

## PĀLI LEXICOGRAPHICAL STUDIES XI<sup>1</sup>

### SIX PĀLI ETYMOLOGIES

Here is another random group of words which are either omitted from PED,<sup>2</sup> or given an incorrect meaning or etymology there.

1. *kaḍḍhati* “to drag”
2. *tiracchānakathā* “gossip”
3. *pacchābandha* “rudder”
4. *mātaṅ'arañña* “elephant forest”
5. *vidha* “buckle”
6. *seṭṭhi* “dregs”

1. *kaḍḍhati* “to drag”

PED explains<sup>3</sup> this word as a dialect form which is alleged to equal Skt *karṣati*. It compares Pkt *kaḍḍhai* “to pull, tear”, and *khaddā* “pit, dug-out”. It also refers to Bloomfield’s article (see below).

---

<sup>1</sup> See K.R. Norman, “Pāli Lexicographical Studies X”, in *JPTS* XVII, 1992, pp. 215–18.

<sup>2</sup> Abbreviations of the titles of Pāli texts are as in the *Epilegomena* to V. Trenckner: *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Vol. I, Copenhagen 1924–48 (= CPD). In addition: BHS(D) = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit (Dictionary); CDIAL = R.L. Turner, *Comparative Dictionary of the Indo-Aryan Languages*, London 1966; CP I, II, III = K.R. Norman, *Collected Papers*, Vols. I, II, III, PTS 1990, 1991, 1992; DPPN = *Dictionary of Pāli Proper Names*; Erz. = *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī*; MW = M. Monier-Williams, *Sanskrit-English Dictionary*, Oxford 1899; PTS = Pali Text Society; PED = PTS’s *Pali-English Dictionary*; PTC = *Pāli Tipiṭakaṃ Concordance*; Pkt = Prakrit; Skt = Sanskrit; Be = Burmese edition; Ce = Sinhalese edition; Ee = European edition; cty/cties = commentary/commentaries.

<sup>3</sup> See PED, s.v. *kaḍḍhati*.

CPD<sup>1</sup> says that *okaddhati* is a denominative from *o + kaddha* < *kaṭṭha* < Skt *kr̥ṣṭa*, which is the past participle of √*kr̥ṣ* “to drag”. For the form with *o-* it compares Pāli *apakaddhati* and *avakaddhati*, and BHS *okaṭṭati*.

Earlier discussions of *kaddhati* include the following suggestions:

1) Weber (perhaps for the wrong reason) suggested that the word which he at first read as *āṭṭana* in Hāla’s *Sattasāi* 109 was to be derived from *ākṛṣṭa*.<sup>2</sup> He mis-quoted<sup>3</sup> Hemacandra IX 187 (where Hemacandra states that *kaddhai* is one of the six *ādeśas* of the root *kr̥ṣ*). By 1881 Weber had decided<sup>4</sup> to read *āaddhana*, quoting Marāṭhī *kāḍhanem* in support of his decision.

2) S. Goldschmidt<sup>5</sup> derived *kaddhai* < *\*kaṭṭhai* < *\*kr̥ṣṭati*, without stating specifically that it was a denominative verb.

3) E. Leumann stated<sup>6</sup> that *pakaddhijai* was the passive of a verb from the past participle passive *pakaddha* (= *prakṛṣṭa*) and referred to Goldschmidt and to Hemacandra IX 187, as had Weber already before him.

<sup>1</sup> See CPD, s.v. *okaddhati*.

<sup>2</sup> A. Weber, *Ueber das Saptaçatakam des Hāla*, Leipzig 1870, p. 107.

<sup>3</sup> A. Weber, “Zum Saptaçatakam des Hāla”, *ZDMG*, 28, 1874, pp. 345–436 (p. 375).

<sup>4</sup> A. Weber, *Das Saptaçatakam des Hāla*, Leipzig 1881.

