PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES V[1]

TWELVE PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random collection of words which are either omitted from PED[2], or given an incorrect or inadequate meaning or etymology there.

1. *apilapati* "to recite"
2. *a-* and *sa-ppaṭihīrakata* "non-referential and referential"
3. *pāṭihāra* "introduction"
4. *pāruta* "clothed"
5. *maṅgura-cchavi* "with brown skin"
6. *manesikā* "mind-reading"
7. *muṭṭha-sati* "forgetfulness"
8. *rakkha* "tree"
9. *saṃdana* "trappings"
10. *samavassari* "(she) uttered"
11. *samudda* "sea"
12. *sahavya* "friendship"

1. *apilapati* "to recite", *apilāpeti* "to recite, to remember by recitation"

At A II 185,12–13 we find the statement: *tassa tattha sukhino dhammapadāni pi lapanti,* (Ee reads so; Ce reads *-padā pi lapanti* [3]; Be reads *-padā plavanti*). The cty, however, reads: *dhammapadâpilapantī* (vv.ll. *pilavantī, plavantī*) *ti ... sukhino ye pi pubbe ... vācāparihīnā buddhavacanadhammā, te sabbe pasanne ādāse chāyā viya apilapanti* (vv.ll. *pilavanti, plavanti*). *upaṭṭhahanti pākaṭā hutvā paññāyanti,* Mp III 170,15–18. Clearly the cty is taking *sukhino* as genitive and *apilapanti* as intransitive. The variant readings *plavantī* and *pilavantī,* and the explanation in Mp (for the use of the verb *upaṭṭhahanti,* cf: *sā* [*sati*] *pan' esā upa-*

tthānalakkhanā apilāpanatālakkhanā vā, Ps I 82,31), suggest a connection with the use of *apilāpana(tā)* which we find elsewhere in the sense of *sati*: *yā ... sati anussati ... saranatā dhāranatā apilāpanatā asammussanatā ... idam ... satindriyam hoti*, Dhs 11,11. This is explained in words based upon Mil 37,6 foll.: *sā pan' esā apilāpana-lakkhanā upaganhanalakkhanā ca*, As 121,18. This is explained: *sati kusale dhamme apilāpeti*, As 121,27 = Ps I 83,2. The explanation in Mil is: *apilāpanalakkhanā ... sati upaganhana-lakkhanā cā ti*, Mil 37,6-7; *sati ... uppajjamānā kusalākusala- ... -dhamme apilāpeti*, 37,9; *ettakā deva te hatthī, ettakā assā ... ettakam sāpateyyam, tam devo saratū ti rañño sāpateyyam apilāpeti*, 37,19-22. Mil 37,22 clearly takes the verb to be *apilāpeti* (≠ *abhilāpeti*) "to repeat, to remember by repetition". The noun from this is *apilāpanatā* = *sati*, e.g. *sati apilāpanatā ti*, As 144,4.

Other texts, however, even though they quote Mil (e.g. As 121,27 and Ps I 83,2) take this to be from *plavati*, from the root *plu-* "to swim, float", and explain *sati* as being "non-floating": *anupavisanasankhātena ogāhanatthena apilāpanabhāvo apilāpanatā. yathā hi lābukatāhādīni udake pilavanti na upavisanti na tathā ārammane sati. ārammanam hi esa anupavisati, tasmā apilāpanatā ti vuttā*, As 147,11-15. We find at Nett 15,18: *yathāditham apilāp-anatthena sati*, which Ñānamoli translates "it is mindfulness in the sense of the act-of-not-floating-away [from its object] according as [it has] seen [it]". He adds[4]: "'*apilāpanatā* — non-floating away': not as in PED for all Nett and similar references. The word is the same as the abstract form *apilāpanatā* (i.e. *a + pilāpana + tā*: see PED) and is glossed by Nett-a with *ogāhana [itarā pana yathāditham yathāgahitam ārammanam apilāpanatthena ogāhanatthena sati ti*, (Nett 215,25-26)]. The root is *plu* (to swim or float), not *lap*; see PED *pilavati*, and also CPD. Mindfulness is regarded as keeping the mind 'anchored' on its object and preventing it from 'floating away' from it."

