernible in Kumārajīva’s transliteration, the most striking phenomenon is the number of divergences from the existing manuscript traditions. There are several instances where there are noticeable disagreements with the Nepalese/Gilgit recensions: in dhāraṇī\#6 for example, there are several words which only correspond to the Centra Asian recension and are lacking in the Nepalese/Gilgit, i.e. sarvabhāṣāvatani, asaṃgha, saṃghāvagadi, ṭraḍhvasaṃghatulya, sarvasaṃgha, sarvadharmsuparīkṣate; there are also a number of words which correspond more closely with the Central Asian recension than the S one: su-āvatani su-āvartane ≠ saṃvartane; sarvadhāraṇī sarvadhārani ≠ dhāraṇī (dhāraṇī \#6);\textsuperscript{1538} atte agasti ≠ sisī; jaṅgali jāṃguli ≠ saṃkule (dhāraṇī\#4); avala abale ≠ valoḍa; bhāṣyābhāṣyasodhi bhāṣyabhāṣyasoddīḥrbhu ≠ bhayābhayāviśodhani; niviṣṭe niviṣṭe ≠ nīdiru (dhāraṇī\#1); however, since much of the dhāraṇīs are missing in the Central Asian

\textsuperscript{1536} This is Edgerton’s thesis mentioned above; see footnote 1360 for references.
\textsuperscript{1537} Lüders, “Miscellaneous Fragments,” 161.
\textsuperscript{1538} In these groups of three, the first word is the transliterated Ch, the second the Central Asian manuscript and the third the S from K&N.
manuscripts, it is impossible to arrive at any general conclusions on the matter, except as already stated by Karashima, that the correspondence between Kumārajīva’s translation and the Central Asian MSS is significantly higher than the correspondence with the S versions.

Divergences are manifold in almost every entry. Sometimes these are minor, with a change in only one syllable or vowel (e.g. S śame or same = Kumārajīva śami) and sometimes the words are barely recognizable (S buddha-vilokite ≠ Kumārajīva buddha-vikliṣṭe) and clearly point to different manuscript traditions. Often within the two S recensions (Nepalese and Gilgit) there are multiple versions of a word or compound (e.g. the second member of the compound abhyantaraniṣṭe in dhāraṇī#1 where we find variants -niviṣṭe, -niviṣṭa, -nirviṣṭa, -visiṣṭa, -viciṣṭa, -piviṣṭe, -praviṣṭe, -vivaṣṭe). Many of the differences between Kumārajīva and the S versions are because Kumārajīva was working with an earlier, more Prakritic version of the text, as the discussion above has tried to show.

Dharmarakṣa’s translation (vs. Kumārajīva’s transliteration) of the dhāraṇīs is a fascinating glimpse into the Indian nirukti mind at work (see footnote 599 on page 244), attempting to find meaning in the dhāraṇī sonic formulae. Sometimes this is a simple one-to-one tracking: ālogabhāsa = 觀察光耀, guānchá guāngyào, “observe the splendour” = S āloka bhāsam, or”; 等無所等, děng wú suǒ děng, "equal to the unequalled" for asamasame, idem; sometimes it seems to be a "mistranslation" based on phonologically similar words: like 其目清淨, qí mù qīng jìng “their eyes are pure,” taking the compound as derived from S śukra-akṣi, when the S suggests it is from śukāṅkṣi, "swift wish"; sometimes multiple nuances are expressed for a repeated word: as in 極甚無我無所無身俱同, jí shēn wúwǒ wú wú wú shēn wú suǒ jù tóng,
“no I, no self, no body, no object together” for the *nime, nime, nime, nime, nime* sequence of *dhāraṇī*#5, perhaps related to *S nir me*; and sometimes the explanation seems to be invented to explain what, on the surface appears to unexplainable: as in most of the explanations to *dhāraṇī*#4 above. In Zhiyi’s commentary on the *dhāraṇī* chapter he says that it is not necessary to understand the meaning of a *dhāraṇī* in order for it to work; but since it is the “secret word of the Buddhas” (*是諸佛密語*, *shì zhū fó mìyǔ*),\(^{1539}\) exegetes must have felt compelled to delve into the significance of the sonic formulae, and indeed most of them do have an Ol/MI phonotactical structure which suggests a meaningful derivation. Nevertheless without the contextual “semantic walking stick” a translation of the *dhāraṇīs* does not appear to be very tenable.\(^{1540}\)

An Urtext?

If it were possible to establish an Urtext, we would have to fully account for all the variants in the existing witnesses by understanding

1) the very complex transmission process involving multiple recensions, each with perhaps hundreds or even thousands of manuscripts.

---

\(^{1539}\) T34n1718_p0146c21 and see footnote 1407.

\(^{1540}\) I thank Prof. Max Deeg for this useful expression (private communication).
2) the scribal errors that have entered into the text because of “normal” copying process of omission, incorrect word division, parablepsis (omission of words caused by repetition of one or more words in the same context), interchange of letters (metathesis), etc.\textsuperscript{1541}

3) errors that have entered into the text because of epigraphical considerations (misreading of scripts), due to unfamiliarity, similarity of letters, etc.