<sup>5</sup> “Prākṛtische miscellen”, *Zeit. für vergl. Sprach.*, XXVI, pp. 103–12 (pp. 105–6).

<sup>6</sup> *Das Aupapātika Sūtra*, 1883, Index p. 130, s.v. *pakaddhijj-*.

4) J. Bloch, discussing Marāṭhī *kāḍhanem*, followed the derivation < *kr̥ṣṭa*.<sup>1</sup>

5) Geiger<sup>2</sup> said that *kaddhati* = *\*kardhati*, which he described as a side-form of *karṣati*, etc. He gave no explanation of the structure of *\*kardh-*. It might be taken as an extension in *-dh-* to *kar-*, in the belief that *karṣ* shows an extension in *-s-*, but there seems to be no evidence for a root *kar-* with the meaning “drag”.

6) Bloomfield<sup>3</sup> suggested a derivation < *\*kr̥žd*. He presumably saw an extension in *-d-* to *kr̥ṣ-*, cf. Burrow’s suggestions for *luṭh-* and *luḍ-* from *luṣ-*, and *heṭh-* and *hīḍ-* from *heṣ-*.<sup>4</sup> Turner, however, said<sup>5</sup> that Bloomfield’s suggestion was phonetically unjustified (presumably because of the unexpected aspiration < *ṣ + d*).

7) Lüders<sup>6</sup> gave examples of the change of *-ṭ(h)-* > *-ḍ(h)-*, but denied<sup>7</sup> the derivation < *kr̥ṣṭa* and acquiesced in Bloomfield’s suggestion. He seemed to base his objection on the fact that *kaddhati* occurs only rarely in canonical texts, the more common forms being based upon *kass-*. His implication was, therefore, that *kaddh-* is a non-Eastern form, and he supported this statement by quoting New Indo-Aryan developments from Western languages only. This is, however, to ignore the fact that various forms from *kaddh-* occur in Jain canonical texts, which would seem to

<sup>1</sup> *La formation de la langue marathe*, 1920 (but based upon a thesis published in 1914), §§ 112, 231.

<sup>2</sup> W. Geiger, *Pāli Literatur und Sprache*, § 130.

<sup>3</sup> *JAOS* 41, 1921, p. 465.

<sup>4</sup> T. Burrow, “Skt. *luḥ* ‘to disturb’”, *JRAS* 1956, pp. 191–200.

<sup>5</sup> CDIAL (App. p. 825).

<sup>6</sup> H. Lüders, *Beobachtungen über die Sprache des buddhistischen Urkanons*, §§ 151–58.

<sup>7</sup> Lüders, *ibid.*, § 165.

make the existence of the Eastern form of the word indisputable. Turner, in fact, quoted derivatives from Eastern New Indo-Aryan languages also.

8) Turner<sup>1</sup> stated that the phonetic or analogical replacement of Middle Indo-Aryan *-tth-* by *-ddh-* is unexplained. Since there is also evidence for a word *\*gaddhati*, he suggested that, with an alternative *-k-* and *-g-*, it is probably non-Aryan. It is not clear why he ignored the other changes of *-tth-* > *-ddh-* which Lüders gave.

I would accept the suggestion followed by Leumann and Bloch because of the existence of BHS *okaṭṭati* (this, as Edgerton points out<sup>2</sup> and as Lüders accepts in a footnote,<sup>3</sup> is what the MSS read, with occasional occurrences of *-tth-*). This seems to me to suggest a form < *-krṣṭa*. There are other examples of *-ṣṭ-* becoming *-tth-*, e.g. the spellings *ovatta* and *ovutta* (< *-vrṣṭa*), and *maṭṭa* < *mrṣṭa* found commonly in Pāli.

The fact that the Pāli canonical preference is for *kass-* (although *kaddh-* is not totally avoided, as already noted), and *kaḍḍh-* is found more commonly as the commentarial gloss, I regard as an example of the phenomenon that I have noted elsewhere<sup>4</sup> — that what one sect regards as canonical another treats as commentarial, and vice versa. I assume, therefore, that texts with both *kaddh-* and *kass-* came to Ceylon from mainland India, but the Theravādin redactors generalised one in the canon and the other in the commentaries.