The initial *a-* was taken to be a negative, and its opposite was created by removing the *a-* (cf. the evolution of *sura* from

asura with the removal of *a-*, and *dhava* from *vidhava* with the loss of *vi-*), and the resultant *pilāpanatā* was explained as "floating": *yā asati ananussati ... asaranatā adhāranatā pilāpanatā sammussanatā* (Ee has a wrong reading with *a-* for both of these) ... *idam vuccati mutthasaccam*, Dhs 232,7-8; *udake alābukatāham viya ārammane pilavatī ti pilāpanatā*, As 405,28-29. A distinction is therefore made between *mutthasacca*, which is connected with things floating on the (surface of the) mind, and *sati* which is connected with things not floating, i.e. entering into the mind.

In the references in A, whether we read *dhammapadāni 'pilapanti* or *dhammapadāpilapanti*, I think we have the verb *api-lapanti = abhi-lapanti*. The three parallel statements at A II 185-86, with a subject, object and finite verb, persuade me that we ought to take *sukhino* (nom. pl.) as subject, *dhammapadā(ni)* as object, and *apilapanti* as a finite verb: "the happy ones recite the doctrine". This then gives a verb *apilapati* "to recite" of which the causative *apilāpeti* means "to cause to be recited, to enumerate" and then "to remind someone of something by enumerating it to them". Because Mp does not recognise the verb *apilapati*, it has to take *(a)pilapanti* as intransitive, with *dhammapadā* as subject, and *sukhino* as genitive (= dative) in agreement with *tassa*.

I presume that the phrases at A II 185,12-13 and Mp III 170,15-18 say the same thing, and so the difference is between *sukhino dhammapadāni pilapanti* and *sukhino dhammapadā pilap-anti*. In the second of these it is not possible to say conclusively whether we have the coalescence of *-padā* and *api- > -padāpi-*, or whether there is elision of initial *a-*. This does happen with *api-*, even in Skt, where we find *pidhāna* for *apidhāna*, etc.

I think the difference between *-padā* and *-padāni* raises a question about the neuter plural ending. Geiger states[5] that the nom. pl. in *-ā* is not rare, but he does not mention the acc. pl., although one would expect the two to be the same. He does not even list *rūpā* as a possible form for the acc. I think this is an omission on Geiger's part. It may be that acc. forms in *-ā* are not

as common as nom. forms, but they certainly exist, e.g. *dadanti dānā* at A I 162,25, where the ending is confirmed by the metre.

2. *a-* and *sa-ppāṭihīrakata* "non-referential" and "referential"

This word (with *a-*) occurs at D I 193,3,18,20; 194,15,17,28,29; 195,18,20; 239,17,20; 241,17,20; 242,10,30,33; 243,14,16; 244,4,7; M II 33,19,21; 41,2,4. The word (with *sa-*) occurs at D I 198,18,19,32; 199,18,19. Rhys Davids translated[6] the former "without good ground" and also suggested "not apposite"; Buddhaghosa explains it as *paṭiharaṇa-virahitaṃ aniyyānikaṃ* (Sv 380,7–8). Walshe translates it as "stupid"[7], and I.B. Horner as "irresponsible"[8]. Jayatilleke investigated a number of possible etymologies of the two words. He looked at a number of commentarial explanations and preferred[9] Buddhaghosa's at Ps III 273,10–11 (quoted by Miss Horner[10]): *aniyyānika amūlaka niratthaka* "what does not lead onwards, is groundless, and without a goal". He consequently translated "baseless and meaningless".

Rhys Davids[11] noted a connection with the word for miracle, but stated that to render the word "unmiraculous" would make nonsense of the passage. It is true that both words are to be derived from the same root, i.e. *prati* + *har-* "to bring or carry, towards, against or back". The development would seem to be from the noun *pratihāra*, and is based upon a *vṛddhi* formation *prātihārya*. This gives in Pāli *pāṭihāriya* and (with a secondary development) *pāṭihīra* (via **pāṭihera*). Judging from the references available to me, when it is prefixed by *a-* or *sa-* we find *pāṭihāriya* when it is freestanding, and *pāṭihīra* when compounded with *-kata*.