4) errors that have entered into the text because of inaccurate translation practices, either between Pkt and S or Pkt and Ch. In the latter case especially, there are many phonetic forms in MI which can not be easily represented in EMC, as we have seen above.

5) the impact of the native dialect of the translators. Kumārajīva was a Kuchean who spoke a Tocharian language; how did this impact his perception and understanding of MI and EMC?

This complex transmission tapestry becomes even more intractable when one adds in the component of time. The \textit{Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra} is one of the oldest of the Mahāyana sūtras, possible dating from as early as the first century BCE,\textsuperscript{1542} which means that as much as four or five centuries had elapsed between its composition and its translation by Kumārajīva in 406 CE, probably with numerous other (now lost) copies and translations made of the \textit{Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra} in between. If indeed the original version was composed in Pkt, as Lüders has suggested, the source document that Kumārajīva had in front of him, was at least in part already Sanskritized. But the process and timescale in which this took place is impossible

\textsuperscript{1541} For a thorough discussion on scribal errors in the Biblical tradition, see Emmanuel Tov, \textit{Textual Criticism}, 236f.

to reconstruct. The complexity of this transmission scenario suggests that the establishment of an Urtext for the *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra* is not a valid endeavour; but we can learn quite a bit about the nature of the text that Kumārajīva and his translation team had in front of him in the early fifth century CE, i.e. the *dhāraṇīs* reveal a lot about the underlying transmission dialect of the source document which Kumārajīva used. Here is a list of the principal Prakritisms found in Kumārajīva’s source document, as reflected in his Ch transliterations:

1) The -e ending to most of the nouns and adjectives in the *dhāraṇīs* is most likely a Prakritism. As is well known, it is the nom. sing. ending for the eastern Aśokan Pkt (REs of Jaugaḍa and Kālsā) and Māgadhī. It also appears in the northwest edicts of Sh and M and historically in the Niya Documents of the north-west China kingdom of Shan Shan. It can be interpreted as the fem. sing. vocative (where there are fem. nouns) or loc. sing. of masc. nouns, but this does not harmonize with the context or the meanings, nor is it consistent with the *sūtra*’s Pkt heritage.

2) Intervocalic lenition. I have isolated all the instances where this has taken place (usually -t- > -d-, but also -k- > -g- and -khy- > -ghy-). This occurs quite a lot throughout the *dhāraṇīs*, but not universally, as in the case of Kumārajīva *su-āvatani*.\(^{1543}\) Although intervocalic lenition is a standard feature in G and most Pkt, it is not a consistent practice in all the dialects. In P, for example, voiceless intervocalics often remain as is, and sometimes voiced stops are subject to fortition (voiced > voiceless), which also

---

\(^{1543}\) See Pulleyblank, “Stages in the transcription,” 88. Here the intervocalic consonant has apparently disappeared.
happens in the case of the word *gāndhāri* which Kumārajīva represents as *kandhāri*; this, however, may simply be due to orthography in G.\textsuperscript{1544}

3) In all but two cases (*akṣara, akṣayatāya*), Kumārajīva transliterates S -*kṣ-* as a single retroflex fricative sound [ʂ], not as a conjunct. We know that this is how it was pronounced in G. In most other Pkt the sound was notated by -(c)cha- or -(k)kha-.\textsuperscript{1545}

4) The -*ty*- conjunct is palatalized and changed to -*(c)*- (as in *pac(c)ave(c)chan)* or assimilated to -*(t(t))* (as in *at(t)antapāriśuddhi*).

5) Conjunct assimilations: The -*ṣṭ*- conjunct is assimilated to -*(t(t))*;

6) The conjunct -*jv*- has changed to -*j*.

7) Conjunct -*sy*- > -*ś*; -*sy*- > -*s*.

8) Conjunct -*rt*- is assimilated to > -*t*.

9) Retroflex -*t* and -*d*- have changed to -*t*.

10) Labials -*p*- and -*b*- changes to -*v*- intervocally.

11) The letter -*s*- > Ø when before a consonant and the following consonant is usu. aspirated.

\textsuperscript{1544} For intervocalic lenition, see Pischel §186 f. For P, see Geiger, *Grammar*, §35, 38, 39. For the use of -*k*- for -*g*- in G see Brough §30.