One objection to the view followed by Leumann and Bloch is the infrequency of denominative verbs made from past participles. Most

<sup>1</sup> CDIAL p. 133, s.v. √*\*kaḍḍh*.

<sup>2</sup> BHSD, s.v. *kaṭṭati*.

<sup>3</sup> Lüders, *Beob.*, p. 125 note 3.

<sup>4</sup> K.R. Norman, "The dialects in which the Buddha preached", in H. Bechert (ed.): *The language of the earliest Buddhist tradition*, Göttingen 1980, pp. 61–77 (p. 73).

of the Middle Indo-Aryan examples which can be given are no more certain than *okaḍḍhati*, and like *okaḍḍhati* can almost always be explained in a different way if one objects to the idea of a denominative formation. From Pāli we can quote *olaggati* from *olagga* < *avalagna*. This could be taken as coming from *lagyate*, but one then has to explain the double *-gg-* in the causative *olaggeti*. There is also Pkt *tuttai* from the past participle *tuttā* < *\*trut-ta*, but *trutyati* is alleged to occur. The Pkt verb *uvakkhaḍai* "to prepare"<sup>1</sup> is, however, hard to explain except as a denominative from *uvakkhaḍa* < Skt *upaskṛta*. Bloch gave<sup>2</sup> a number of New Indo-Aryan examples.

Another past participle showing the development *-ṣṭ-* > *-tth-* is *ugghaṭṭa*, which we find in the compound *ugghaṭṭapādo* at Sn 980. It is glossed: *ugghaṭṭapādo ti, maggakkamanena ghaṭṭapādatalo, paṇhikāya vā paṇhikaṃ gopphakena vā gopphakaṃ jaṇṇukena vā jaṇṇukaṃ āgantvā ti ghaṭṭapādo* (Pj II 582,6–9). We presumably have a past participle *ghaṭṭa* < *ghaṭṭha* < *ghrṣṭa*, with dissimilation of aspirates. The verb *ghaṭṭ-* "to rub" occurs in Skt, and is probably a Prakritism there, if CPD is correct<sup>3</sup> in seeing a derivation from Skt *ghrṣṭa*. We must then assume a denominative verb formed from the Pkt past participle *ghaṭṭa*.

The only treatment I know of such forms is by L.A. Schwarzschild.<sup>4</sup> Some of the examples she gives seem irrefutable, but they are for the most part from rather late texts. This, in itself, is an argument from silence. The fact that we do not have early examples does not prove that the type of formation cannot be early.

<sup>1</sup> Uvāsagadasāo, § 68.

<sup>2</sup> Bloch, *op. cit.*, § 231.

<sup>3</sup> CPD, s.v. *ugghaṭṭa*.

<sup>4</sup> L.A. Schwarzschild, "Prakrit *thakka*, "tired", *Indian Linguistics*, XIX, 1958, pp. 311–18.

I must make it clear that when I write of “denominative” verbs, I mean verbs made from nouns (or adjectives), i.e. the stem of the noun (or adjective) is taken over as a verbal root. They are not necessarily conjugated as denominative verbs would be in Sanskrit, i.e. I do not thereby imply that they are Class X verbs. We can see this from examples of this type of formation in Sanskrit.