What do these various words mean ? In Skt, among the other, more understandable, meanings, we find the sense of "doorkeeper" for *pratihāra*. This sense perhaps arose from the fact that he was the person who brought the visitors to the owner of the house. We also find, in the lexicons, the meaning "juggler, magician". The *vṛddhi* formation noun *prātihārya* therefore has the

meaning of "jugglery". It is not easy to see how the meaning "juggler" arose — perhaps from some punning use of the basic meaning of the word, e.g. "producer". It is this "jugglery, magic" idea which is translated as "miracle" in Pāli.

If we assume that "bring back, bring towards" is a possible meaning, then we could give a meaning based on a Latin quasi-parallel from *re* + *fer*, and suggest that "reference" might well be tried as a starting point. We might think of "referential" and "non-referential", unless it is thought that these words already have a specific sense in philosophical discussion. "Appropriate" and "non-appropriate", or "apposite" and "non-apposite" would all be possible. Rhys Davids[12] seemed to be suggesting "apposite" for *appāṭihīra-kata-* and "non-apposite" for *sappāṭihīra-kata-*, but this seems to be incorrect, and is contradicted by what he went on to say in that note. In the same note he quoted two readings from Buddhaghosa which are not accepted by the editors of the commentary [*paṭibhāna-* and *-viharaṇaṃ*], and these words should not be taken into consideration in this matter.

CPD suggests "not convincing, without arguments" for *appaṭihāriya*[13], and "made unreliable" for *appaṭihīra-kata*. If we assume that this means "basis for argument", i.e. the facts or references which one brings forward as the basis of a statement, then this would be an acceptable translation. Something like "arguable" and "non-arguable" would be possible. The idea would be that certain talk could be seen to be with (or without) reference, and therefore "arguable (or non-arguable)", because there was (or was not) something to argue about.

3. *pāṭihāra* "introduction"

This word is found at Ja I 121,29 (*bāhirato vāṇijesu āgatesu tatiyena pāṭihārena ārocetha*) ≠ 122,5. PED defines "striking, that which strikes (with reference to marking the time)", but that hardly fits the context here. Ja-Trsl. translates "let them

as common as nom. forms, but they certainly exist, e.g. *dadanti dānā* at A I 162,25, where the ending is confirmed by the metre.

2. *a-* and *sa-ppāṭihīrakata* "non-referential" and "referential"

This word (with *a-*) occurs at D I 193,3,18,20; 194,15,17,28,29; 195,18,20; 239,17,20; 241,17,20; 242,10,30,33; 243,14,16; 244,4,7; M II 33,19,21; 41,2,4. The word (with *sa-*) occurs at D I 198,18,19,32; 199,18,19. Rhys Davids translated[6] the former "without good ground" and also suggested "not apposite"; Buddhaghosa explains it as *paṭiharaṇa-virahitaṃ aniyyānikaṃ* (Sv 380,7–8). Walshe translates it as "stupid"[7], and I.B. Horner as "irresponsible"[8]. Jayatilleke investigated a number of possible etymologies of the two words. He looked at a number of commentarial explanations and preferred[9] Buddhaghosa's at Ps III 273,10–11 (quoted by Miss Horner[10]): *aniyyānika amūlaka niratthaka* "what does not lead onwards, is groundless, and without a goal". He consequently translated "baseless and meaningless".

Rhys Davids[11] noted a connection with the word for miracle, but stated that to render the word "unmiraculous" would make nonsense of the passage. It is true that both words are to be derived from the same root, i.e. *prati + har-* "to bring or carry, towards, against or back". The development would seem to be from the noun *pratihāra*, and is based upon a *vṛddhi* formation *prātihārya*. This gives in Pāli *pāṭihāriya* and (with a secondary development) *pāṭihīra* (via **pāṭihera*). Judging from the references available to me, when it is prefixed by *a-* or *sa-* we find *pāṭihāriya* when it is freestanding, and *pāṭihīra* when compounded with *-kata*.