\textsuperscript{1545} See Pischel §317f. Generally –*ccha*- was used in the west and –*kkha*- in the east per Woolner, *Prakrit*, §40. Also Geiger, *Grammar*, §56. P shows both notations. The sound -*(k)kha*- represents a voiceless velar stop + a velar aspirated stop; the sound -*(c)cha*- represents a voiceless palatal stop + an aspirated palatal stop. -*kṣa*- can also become -*(j)ha*- in Pkt (Pischel §326). An interesting example of this occurs at DN 2, 161\textsuperscript{21-22}, where *jhāpenthi* (< S √*kṣai*, to "burn") is used: "they burn the body of the universal monarch" (rañño cakkavattissa sarīram jhāpenthi); in the corresponding MPS version (Waldschmidt, §46.7, p. 410 we find *dhyāpyate* ("it was burnt") which is a hyperform as Edgerton points out (BHSD, 288 s.v. *dhyāyati* - the translator misunderstood the P *jhāpenthi* as being derived from *dhyāpenthi* (< S √*dhyai*, "to meditate," caus. *dhyāpayati*), when it was actually derived from S √*kṣai*, "to burn," caus. *kṣāpayati*. He/she therefore wrongly Sanskritized the *jh*- > *dhy*-.
None of these phonological changes are inconsistent with a G source document. But since they are also not inconsistent with many other Pkts (except for the retention of the distinction between the sibilants: dental -s-, retroflex -ṣ-, and palatal -ś-, which is only preserved in G), we can not make any final conclusions about the provenance of the source dialect, only noting the “probability” of G as the transmission dialect, along with Waldschmidt, Pulleyblank and other researchers.\footnote{For example Franz Bernhard, “Gāndhārī and the Buddhist Mission in Central Asia,” in J. Tilakasiri, ed., Añjali, Papers on Indology and Buddhism. A Felicitation Volume Presented to Oliver Hector de Alwis Wijesekera on his Sixtieth Birthday (Peradeniya, 1970), 57, who argues that G was the “medium in which Buddhism was first propagated in Central Asia, the medium through which Indian culture was transmitted from the northwest across Central Asia to China.” See also Dschi, “Umwandlung,” 141-42 who establishes the translation sequence from Alt-Ardhamāgadhī > northwestern dialects > Sanskritization, which sequence he says applies not only to the Lalitavistara and the Saddharmapuṇḍarīksūtra but for all old Buddhist writings where the ending -u appears for -aṃ (in the nominative and accusative singular, which is also prevalent in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīksūtra S recensions). “Magadha was the homeland and Gandhāra, ‘the second holy land of Buddhism’ [quoting Waldschmidt]. Numerous old Buddhist texts wandered through both lands and carried the traces of them.” (trans. author, p. 142). In K. R. Norman. “Pāli and the language of the heretics,” Acta Orientalia, 37 (1976): 117-27, also available in Collected Papers 1, 238-246, the author suggests that certain anomalous forms in Pāli (nom. sing. ending in -e and the gen. pl. ending in -uno were taken over from a North-Western Pkt, i.e. G (p. 125-26).} However, recent discoveries in Pakistan of G mss of the Prajñāpāramitāsūtra and an Akṣobhyvyūha type text (in Karoṣṭhi script) dated to the first or second centuries C.E. certainly make the "G hypothesis" even more plausible; it is quite possible that a G version of the Lotus Sutra - or fragments thereof - will eventually be uncovered in the monastic ruins of ancient Gandhara.\footnote{For the Akṣobhya-type text, see Strauch, "The Bajaur collection," 47-60. For the Prajñāpāramitā, see Falk, H. and S. Karashima 2012. "A first-century Prajñāpāramitā manuscript from Gandhāra - parivarta 1 (Texts from the Split Collection 1) " Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University 15: 19-62, and Falk, H. and S. Karashima 2013. "A first-century}
Conclusions

From the above data, we can draw the following conclusions about the dhāraṇīs in Kumārajīva’s source.

1) The source document was a Pkt one with limited Sanskritizations - only 12% of the items (words and compounds) in the dhāraṇīs can be shown to have had a S source.

2) Kumārajīva’s source document cannot be said to match any of the three recensions, although it appears to be closest to Central Asian in the examples shown above. Because of absence of data, this is not fully conclusive.

3) Kumārajīva’s Pkt source document pre-dates the Nepalese and Gilgit recensions, probably by centuries, based on Edgerton’s Sanskritization ∝ time rule. Whether it goes back to an “original” source is impossible to tell, but considering the vagaries of the transmission process, probably not.

4) The abundant variant forms in the different recensions point to divergent source texts. In addition there appear to be numerous intra- and inter-recensional scribal errors or confusions, taking the form of incorrect word division (e.g. S samitā-viśānte, vs Kumārajīva samitāvi-sānte), confusion on -i and -e endings (throughout);\(^{1548}\) misspellings (e.g. S nāḍi vs. Tib nāṭ); metathesis (e.g. S kunāḍī/kuṭāṇil); intervocalic consonantal confusion (S/Kumārajīva citte/cire; akṣaya/akṣara; vrūsali/vrūsunil); omissions and additions of whole words (as in dhāraṇī#6 for the Central Asian Prajñāpāramitā manuscript from Gandhāra - parivarta 5 (Texts from the Split Collection 2) \(^*\) Annual Report of the International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology at Soka University 16: 97-169.\(^{1548}\) This may simply reflect the fact that in G an -e at the end of a word can be written either as -e or -i, as per Brough, GDhp §21.
recension above) or syllables (e.g. S/ Kumārajīva akṣayavanatāye/akṣayatāya or bhayābhayāśviśodhani/bhāsyābhāṣyaśodhī); different words (S buddhavilokite vs. Kumārajīva buddhavikliṣṭe or S nirghoṣani vs. S -nīsāṃghani); etc. This may also be due to oral/aural problems in the transmission process.