We find in Sanskrit both *cūrṇayati* and *ghūrṇati* (and *ghūrṇāyate* can be deduced from *ghūrṇāyamāna*) as denominative verbs from past participles of verbs which are no longer used in Sanskrit, although they, and derivatives from them, exist in Middle Indo-Aryan, e.g. (\**ghr̥-* ?), \**ghurati*,<sup>1</sup> *ghulai* and *gholai* = *ghūrṇati* (Hc), *gholira* (Sattasāi 391 and Erz.); (\**cṛ-* ?), *cūraissam*, *cūriadu* (Karpūramañjari), cf. \**cūra*.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. *tiracchānakathā* “gossip”

References for *tiracchānakathā*, and other compounds of *tiracchāna*, can be found in PTC and in PED, and the word can also be found in the commentaries upon the various canonical texts listed there. To these can be added Pj II 564,5–6 (ad Sn 922): *gāmakathāya āvaraye sotān ti tiracchānakathāto sotāṃ āvareyya*. This is derived from Nidd I 367,27 foll., which is listed in PTC. It is variously translated: “animal-talk, wrong or childish talk”,<sup>3</sup> “low conversation”,<sup>4</sup> “inferior matters”,<sup>5</sup> “worldly talk”,<sup>6</sup> “unedifying conversation”.<sup>7</sup> The last might be thought to

<sup>1</sup> CDIAL 4497.

<sup>2</sup> CDIAL 4888.

<sup>3</sup> PED, s.v. *tiracchāna-kathā*.

<sup>4</sup> T.W. Rhys Davids, *Dialogues of the Buddha*, Vol. I, p. 13.

<sup>5</sup> I.B. Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, Vol. V, p. 99.

<sup>6</sup> I.B. Horner, *Book of the Discipline*, Vol. IV, p. 250, and Pe Maung Tin, *The path of purity*, p. 148.

<sup>7</sup> M. Walshe, *Thus have I heard*, p. 70.

be the nearest to, and is perhaps influenced by, Buddhaghosa’s definition at Sv 89,16–17, which see below. To these translations can be added: “aimless talk”,<sup>1</sup> “frivolous chatter”,<sup>2</sup> and “childish talk”.<sup>3</sup>

The list of 32 types of *tiracchāna-kathā* which is given at Nidd I 367,27 foll. also occurs at M III 113,17 foll., but there they are not called *tiracchāna-kathā*, but *kathā hīnā gammā pothujjanikā anariyā anathasamhitā*, which is another way of saying that *tiracchāna-kathā* = *gāma-kathā*. The meaning of *gāma-kathā* is “village talk, i.e. the sort of talk that goes on in villages, i.e. gossip”, as is made clear by the little snippets given as examples at Ps III 221,20 foll., etc. There the adjective *gehasitakathā* is used — “household gossip”. When it is said to be one of the five *ādīnavas* arising from fire,<sup>4</sup> we must suppose that a fire leads to useless talk and gossip about it, on the lines of: “Do you remember the night X’s house burned down?” I would suggest that Hare’s translation “tales of animals”<sup>5</sup> is way off the mark.

The commentarial explanation *anīyānikattā* (or *-iyy-*) *saggamokkhamaggānaṃ tiracchānabhūtā kathā tiracchānakathā* (Sv 89,16–17) comes into the “folk etymology” category. Buddhaghosa is here taking *tiracchāna* in its sense of “crossways”, and is explaining that this type of talk lies crossways, i.e. is an impediment, to the ways to release. It is not specifically condemned for *bhikkhus* in the Vinaya. The *chabbaggiyā bhikkhus* are rebuked for making a loud noise with their wooden shoes (Vin I 189,2–3) or for going to the village at the wrong time (Vin IV 165,1–2), rather than for *tiracchānakathā*. Nevertheless, it is designated as unsuitable (*na kho pan’ etaṃ ... tumhākaṃ paṭirūpaṃ*

<sup>1</sup> Nāṇamoli, *The path of purification*, p. 133 (ad Vism 127,23) and F.L. Woodward, *Gradual Sayings*, Vol. V, p. 86.

<sup>2</sup> Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The all-embracing net of views*, p. 60 (ad D I 7,28).

<sup>3</sup> F.L. Woodward, *Kindred Sayings*, Vol. V, p. 355.

<sup>4</sup> A III 256,15.

<sup>5</sup> *Gradual Sayings*, Vol. III, p. 188.