What do these various words mean ? In Skt, among the other, more understandable, meanings, we find the sense of "doorkeeper" for *pratihāra*. This sense perhaps arose from the fact that he was the person who brought the visitors to the owner of the house. We also find, in the lexicons, the meaning "juggler, magician". The *vṛddhi* formation noun *prātihārya* therefore has the

meaning of "jugglery". It is not easy to see how the meaning "juggler" arose — perhaps from some punning use of the basic meaning of the word, e.g. "producer". It is this "jugglery, magic" idea which is translated as "miracle" in Pāli.

If we assume that "bring back, bring towards" is a possible meaning, then we could give a meaning based on a Latin quasi-parallel from *re + fer*, and suggest that "reference" might well be tried as a starting point. We might think of "referential" and "non-referential", unless it is thought that these words already have a specific sense in philosophical discussion. "Appropriate" and "non-appropriate", or "apposite" and "non-apposite" would all be possible. Rhys Davids[12] seemed to be suggesting "apposite" for *appāṭihīra-kata-* and "non-apposite" for *sappāṭihīra-kata-*, but this seems to be incorrect, and is contradicted by what he went on to say in that note. In the same note he quoted two readings from Buddhaghosa which are not accepted by the editors of the commentary [*paṭibhāna-* and *-viharaṇaṃ*], and these words should not be taken into consideration in this matter.

CPD suggests "not convincing, without arguments" for *appaṭihāriya*[13], and "made unreliable" for *appaṭihīra-kata*. If we assume that this means "basis for argument", i.e. the facts or references which one brings forward as the basis of a statement, then this would be an acceptable translation. Something like "arguable" and "non-arguable" would be possible. The idea would be that certain talk could be seen to be with (or without) reference, and therefore "arguable (or non-arguable)", because there was (or was not) something to argue about.

3. *pāṭihāra* "introduction"

This word is found at Ja I 121,29 (*bāhirato vāṇijesu āgatesu tatiyena pāṭihārena ārocetha*) ≠ 122,5. PED defines "striking, that which strikes (with reference to marking the time)", but that hardly fits the context here. Ja-Trsl. translates "let them

be passed on by three successive ushers ... announced them by three successive ushers"[14]. We find *pāṭihārakena* used in a version of the same story found elsewhere at Mp I 219,18.

Apte[15] gives as one of the meanings of *pratihāra*: "intimating arrival": *samprāpyaite mahātmāno Rāghavasya niveśanaṃ visṭhitāḥ pratihārārtham* (Rām. 7.1.7). For *pratihāraṇa* (s.v.) he gives: "entrance, permission to enter a door".

We also find *paṭihāra-kamma* in Pāli (*yathā ca sabba-kammiko amacco yodhakammam pi karoti, mantakammaṃ kammam pī ti sabbakiccāni sādheti*, Spk III 171,6). The ṭīkā on this states: *paṭihāra-kamman ti rañño santikaṃ āgatānaṃ vacanaṃ rañño nivedetvā tato nesaṃ paṭiharaṇakammaṃ*, Spk-pṭ.

We also find: *vinā paṭihārena upaṭṭhānaṃ anujāni*, Ja VI 345,27 ("without ceremony", Ja-Trsl.[16]). Since the second time the phrase occurs in Ja I 122,5 we find the statement *purimasaññā-vasena tatiyena pāṭihārena tesaṃ āgatabhāvaṃ ārocesuṃ*, we must assume that the third *pāṭihāra* was in some way distinctive, and could be used to give information, in a way previously arranged, that the people being introduced were the particular people (the king) was expecting. It is therefore to be translated "(the third) method of introduction (of visitors to the king)".