5) Many of the MSS show a scribal misunderstanding or confusion re: Pkt dialects: e.g. -dh- > < -ν-, S nidhiru > Kumārajīva nivi(t)te; interchange of -ś- and -s- in words like Kumārajīva śame ≠ S same; interchange of -ṛ- and -i- (in S: nṛtyāvati vs. nityāvati), omission of anusvāra (Kumārajīva śuka(c)chi vs. S sukānksī), confusion on voicing (S gandhāri vs. Kumārajīva kandhārī), etc.

6) Sanskritization of the Nepalese & Gilgit MSS is almost one hundred per cent. Very few Pkt forms survive (e.g. iṭṭini, nityāvati, are examples of two surviving Pkt forms.)

7) Dharma transmission from MI to EMC is highly complex process, with dozens of human, temporal, spatial, dialectal, scribal, perceptual, accentual, psychological, etc. variables, making it almost impossible to transmit something accurately and error free.

At the beginning of this study, I asked why Kumārajīva’s dhāraṇī transcriptions are so different from the S versions. The answer should now be clear: Kumārajīva’s source document was quite different from the surviving S exemplars, being much more Prakritic; in addition, there are numerous transmission errors and confusions present, both within the MI recensions themselves and between the MI and Kumārajīva’s Ch translation. Given the long, almost two millenium timescale involved, it is impossible to unravel the complex transmission tapestry. All the MI versions have undergone significant Sanskritization (Gilgit & Nepalese the most), and, while the Central Asian recension preserves many more Prakritisms and correlates better with Kumārajīva’s translation overall, much of the dhāraṇī material is missing. As well as uncovering
the nature of Kumārajīva’s underlying source, this study has also tried to demonstrate the
complexity of the transmission and translation process, whether Indic to Indic, that is Pkt > S, or
Indic to Ch and the many different temporal strata, linguistic and human factors involved.

Akkheyyasaññino sattā, akkheyyasmīṃ patiṭhitā;
Chapter Fourteen: Summary and Conclusions

This study has examined the earliest recoverable language of Buddhism, ambiguities in the canon and the process of its transmission. We have found that the earliest recoverable language of Buddhism was a highly simplified and adaptable lingua franca or koine gangétique which eliminated dialect differences, and allowed for broad dissemination of the teachings across India. We may call it pre- or proto-canonical language, Buddhist Middle Indic, a northern pan-Indic trade language or Verkehrssprache, the administrative language of Aśoka’s court in Pāṭaliputra (Kanzleisprache) or try to associate it with one of the eastern dialects - (Old) Māgadhī or (Old) Ardhamāgadhī - (although it was probably itself a translation from one of these), but whatever we call it, there was some kind of shared common source from which variational descent emanated, as the tradents differentially interpreted its meaning. The homogeneity and malleability of this language allowed for various ambiguities to enter the canon when the teachings were translated back into various dialects and S and eliminated its polysemous richness, which often still survives in the commentarial tradition. Indeed it can be shown - and hopefully has been in this study - that some of the common words of Buddhism can not be fully understood without a thorough philological unravelling of their genealogy. The Indian love of paranomasia and etymology suggests that intentional polysemy - where it is not
immediately obvious - played a much more significant role in the Buddhist teachings than previously thought.

Nevertheless, we can not know what the original composer(s) of the teachings actually intended, so this study tries to strike a balance between the “what” and the “how” of the transmission - i.e. staying open to the semantic possibilities of the words themselves, while studying the process of the diachronic transference which caused the ambiguities in the first place. We have learned a lot about the nature of linguistic evolution over time in early India.

Philology is about understanding what the words mean, and why they mean what they mean, as Norman so succinctly put it. The Buddha, the saṅgha and the commentators were themselves very concerned with the accurate transmission of the buddhadharma, and instituted various controls to ensure its integrity. But everything changes over time and so did the buddhadharma, as the language it was encased in inexorably evolved, and those responsible for its continuance unwittingly introduced various alterations.

That there was indeed an “original teaching” of the Buddha is undeniable. As is represented to us in the Vinaya, the Buddha expected these teachings to be memorized using the terms and designations that he taught it in; and indeed while he lived, this appears to have taken place as the various recitation sutras and other injunctions indicate. But as the language spread outside the immediate area of his control (north and north west at first), and was translated into different dialects, and then different languages, it necessarily changed. The Buddha may, as Norman has suggested, have spoken in more than one dialect; he may also have spoken a
Dravidian and/or Munda language, now long lost. But had their been a multiple source \textit{ab initio},
there would be no underlying shared tradition to recover through inferential stratigraphy, only a
series of separate unrelated transmissions. However, the data from this study shows descent
with variation - a shared common source, understood differently and differently interpreted by
the various translational nodes over time. Whether indeed this common source was the original
teaching or actually spoken by the Buddha is a moot point; we can only say that it is the earliest
recoverable teaching, or perhaps better, an \textit{earlier} language underlying and a common source
of (parts of) the surviving MI witnesses, P, Gāndharī, and the other Sanskritized PktS. This is
not to argue for a monolithic "Urtext" type source, as Lüders had envisaged; for there are too
many divergences amongst the traditions which point to a certain underlying multiplicity. But
numerous cognate relationships in the earliest \textit{gāthās} confirm a common source in at least
some of the fundamental teachings.