... *yaṃ tumhe anekavihiṭaṃ tiracchānbakathaṃ aṇuyuttā vihareyyātha*, A V 128,30–129,3), presumably because it is conducive to thoughts about the material world, rather than to *nibbāna*. The *bhikkhus* were warned against it: *mā bhikkhave anekavihiṭaṃ tiracchānakathaṃ katheyyātha*, S V 419,23–24, and it is described as *n' esā ... kathā atthasamhitā nādibrahmacariyikā na nibbidāya ... saṃvattati*, S V 420,4–5. When Dabba is allotting lodgings, the *tiracchānakathikā* come towards the end of the list, with the *kāyadaḥhibahulā*, and Dabba thinks they will spend their time *ratiyā* (Vin II 76,1–3). At A V 185,15 it is *paribbājaka* of other sects (*aññatitthiyā*) who are engaging in *tiracchānakathā*. The same statement is made at D I 7,27 foll., where Gotama is said to abstain from such talk (*evarūpāya tiracchānakathāya partivirato samaṇo Gotamo*, D I 8,4). At D I 178,16 foll. It is Potṭhapāda the *paribbājaka* with a large company of *paribbājakas* who is engaging in it, and at D III 36,17 foll. it is Nigrodha the *paribbājaka*, again with a large company of *paribbājakas*, who is engaging in it, whereas it is specifically stated (D III 54,16 foll.) that *arahats* and *sammā-sambuddhas* did not indulge in such talk.

I would suggest that *tiracchāna-kathā* was at one time one example of this gossip “talk about animals”, on the same lines as “talk about kings”, etc., and it then became used in a generic sense, to stand for all such talk, just as *gāma-kathā* is used at Sn 922. In *tiracchāna-kathā* and in the compounds which are used to explain it, *kathā* is singular and its meaning is “talk”, although if the words are taken individually the distinction may be blurred, since “talk about kings” (*rāja-kathā*) will, of course, involve “stories about kings”.

### 3. *pacchābandha* “rudder”

Under the entry for *kañcana-mahānāvā* “a big golden ship” the latest fascicle of CPD (i.e. Vol. III fascicle 1) gives a reference which

includes the word *pacchābaddha*: *so kañcana-mahānāvāya pacchā-bandho* (Be so; Ee reads *-ddh-*) *viya satthu padānupadikaṃ anugañchi*, Mp I 182,11. This word is not listed in PED. It is used of something which follows behind a ship, and presumably means “rudder”. A similar reference occurs for *kañcana-nāvā* “golden ship”, which is not listed in CPD: *so kañcana-nāvāya pacchābandho* (Ce so; Be and Ee read *-ddh-*) *viya satthāraṃ padānupadikaṃ anugacchati*, Th-a III 134,29 = Ap-a 264,24.

It is to be noted that the reading *-baddho* in the first reference is that of Ee; Be reads *-bandho*, whereas in the second reference *-baddho* is the reading of Be and Ee; Ce reads *-bandho*, i.e. Ee consistently reads *-baddho*, whereas Be is inconsistent. I think that the noun *bandha* (or *ābandha*) is more likely to be the correct reading “the behind equipment, the equipment behind”, rather than the past participle *baddha* (or *ābaddha*) “(the thing) tied on behind”.

### 4. *mātaṅg'arañña* “elephant forest”

This collocation of words occurs in two consecutive verses in Dhp and elsewhere in Pāli:

*eko care mātaṅg'arañṇe va nāgo* (Dhp 329 = M III 154,23\* = Vin I 350,10\* = Ja III 488,23\*) and  
*appossukko mātaṅg'arañṇe va nāgo* (Dhp 330 = M III 154,26\* = Vin I 350,13\* = Ja III 488,26\*).

Max Müller<sup>1</sup> seems to have omitted *mātaṅga* in his translation of Dhp: “let him walk alone ... like an elephant in the forest” and “[let a man walk alone] ... with few wishes, like an elephant in the forest”.