4. *pāruta* "clothed"

This word is given by Geiger[17], and quoted from him by Renou[18], as another example of the change of *vṛ* > *ru*. This is not correct. As PED correctly states, *pāruta* is the past participle of *pārupati*, which is a metathesised form of *pāpurati*. *This* is a hyper-form of **pāvurati*, which is to be derived < **prāvarati* (showing labialisation of *-a-* > *-u-* after *-v-*) = *prāvṛṇoti*, i.e. *pāruta* is a conflation of *pārupati* and **pāvuta*. The strange statement in PED[19] that the form *apāruta* "is apparently only a neg. *pāruta*" should be changed to read "is only in appearance a negative of *pāruta*", since it is, in fact, the past participle of *apāpurati*.

5. *maṅgura-cchavi* "with brown skin"

This compound occurs at M I 246,17 (referring to the colour of the Buddha's body); 429,14 (referring to no-one in particular); II 33,14; D I 193,13; 242,2 (referring in these last three cases to the complexion of a unknown beautiful girl). In all these references it is used together with the words *kāla* and *sāma*. We presumably have a graded series of colours — black, (dark) brown, (light) brown. It also occurs outside the canon at Vism 184,4 and Sp 238,19, where it is used with *kāla* and *odāta*. Here it presumably refers to a colour (halfway) between black and white.

The BHS equivalent, found in the references to the colour of the Buddha's body in LV (255,5; 256,8) and Mvu (II 126,11; 127,15), is *madguru*. This is also the name of a fish, and it is interesting to note that Ps II 290,9 (on M I 246,17) states: *maṅgura-cchavī ti maṅgura-maccha-chavi*. Edgerton[20] states that the two words are probably not connected, unless the fish was named for its colour, This, however, seems very likely, since there is also a fish called *rohita* (Ja V 405,32*).

It is difficult to believe that *maṅgura* and *maṅgulī* (found at S II 260,3 = Vin III 107,11; and compounded with *itthi* at Vin III 100,22) are not connected, since they differ only in the *-r-/-l-* alternation, and are both used of (a woman's) appearance. It seems, however, that *maṅgulī* is used only in a bad sense. It is glossed: *maṅgulin ti virūpaṃ duddasikaṃ bībhacchaṃ* (Sp 511,1 = Spk II 221,10). In Pkt too *maṃgula* seems to be used only in a bad sense, since PSM[21] gives the meanings: *aniṣṭa, pāpa, asundara*. It is presumably for this reason that Edgerton reads (*a*)*madgurucchavir* at Mūla-Sarvāstivāda-Vinaya I 36,17[22], where it is used of a Cakravartin's *strīratna* with *nātigaurī* and *nātiśyāmā*.

A bad sense is perhaps appropriate for Gotama's colour in the particular circumstances, but possibly not for the beautiful

girl, unless we are to interpret it as meaning: "You really do not know whether she is beautiful or not".

A Dravidian etymology is given at DEDR 4750 (= DED 3890), where *mangura* and *mangula* are assumed to have the same (bad) meaning, i.e. "sallow, unhealthy (in appearance)", although Mayrhofer[23] expresses doubts about this.

6. *manesikā* "guessing another's thoughts"

This is one of the eighteen examples given of games played by *brāhmaṇas* and *samaṇas* who are addicted to games and recreations. It occurs at D I 7,1, and is explained in the cty as: *manesikā nāma manasā cintita-jānana-kīḷā* (Sv 86,19). PED explains it as being derived from *mano* + [2]*esikā*, and defines it as "mind-searching", i.e. guessing the thoughts of others, mind-reading; a practice forbidden to *bhikkhus*. The word also occurs at Vin II 10,23 and III 180,28, and Sp 621,24 explains: *manesikā vuccati manasā cintita-jānana-kīḷā* .

The explanation given by PED is hardly satisfactory. [2]*Esikā* is quoted only in the sense "desire" and it is found in this sense in the compound *abbūḷhesika* Even if we assumed that it was a form from the root *is-/es-* "to seek, search", it would scarcely give the sense required here.

It seems more likely that we are dealing with a variant of the word which appears in Skt in the form *manīṣikā* "wisdom, intelligence", and its use with reference to a particular type of intelligence is parallel to the way in which the adjective *tevijja* "having three knowledges" is used of three particular types of Buddhist knowledge.