Of the four dialects that we have studied, this underlying \textit{koine} seems to have the most
similarities to G. Phonologically it was the most evolved of the dialects, i.e. the most simplified
and probably, considering the Indo-Aryans came from the northwest, the oldest and most
prestigious. Many of its features were already present in the Vedic writings. Its flexibility made it
adaptable to a trade language and an administrative language, as it had already eliminated
many dialect differences; however, it did preserve some of the features of Vedic and was
definitely not the \textit{koine} itself, although it appears to have influenced it.

In addition to the arbitrary and sometimes misconstrued back-formations, there were several
other factors which caused ruptures in the transmissional chain. Many of these are the normal
scribal problems well known from the field of Biblical criticism, but others indicate an early muddling of the oral transmission chain, like incorrect word division, loss or addition of nasalization, confusion of voicing, aspiration, glides and liquids, metathesis, faulty memorization or hearing, etc. Many of these would likely not have happened if the tradents were dealing with a written text. Other issues - like unfamiliarity with divergent dialects, insufficient mastery of Vedic, deliberate alteration of a teaching for sectarian reasons, mistakes of copying or of hearing/reading - might happen at either an oral or written stage. Once written down, many of the manuscripts have been harmonized to a common standard, and the extreme paucity of preserved manuscripts leaves a huge void in understanding the transmissional continuum. When we do possess a richness of source material, as in the Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra, (although most of them are quite late) we have a much better chance of piecing together an accurate textual transmissional history, as has been attempted in Chapter Thirteen for one section of the sutra.

The witnesses show a record of constant change; although we use the term "linguistic stratigraphy" as a useful abstract model from geology, we must beware - as in geology - of reifying these strata at any stage along the diachronic continuum. Indeed, sometimes the material was transmitted and/or translated accurately, but at other times we witness mistakes, deletions and additions which compromised the integrity of the communication and sometimes sent it off in whole new (often contradictory) directions. Transmission of the buddhadhamma is

\[\text{A good example of what appears to be oral metathesis occurs in Pj 2, 40}^{3-4}, \text{ad Sn 28, where there are four different variants of the compound } \text{ratanasāraṃ ("jewel essence"), amatārasāṃ ("immortal essence"), rasāyatanam ("essence-sphere"), and rasāyanam ("elixir").} \]
an ongoing process where each tradent assimilated and passed on the teachings, and sometimes - either deliberately or accidentally - not in the form in which they were received. Only snippets of this continuum have been preserved.

This study has also attempted to widen the scope of MI studies by investigating the diffusional effects of other non-IA Indic languages. Although some of these structural influences are well-known, they have not been incorporated into the philological study of Buddhism. That the indigenous languages of India influenced MI in significant ways is undeniable - phonological constraints and onomatopoetic formulations are probably the most palpable examples, among many others. A more important purpose of this study is to provide a sound theoretical and methodological basis for future work to demonstrate the mutual interaction between these immigrant and indigenous language groups. The study of the semantic scope of the word *muṇḍa/muṇḍaka* is one such attempt.

The transmissional history of the Buddhist teachings is long and complex. In terms of dialects, oral traditions and manuscripts, much more has been lost than has been preserved. What has survived may well prejudice our view, as it is no doubt a very imperfect and imbalanced artefact of the textual stratigraphic record. There were certainly other MI dialects which we do not know about; there are thousands of lost manuscripts; and there may well have been a Dravidian, Munda or Tibeto-Burman oral tradition, now long gone, or even Dravidian Buddhist manuscripts, for the Dravidians developed writing by the second century BCE and have their own Buddhist literary tradition, although what has survived is much later (4th century CE) than the period we are discussing. Buddhism was eliminated in the land of its birth by the second millennium CE
and most of the manuscripts we possess are from outside of India (Śrī Laṅkā, Burma, Thailand, Turkestan, Tib, north-west China, etc.), so the lack of native Indic material is not surprising. It was destroyed by invaders, or rotted away in old deserted monasteries, the monkhood dying out and no longer supported by laypeople who were assimilated to the then more popular brahmanical traditions. Nevertheless we can only work with what we have, and though the picture is incomplete and no doubt biased by massive omissions, it still provides a fascinating picture of the nature of the earliest Buddhist language, how it led to various phonological and semantic ambiguities and from there to mistranslation, errors and omissions, and a whole host of other transmissional issues.
Phonetic Abbreviations:

' (apostrophe) = rising tone; 'alif as a syllable divider in Gāndhārī transcriptions; denotes a missing intervocalic consonant in P words.

$h$ (superscript $h$) = sign of aspiration, including aspiration in the departing tone.

$\ddash$, a dental voiced fricative

$\epsilon$, $i$, $\epsilon$, etc. = subordinate vowels in diphthong per Karlgren (in Ulving 1997, 13).

level tone = unmarked

entering tone = syllables ending in -p, -t, -k

$n$ = palatal nasal; $\eta$ = velar nasal

$\epsilon$ = schwa

$\ddot{\epsilon}$ = a schwa like off-glide found in combinations like iã; see Pulleyblank 1991, 5.