<sup>1</sup> F. Max Müller, *The Dhammapada*, Sacred Books of the East X, Oxford 1881, pp. 79–80.

Radhakrishnan<sup>1</sup> was inconsistent, translating the first time “walk alone ... like an elephant ... in the forest” but then “let a man walk alone with few wishes like an elephant ... in the elephant forest”. Acharya Budharakkhita<sup>2</sup> translates it as “elephant forest” in both verses. Kalupahana<sup>3</sup> similarly translates it as a compound in both verses: “like the elephant in the Matanga forest”. Miss Horner<sup>4</sup> translates it as “elephant-jungle” in both verses in both M and Vin.

All these translations have in common the fact that they do not follow, and make no comment upon, the commentarial tradition. Carter and Palihawadana, however, who also<sup>5</sup> translate: “like the elephant in the Mātāṅga forest”, point out<sup>6</sup> that in so doing they are going against the commentary which explains: *mātāṅg’ araṅṅe va nāgo ti yathā ca “aḥam kho ākiṅṅo viharāmi hatthihi hatthinīhi hatthikalabhehi hatthicchāpehi chinṇaggānī c’ eva tiṅṅāni khādāmi, obhaggobhaggaṇ ca sākḥābhāṅgaṇ khādāmi, āvilāni ca pāṇiyāni pivāmi, ogāhantassa ca me tiṅṅassa ca hatthinīyo kāyaṇ upanighamsantiyo gacchanti, yan nūnāhaṇ ekako gaṇamhā vūpakaṭṭho vihareyyan” ti evaṇ paṭicikkhitvā [ayaṇ me tena] gamanato mātāṅgo ti laddhanāmo, imasmim araṅṅe ayaṇ hatthināgo yūthaṇ pahāya sabbiriyāpathesu ekako sukhaṇ carati, evaṇ pi eko careyyā ti attho*, Dh-p-a IV 29,16–30,9.

Similarly, Ps IV 206,12 foll. (= Sp 1151,26 foll. = Ja III 489,25’ foll.) explains: *mātāṅgaraṅṅe va nāgo ti mātāṅgo araṅṅe nāgo va*.

<sup>1</sup> S. Radhakrishnan, *The Dhammapada*, London 1952, p. 162.

<sup>2</sup> Acharya Budharakkhita, *The Dhammapada*, Kandy 1985, p. 61.

<sup>3</sup> David J. Kalupahana, *A Path of Righteousness: Dhammapada*, Lanham 1986, p. 144.

<sup>4</sup> I.B. Horner, *Middle Length Sayings*, Vol. III, London 1959, p. 199; *Book of the Discipline*, Vol. IV, London 1951, p. 500.

<sup>5</sup> John Ross Carter & Mahinda Palihawadana, *The Dhammapada*, New York 1987, p. 48.

<sup>6</sup> *ibid.*, p. 494 note 15.

*mātāṅgo ti hatthi vuccati. nāgo ti mahantādhivacanam etaṇ*. In this view, therefore, *mātāṅgo nāgo* means “large elephant”.

Carter and Palihawadana justify their rejection of the cty on the grounds that the sandhi of *-o + a- > -a-* seems unusual. They draw attention to two references to the name of a forest named Mātāṅgāraṅṅa connected with the outcaste Mātāṅga, quoting DPPN as their authority. One of these references is Mil 130,7, where I can see no mention of the outcaste Mātāṅga, nor does the text seem to justify Malalasekera’s statement that Mātāṅgāraṅṅa, which occurs with Daṇḍakāraṅṅa, Mejjhāraṅṅa and Kalingāraṅṅa, is the same as Mejjhāraṅṅa. These four forests are the same as those at M I 378,20–21, to which DPPN makes no reference, although it does refer to Ps II 615 (= PTS ed. III 88,11), where Mātāṅgāraṅṅa is commented upon. It seems just as likely that Mātāṅga in this name is a geographical location, and I have considered elsewhere<sup>1</sup> a number of compounds where Mātāṅga (which presumably underlies Mātāṅga) seems to be a geographical feature. A specific geographical location, however, seems unlikely in the context of the Dh-p, since it is not clear why anyone should wander alone or have few desires like an elephant in the Mātāṅgāraṅṅa more than in any other place. If, then, we are dealing with a compound, it is more likely to mean nothing more than “elephant forest”, and it would be a synonym of *nāgavana* which occurs in Dh-p 324 and elsewhere in Pāli,<sup>2</sup> and also in one of Aśoka’s Pillar Edicts.<sup>3</sup>