7. *rakkha* "tree"

Geiger[24] takes *rukkha* as being derived < *vṛkṣa*, with *vṛ* > *ru*, presumably via **vru*, although this would seem to be

unparalleled. The same etymology is given by Sen[25]. The parallel which Geiger gives (*pāruta*) is probably not a parallel (see above). On the other hand Pischel[26] connects the word with Skt *rukṣa*, which may perhaps mean "tree". Pkt also has *vaccha*, which is to be derived from *vṛkṣa*. Wackernagel[27] and Renou[28] propose a metathesis. This is certainly the solution, but the metathesis is probably pre-Indo-Aryan, and is to be compared with the VR/RV alternation which is found in *wolf* and *vulpes* as opposed to *lupus*, *lopāsa*, *ṛkṣa* and Greek αλωπηξ.

The derivation from *rukṣa* is not, however, possible for *rakkha* (Ja III 144,15). This is taken as a side-form by both PED and Geiger[29]. The occurrence, however, of *rakṣa* and *rakhkṣa* (as well as *rukha*) in GDhp, suggests that it is not merely "an old misreading" as PED says[30]. If we are to derive this from *vṛkṣa*, then we would be forced to return to Geiger's etymology for *rukkha*, i.e. *vṛkṣa* > **vrukkha* > *rukkha*, and assume *vṛkṣa* > **vrakkha* > *rakkha*. The same objection remains, but it is, however, possible that the loss of initial *v-* is not to be regarded as a specific MIA phenomenon, but rather to be located in OIA or even pre-OIA. We can, in fact, give several examples of this change, and they have been listed by John Brough[31]. We can quote: (*v*)*ṛṣabha* "bull"; (*v*)*añc-* "go crookedly"; (*v*)*ṛddh-* "increase, succeed"; (*v*)*arc-* "be brilliant"; (*v*)*ṛṣṭi* "rain"; (*v*)*as-* "remain". There seems, therefore, no reason to doubt that (*v*)*ṛkṣa* "tree" could also be in this group. This would mean that all forms can be derived from related forms and by-forms, i.e **rukṣa*, *vṛkṣa* and **ṛkṣa*.

On the other hand, a satisfactory etymology for the Skt form can be obtained by comparing *vṛkṣa* with *valśa*, and assuming that the former is based upon the latter + -*s*-, with a weak grade of *ar/al*, i.e. *vḷś/vṛś* + *s* > *vḷkṣ/vṛkṣ*.[32]

The variation in the Aśokan inscriptions (*vracha* at G[33]; *lukha* at K Y J and *rucha* at M) probably reflects a situation where the original form in an Eastern Pkt had *lukha*, which with the North-Western changes of *l* > *r* and *kh* > *ch* gives M *rucha*.

Although it looks as though G confirms the *vrakha/vracha* stage between *vrkṣa* and *vakkha*, I think that, in fact, it shows an attempt at Sanskritisation, i.e. *ra* is the scribe's attempt at reproducing the *-r-* sound in a script which did not have a character for it.

8. *muṭṭha-sati* "forgetfulness"

The BHS equivalent of this is *muṣita-smṛti*, which PED states is in appearance wrongly derived from Pāli *musati* "to rob". Edgerton, however, states[34] that Pāli *muṭṭhasati* "pace PTS D(ictionary) ... may well be from Skt *muṣṭa = muṣita*". Morris[35] also quotes Skt *muṣita-smṛti*, but rejects the connection. The commentaries give an explanation based upon *mussati < mṛṣyati*, but I believe that they and both the modern commentators I have mentioned were all wrong, and I believe that Edgerton was correct.

PED is also wrong in stating that *muṭṭha* occurs "only in two compounds". It occurs twice uncompounded in the phrase *sati muṭṭhā* at Th 98 and 794, where *muṭṭhā* is glossed as *naṭṭhā* (Th-a I 214,15).

In BHS *muṣita-smṛti* is a noun. It is an adjective in Skt, with an abstract noun (lex.) formed by adding *-tā*. In Pāli it is a *bahuvrīhi* compound adjective. The noun in Pāli is *muṭṭha-sacca*. PED states that this is derived < *muṭṭha + sati + ya*, but it is rather < *muṭṭha + sacca < *smartya*.