$\varsigma$ = lower mid back rounded vowel like “long” in English

$\gamma$ = closed mid back unrounded vowel.

$\varsigma$ = a voiceless palatal fricative, $s$ in S. Also found as $\zeta$ which is an affricate form

$\varsigma$ = a voiceless retroflex fricative, $s$ in S. Also found as $\zeta s$ which is an affricate form

$\epsilon$ = lower mid-front vowel.

$\jmath$ = high front glide like the consonant $y$ in English

$i$ = high, central unrounded vowel.

$\epsilon$ = lower mid front vowel.

$:\$ = long vowel

$[ ]$ = alternate reading in the different Taisho editions or alternate phonetic spelling (depending on context).
[char/char] = a Chinese character where the first radical is located vertically above the second (and there is no single Unicode character available for display).

\( \gamma \) = (vowel with subordinate marker in a diphthong, e.g. diphthong -\( \ddot{\text{a}} \)-)

\( \gamma \) = voiced velar fricative.

\( ? \) = glottal stop.

\( \zeta \) = voiced retroflex fricative.
Abbreviations:

AA=Austro-Asiatic

A1, etc = Ambiguity type (see page 165)

All = Allāhābād-Kosam (Pillar Edict)

AMg = Ardhamāgadhī

AN= Anguttara Nikāya, R. Morris, E. Hardy, PTS London 1885-1900


Ar = Lauriyyā-Ararāj (Pillar Edict)

As = Aṭṭhasalini, ed. E. Müller, PTS London 1897.

BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (Sanskritized Prakrit)


BMI = Buddhist Middle Indic.


Br = Brahmagiri (Minor Rock Edict)

bu = Burmese recension

C = Consonant

caus. = causative.


Ch = Chinese

CPD = Critical Pāli Dictionary.

CPS = Catusparīṣatsūtra, Ernst Waldschmidt, Abhandlungen der Deutschen Akademie der


Dh = Dhauli (Rock Edict)


Divy = Divyāvadāna, Vaidya 1959.


DN-ṭ = *Dīgha Nikāya Tika*, Lily de Silva, Colombo University, Ceylon, 1960.

DP = *A Dictionary of Pāli*, Margaret Cone, PTS Bristol, 2001-2010.

DPR = Digital Pāli Reader.


Divy = *Divyāvadāna*

EMC = Early Middle Chinese

Err = Eṛṛaguḍi (Rock Edict)


G = Gāndhārī


ger. = gerundive.
Gir = Girnār (Rock Edict)

H = Hindi


IA = Indo-Aryan

IE = Indo-European


J = Jaugāda (Rock Edict)


JM= Jaina-Mahārāṣṭrī

JŚ = Jaina-Śaurasenī.

K = Kālsī (Rock Edict)

ka = Cambodian recension

KEWA = Kurzgefasstes etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen, M. Mayrhofer, Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag., 1963

Khvs = Khaggavisāṇasutta


L = liquid consonant.


M = Mānsehrā (Rock Edict)

Mā-L = Mahāsāṃghika-Lokottaravādin.

Māh. =Māhārāṣṭrī
MBh = Mahābhārata.
m.c. = metri causa, for the sake of the meter
MC = Middle Chinese
Mg = Māgadhī.
MI = Middle-Indic
Mil = Milindapañha, ed. V. Trenckner, PTS London, 1880.
MISL = Middle-Indic as a Second Language.
MIA = Middle Indo-Aryan
Mīr = Delhi-Mīrāṭh (Pillar Edict)
MN = Majjhima Nikāya
MPN = Mahāparinibbānasutta.
Mr = Māhārāṣṭrī
MRE = Minor Rock Edict
N = nasal consonant
Nand = Lauṛīyā-Nandangarh (Pillar Edict)
Nett = Nettipakaraṇa, ed. E. Hardy, PTS London 1902§
NIA = New Indo Aryan
Nidd I = Mahāniddesa, ed. L. de La Vallée Poussin, E.J. Thomas, PTS London 1978
Nig = Nīgālī Sāgar (Minor Pillar Inscription)


OI = Old-Indic (Vedic)


P = Pāli

Pān = Pānguḍāriyāṃ (Minor Rock Edict)


pe = peyyāla (formulaic repetition).

PE = Pillar Edict.


pī = PTS edition


Pkt = Prakrit, Pkts, plural.

PN = Proper Name

p.p. = past participle
pr.p. = present participle


Ps-ṭ = ṭīkā on Ps, Rangoon, 1961.

Qu = Queen's Edict (Pillar Edict)

Rām = Rāmpūrvā (Pillar Edict)

RE = Rock Edict.

RV = *Rg Veda*

Rum = Rummindei Pillar (Lumbinī)

S = Sanskrit

Ś = Śaurasinī

Sah = Sahasrām (Minor Rock Edict)

sc. *scilicet* (that is to say, namely).

Sep. Ed. = Separate Edict


Sh = Shābāzgarhī (Rock Edict)

sī = Sinhalese edition


SN = *Samyutta Nikāya*

SP = Sanskritized Prakrit


s.v. = sub verbo, under the word. plural s.vv, sub verbis.