It is perhaps worth considering whether the unusual sandhi is sufficient reason for rejecting the cty’s explanation. I cannot at the moment quote another example of the sandhi of *-o + a- > -a-*, but if the

<sup>1</sup> K.R. Norman, “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies (I)”, *JOL(B)*, IX, 1960, pp. 268–73 (pp. 271–73) (= CP I, pp. 15–20 [pp. 18–20]).

<sup>2</sup> See PTC II, p. 460, s.v. *nāgavana*.

<sup>3</sup> Pillar Edict V(1).

word were a compound, then we should have expected *mātaṅgāraññe*, and we must assume that the shortening to *mātaṅgaraññe* is metri causa, to avoid --- in the break in the middle of a Triṣṭubh pāda. If we assume that *mātaṅgāraññe* was an earlier form of the word(s), then we can state that the sandhi of *-o + a-* > *-ā-* is certainly not unparalleled, e.g. *ratāhaṃ* (< *rato + ahaṃ*) Sn 461, *anuttarāyaṃ* (*anuttaro + ayaṃ*) Sn 690, *orakāyaṃ* (< *orako + ayaṃ*) Sn 692, and probably *vivattacchaddāsi* (< *vivattacchaddo + asi*) Sn 378. There are other examples in Dhp itself: *yāyaṃ = yo ayaṃ* 56; *appassutāyaṃ* (*appassuto + ayaṃ*), 152; and with shortening of the vowel before a double consonant *y' assa = yo assa* 389.<sup>1</sup>

To support their translation Carter and Palihawadana quote PDhp 10–11: *mātaṅgāranne*,<sup>2</sup> but this is no more conclusive than Pāli *mātaṅgarañña*, since it too can be taken in both ways. On the face of it *mātaṅgāraṇye* in Udāna-v 14.16, which they also quote, is conclusive, because this can be only be taken as a compound. This form of the word cannot be due to the metre, for if the BHS redactor had wished to follow the explanation of the Pāli cties, then he could have written *mātaṅgo 'raṇye*, with no change of scansion. A moment's thought, however, shows us that this is not as conclusive as we might wish. If the BHS redactor received *mātaṅgāraññe* in his exemplar, but did not have access to the same commentarial tradition as we find in the Pāli cties, then it is inevitable that he would have taken it as a compound, and “translated” accordingly. Even if he received the same commentarial tradition, it is possible that, being trained in Skt grammar, he would have had the same distaste for the unusual sandhi, and would have rejected this explanation, like Carter and Palihawadana.

<sup>1</sup> For other examples see K.R. Norman, “The influence of the Pāli commentators and grammarians upon the Theravādin tradition”, *Buddhist Studies (Bukkyō Kenkyū)*, XV, 1985, pp. 109–23 (= CP III, pp. 95–107).

<sup>2</sup> See M. Cone, “Patna Dharmapada”, *JPTS* XIII, 1989, p. 107.

Another reason for the rejection of the commentarial explanation by modern translators is probably because they find it difficult to include two words for “elephant” in the same sentence. As noted above, some of the commentators avoided this problem by assigning the meaning “large” to *nāga*. We may, however, avoid this problem by assuming that *mātaṅga* is not the name of a particular elephant as the Dhp-a seems to imply, but a type or breed of elephant, perhaps one coming from the Mātāṅga region. The epithet would then give the hearer some idea of the quality of the elephant, as Meenakshi<sup>1</sup> suggests, just as *sindhava* “coming from Sindh” was used as an epithet of excellent horses. In this connection we should note the collocation of words for “elephant” in: *koñcaṃ kāhiti mātaṅgo kuñjaro saṭṭhihāyano*, Ja VI 497,2\*.