9. *sandana* "trappings"

This word occurs at D II 188,5. It is presumably the same as the word *saṃdāna* "bond, halter, fetter" found in Skt, and PED queries whether we should not read *sandāna*. There seems to be no reason why we should do so. The word can perfectly well be explained as showing the weak grade form of the root *dā-* "to

bind", i.e. either the very weak grade *d-*, with the suffix *-ana*, or the middle grade *da-* with the suffix *-na*, cf. *uddhana*, etc.[36]

10. *samavassari* "(she) uttered"

PED does not list this word in this form, but under *samavasarati* (sic) it states "of a goad or spur" with a reference to Thī 210, and instructs readers to see *samosarati*. Under this last word, which is derived by PED from *osarati* (< *sr-* "to flow"), two meanings are given: "to flow down together" and "to come together, gather". There is no reference to *samavasarati*.

We must therefore assume that PED is suggesting a derivation from the root *sr-* for *samavassari*. If this is so, then we must also assume that the appearance of double *-ss-* is metri causa. For the word *patodaṃ* to be the object of *samavassari*, we must assume that it is a causative form. If this is so, then *-ssari* must stand for *-sārayi*, i.e. the vowel *-ā-* has been shortened, again metri causa, and the ending *-ayi* has been replaced by *-i*. Taken in themselves, none of these three changes is unparalleled, but it is perhaps rather unlikely that three such anomalous forms should occur in one word.

If the derivation is not from *sam + ava + sr-*, then we must consider alternatives. If we assume that the reading is correct, with no changes metri causa, then we are looking for a root which could give the stem *-ssar-*. I can think only of *smar-* or *svar-*. It is, of course, true that neither of these roots occurs in Skt with the prefixes *sam + ava*, but there are formations from both roots which would not be inappropriate.

The root *smar-* has among its meanings "to hand down memoriter, teach, declare" and "to recite", while *ava-svar-* has the meanings "to sound (as an instrument)" and "to sustain with gradually lowered voice".[37] The latter verb is very rare, but if we can assume that *smar-* and *svar-* were more common in MIA than in Skt, then either of these would give an acceptable etymology

and meaning, on the assumption that the verb does not have *patodaṃ* but rather *gāthā* as its object, i.e. "she uttered these verses as a spur", rather than "she used a spur, i.e. these verses".

11. *samudda*, "sea"

There is, of course, no doubt about this word or its meaning, but readers of Mil 85–86 may have been puzzled at the explanation of its meaning given there. It is explained as *sama* + *uda* + *ra(vaṇa)*. We can therefore see that **ravaṇa = lavaṇa* = "salt". This explains the retroflex -*ṇ*-, which is otherwise inexplicable after -*l*-.

This agrees with the explanation given by Charpentier[38]. Against this is the explanation given by J.C. Wright[39], who assumes it is < MIA *lavana* "piece" (of rock salt), with the spontaneous development of -*n*- > -*ṇ*-.

12. *sahavya* "friendship"

PED states that this is from *sahāya*, and compares Skt *sāhāyya*, but does not explain the development in detail. It would seem that in origin *sahavya* must be a *vṛddhi* formation from *sahāya*, i.e. it is the direct development from *sāhāyya*, and it could well be that an original long -*ā*- in *sāh*- was shortened on the analogy of the short -*a*- in *sahāya*. The development of -*yy*- > -*vv*- is on the same lines as *vaṇibbaka, pubba*, etc.[40], and the double -*vv*- was then "back-formed" or Sanskritised into -*vy*-. Perhaps because the long -*ā*- in the first syllable had been lost, the tradition did not know that *sahavya* was an abstract noun, with the result that another abstract noun was formed by adding the suffix -*tā*, giving *sahavyatā*. The word seems to have been known to the BHS tradition while it still had a form with -*vv*-, because the word occurs in BHS with the spelling *sahavratā*. This is doubtless based

upon a "folk etymology", which took the meaning to be "joint vow".