Sv-t = Sumaṅgalavilāsinī ṭīkā, (Līnatthavanṇanā), L. de Silva, Columbo University, Ceylon 1960

syā = Thai recension

TBRC = Tibetan Buddhist Resource Centre, tbrc.org

Th, Thī = Theragāthā and Therīgāthā

Th-a = Paramatthadīpanī (Theragāthā- āṭṭhakathā), ed. F. L. Woodward, PTS London 1940-1965


Tib = Tibetan

Top = Delhi-To prá (Pillar Edict)

Uḍe = Uḍegoḷam (Minor Rock Edict)

Ud = Udāna, ed. P. Steinthal, PTS London 1885


V= vowel

var. = variant reading

Ve = verb


Vism = Visuddhimagga, ed. C.A.F. Rhys Davids, PTS London 1920-21
v. l. = varia lectio (variant reading).


Symbols

< derived from

> source for
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Appendix One, Kumārajīva’s Syllabary

(from Dazhidu lun, Taishō, Volume 25, Sūtra 1509 (大智度論), 0408b15 and following.)

These take the following form: 若聞羅字，即隨義知一切法離垢相。羅闐，秦言垢，Ruò wén luō zì, jí suí yì zhī yì qì fā lí gòu xiāng. Luō shé, Qín yán gòu, “If one hears the character 羅, the meaning immediately follows that all dharma are apart from the characteristic of filth, rajas (S word), which is 垢 in the language of the Qin dynasty.”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arapacana syllabary</th>
<th>Headword</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>阿 a</td>
<td>阿提 ā tí, 阿耨波陀 ā nòu bo tuó</td>
<td>初 (chū) = beginning; 不生 (bù shēng) = unborn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>羅 la (ra)</td>
<td>羅闐 luó shé (PB: la-dzia) raja</td>
<td>垢 (gòu) = filth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>波 pa</td>
<td>波羅[末]木陀 bō luo [mò]mù tuó</td>
<td>第一義, (dì-yī yì) = ultimate truth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>遮 ca</td>
<td>遮梨夜 zhē lǐ yè (PB: tɕiaw-li-jiaⁿ)</td>
<td>行 (xíng) = to practice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>那 na</td>
<td>那= not, na</td>
<td>不 (bù) = not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>陀 da</td>
<td>陀摩 tuó mó (PB: da-ma) &lt; dama</td>
<td>善 (shàn) = good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>婆 ba</td>
<td>婆陀 pó tuó (PB ba-da) &lt; baddha</td>
<td>縛 (fù) = tie up, bind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>茶 ḍa</td>
<td>茶闍[陀]他 tū shé[tuó]tā (PB: do - dzia [da/tʰa] &lt; ḍajamaṇo)(^{1550})</td>
<td>不熱 (bù rè) = not hot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(GDhp 75-d, 159-b) &lt; S dahyamāṇa (“burning”)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>沙 ṣa</td>
<td>沙 shā (PB: sai/sɛː) &lt; P cha, S šas/šad</td>
<td>六 (liù) = six</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>和 va</td>
<td>和(于波[切]反波他 hē(yú bō [qiĕ]fān)bō tā, (PB: ywa-pa-tʰa) &lt; vappatha &lt; S vākpatha</td>
<td>語言 (yǔyán) = language, speech.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>多 ta</td>
<td>多他 duō tā (PB: ta-tʰa)</td>
<td>如 (rú) = thus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>夜 ya</td>
<td>夜他跋 yè tā bá (PB: jia^n-tʰa-bat)</td>
<td>實 (shí) = true, real.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[呴]呴 (PB: [traɪ^n/trɛː^n]) = Šṭa?</td>
<td>呴婆 zhā pó (PB: traɪ^n/trɛː^n-ba) &lt; ta(m)bha, Prakrit version of Šṭambhā?(^{1551})</td>
<td>障礙 (zhàng’ài) = obstacle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>薩(婆)(^{1552}) sa</td>
<td>[婆]薩婆[pó] sà pó (PB: [ba] sat-ba &lt; sabba or S sarva.</td>
<td>一切 (yīqiè) = all</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{1550}\) letter jabi has a macron over it indicating -jh- per Brough GDHp §6.

\(^{1551}\) Brough "Arapacana," 89.