CAMBRIDGE   K.R. NORMAN

NOTES

1   See K.R. Norman, "Pāli Lexicographical Studies IV", in *JPTS* Vol. XI, 1987, pp. 33-49.

2   Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli and Sanskrit texts are as in the Epilegomena to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924-48 (= CPD). In addition: CDIAL = *Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*; DED(R) = *Dravidian Etymological Dictionary* (Revised edition); EWA = *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindischen*; GDhp = *Gāndhārī Dharmapada;* GS = *Gradual Sayings*; PSM = *Pāiasaddamahaṇṇavo*; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS's Pali-English Dictionary; BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit; MIA = Middle Indo-Aryan; OIA = Old Indo-Aryan; Pkt = Prakrit; Skt = Sanskrit.

3   According to GS II, p. 194 n. 1.

4   Bhikkhu Ñāṇamoli, *The Guide*, London 1962, p. 28 n. 83/3.

5   W. Geiger, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*, Strassburg 1916, § 78.6.

6   T.W. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Vol. I, London 1890 p. 257.

7   M. Walshe, *Thus Have I heard*, London 1987, p. 166.

8   I.B. Horner, *Middle Length Sayings*, II, London 1957, p. 230.

9   K.N. Jayatilleke, *Early Buddhist Theory of Knowledge,* London 1963, p. 326.

10   Horner, *op. cit.*, p. 230 n. 3.

11   Rhys Davids, *op. cit.*, p. 257 n. 3.

12   *ibid.*, p. 257 n. 3.

13   s.v. *appaṭihāriya*.

14   *The Jātaka,* Vol. I, translated by R. Chalmers, p. 20.

15   Apte, *Sanskrit Dictionary,* s.v. *pratihāra,* § 7.

16   *The Jātaka,* Vol VI, translated by E.B. Cowell and W.H.D. Rouse, p. 172.

17   W. Geiger, *op. cit.,* § 13.

18   L. Renou, *Introduction générale* to Jakob Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik,* Vol. I, Göttingen 1957, p. 113.

19   See *PED,* s.v. *pāruta.*

20   F. Edgerton, *BHS Dictionary,* New Haven 1953, s.v. *madgura.*

21   *PSM,* s.v. *maṃgula.*

22   (= N.N. Dutt, *Gilgit Manuscripts,* Vol. III, part 1).

23   *EWA* II, p. 548.

24   Geiger, *op. cit.,* § 13.

25   S. Sen, *Comparative Grammar of Middle Indo-Aryan,* Calcutta 1951, § 23.

26   R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prākrit-Sprachen,* Strassburg 1900, § 320.

27   J. Wackernagel, *Altindische Grammatik,* I, Göttingen 1896, § 184b.

28   Renou, *op. cit.,* p. 113.

29   Geiger, *op. cit.,* § 13, f.n. 1.

30   *PED,* s.v. *rakkhā.*

31   J. Brough, "Problems of the 'Soma-mushroom' theory", in *Indologica Taurinensia,* I, 1973, pp. 29-32.

32   See H.W. Bailey, *Dictionary of Khotan Saka,* Cambridge 1979, 162b s.v. *durauśa,* and 275a s.v. *bāggara* .

33   G = Girnār; K = Kālsī; Y = Yeṟṟaguḍi; J = Jaugaḍa; M = Mānsehrā.

34   F. Edgerton, *op. cit.,* s.v. *muṣita-smṛti.*

35   R. Morris, "Notes and Queries", in *JPTS* 1884, pp. 69-108 (p. 92), quoting the Kathāsaritsāgara.

36   See the discussion of such matters in T. Burrow, *The Problem of Shwa in Sanskrit,* Oxford 1979, pp. 33 foll.

37   See M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary,* s.vv. *smṛ* and *anusvṛ.*

38   J. Charpentier, "Some Sanskrit and Pāli notes", in *Indian Linguistics* II, pp. 45-71 (p. 55).

39   *CDIAL* 10978.

40   See Geiger, *op. cit.,* § 46.1.