\(^{1552}\) There seems to be some confusion on the headword. Shown is po (婆), not sa (薩), but since 婆 = ba above, it must be a mistake.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>魔 ma</th>
<th>[磨磨]魔迦羅 mó mó jiā luó (PB: [ma-ma]ma-kia-la) &lt; mamakāra</th>
<th>我所 (wǒ suǒ) = mine</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>伽 ga</td>
<td>伽陀 qiétuó (PB: gia-da) &lt; gada</td>
<td>底 (dì) = bottom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>閻 ja</td>
<td>閻提閻羅 shé tí shé luó (PB: dzía-dcé- dzía-la) &lt; Pkt jādi-jarā &lt; Skt jāti-jarā</td>
<td>生老 (shēng lǎo) = birth and age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>濯波 sva</td>
<td>濯波 shī bō (PB: cip-pa)</td>
<td>無義, wú yì, “has no meaning”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>駄 dha</td>
<td>駄[魔]摩 tuó [mó]mó (PB: da-ma) &lt; dhamma/dharma</td>
<td>法 (fǎ) = dharma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>赦 ša</td>
<td>赦[多]赦[切]反 shē duō (dōu è[qié]fán) PB: cia-ṭa &lt; ša(n)ṭa.</td>
<td>寂滅 (jìmiè) = extinction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>吼 kha</td>
<td>吼伽 qū qié (PB: kʰiʃ'-gia) &gt; kha = air, space sky; khaga = bird</td>
<td>虚空 (xūkōng) = void.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>叉 kṣa</td>
<td>叉耶 chā yé (PB: tʂʰai-tʂʰε:-jia) &lt;kṣaya</td>
<td>盡 (jìn) = use up, exhaust.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>哆 sta1553</td>
<td>[何]阿利迦哆度求那[ hé] ā lì jiā duō dù qiū nà (PB: [ya] ?a-liʰ-kia-)</td>
<td>是事邊得何利 (shí shí biān dé hé lì) = the limit of these</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1553 Not in Pulleyblank or Karlgren, using 多. See footnote 1447 where Coblin gives it the value tȃ.
| | ta-ḍo"-guw-naḥ) < alakṣita-guṇaḥ? | matters is unobtainable (lit:
"qualities with no characteristics") |< S jñāna |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>若 ्‌ña</td>
<td>若那 ruó nā (PB: niak-naḥ)= ṇāna</td>
<td>智 (zhī)=wisdom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>他 rtha</td>
<td>[阿利他] 阿他 [ā lītā] ā tā (PB: [ʔa-\līt-tʰa] ?a-tʰa &lt; attha &lt; S artha.1554</td>
<td>義 (yī) = meaning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[波]婆 bha</td>
<td>婆伽 pó qié (PB: ba-gia) &lt; bha(r)ga</td>
<td>破 (pò ) = broken</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>車 cha</td>
<td>伽車提 qié chē tī (PB: gia-tcʰia-dcj) &lt; gacchati (GDhp gachadi)</td>
<td>去 (qù) = go</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>潮[波] smina</td>
<td>阿潮 aśhi ma (PB: ?a-sip-ma) &lt; aśma</td>
<td>石 (shí) = stone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>火 hva</td>
<td>[火婆夜]火夜 [huō pó yè]huō yè (PB: [xwa'-ba-jiaʰ] xwa'-jiaʰ)</td>
<td>喚來 (huàn lái) = call to come</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hvaya &lt; S ṭhe, hvayati</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1554 Here both Pkt forms of S artha are given: aritha with epenthetic vowel and attha with conjuncts assimilated.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>伽 gha</th>
<th>伽那 qiè nà (PB: gia-naⁿ) &lt; ghana, “thick”</th>
<th>厚 (hòu) = thick</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>南天竺[啠]他那 nán tiān zhú</td>
<td>處 (chù) = place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[啠]他 thā</td>
<td>1556 thāna</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>拏 ṇa</td>
<td>南天竺拏 nán tiān zhú ná (PB: south India nra/nc)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>不 (bù) = not</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>頗 pha</td>
<td>頗羅 pō luó (PB: pʰa'-la) &lt; phala</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>果 (guǒ) = fruit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>歌 ska</td>
<td>歌大 gē dà (PB: ka-da'/dajʰ)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>眾 (zhòng) = many (五眾 = 5 skandhas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>醞 ysa?</td>
<td>醞 cuó (not in PB or Karlgren)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555 dza or tsʰa?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>即知醯字空，諸法亦爾, jí zhī cuó zì kōng, zhū fǎ yì ěr, “one knows it (醯) is an empty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1555啠 not in Pulleyblank, using 他

1556 Per PB 414, 天竺 = a transcription of Iranian Hinduka with 天 = 祆 [xiān] = xɛn

1557 Why does Kumārajíva leave out the -n- in khanda? he had characters like 根 (gen = PB ken) if he wanted to. See Brough §48: “sporadic weakening or loss of the nasal before voiced consonants” in G. Also see Geiger §6.3 where short nasalized vowels are not infrequently replaced by a pure long vowel (so khadha = khādha above) and Fussman §33.5 where an open long syllable was automatically nasalized in G. Of course sometimes the anusvāra was simply omitted.
character; all phenomena are also thus."

| 遮 şca | 遮羅地 zhē luó dì (PB: tɕia- la-diʰ) (per Brough) < *caladi < cal/car, to move | 動 (dòng) = move |
|        | GDhp 68-c, 256-b; *caradi = S carati; but śārathi (“charioteer”) seems closer | 即知一切法不動相, jí zhī yīqiè fā bù dòng xiāng, = all dharmas have the characteristic of motionlessness) = nīscala |


| 波[茶]茶 bō [tú]chá (PB:pa-[dɔ]-drai/drɛ:) < bāḍham per Brough¹⁵⁵⁹ | 必 (bì) = must (certainly, positively, necessarily, etc.) |

¹⁵⁵⁸ 蛇 alt. form
Appendix Two, Map of Ancient India (Lamotte, History, Map 2, with additions)