My conclusion, therefore, is that the evidence for the interpretation of *mātaṅg'araññe* in Dhp 329–30 is nor sufficient for us to be able to say decisively whether we are dealing with two separate words or a compound. Much depends upon the value which we place upon the commentarial tradition, and there are many scholars who believe that, although it has long been standard practice to consult the Theravāda commentarial interpretations in order to interpret a difficult passage in an early text, every possible effort should be made to avoid the influence of the traditional commentarial interpretations on their own analysis.<sup>2</sup> I would agree wholeheartedly with the view that commentaries are frequently misleading because they are usually the product of a different social and historical background, and the information they give is sometimes unreliable and occasionally incorrect.<sup>3</sup> I would, however, regard it as perverse to ignore completely all the information they give,

<sup>1</sup> K. Meenakshi, “Lexical borrowing from the non-Aryan into Indo-Aryan”, *Indian Linguistics* 50, 1989 [1991], pp. 113–26 [p. 120].

<sup>2</sup> See Grace G. Burford, *Desire, Death, and Goodness*, New York 1991, p. 11.

<sup>3</sup> K.R. Norman, “On translating from Pāli”, *One Vehicle*, Singapore 1984, pp. 77–87 (p. 80) (= CP III, pp. 60–81 [p. 68]).

and would rather hope that it might be possible to evaluate commentarial information, and to determine what is likely to be reliable, and what not.

In this particular case, I should like to propose the principle of *explicatio difficilior*, which states that when two or more explanations are equally possible, preference should be given to the one which involves the greater difficulty. In this particular case, by far the simpler explanation is to take *mātāngarañña* as a compound, which is what the Udāna-v redactor and all the modern translators I have quoted have done. The Pāli commentarial tradition, however, has adopted the more difficult explanation which involves taken *mātāng'* and *arañña* as two separate words, and presuming the existence of the sandhi of *-o + a- > -a-* (via *-ā-*, I believe). This sandhi is rare, although well authenticated, and it would seem perverse for the commentarial tradition to have proposed and followed this more difficult explanation, without alternative, unless it was made on good authority.

#### 5. *vidha* “buckle”

In the Nepali folios of the Vinayapiṭaka recently studied by Professor von Hinüber<sup>1</sup> we find the variants *veḍha* and *vehā* for Pāli *vidha* (which is said to mean “buckle”<sup>2</sup>). Taking these together with the readings *vītha* and *vīṭha* which are found in some oriental editions of the Vinaya, Professor von Hinüber was led to suggest a connection with BHS *veṭhaka*. If this is right, then presumably the correct reading is *vīṭha* or *\*veṭha*, with the *ī/e* alternation.<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Oskar von Hinüber: *The oldest Pāli manuscript. Four folios of the Vinayapiṭaka from the National Archives, Kathmandu*. Mainz, 1991.

<sup>2</sup> See PED, s.v. *vidha*<sup>2</sup>.

<sup>3</sup> K.R. Norman, “Some vowel values in MIA”, *Indian Linguistics*, 21, 1960, pp. 104–7 (CP I, pp. 21–24)

This is presumably to be derived from Skt *veṣṭaka*, which has a variety of meanings based upon the senses “covering, surrounding”. The multiplicity of developments from Skt *ṣṭ* which occur in Middle Indo-Aryan can be well seen by examining the developments of *leṣṭu* (*leṭṭhu*, *leḍhukka*, *leḍu*, *lelu* [via *lehu*], *leḍḍu* [via *\*leṭṭu*], *lehuḍa*)<sup>1</sup> and *\*luṣṭa* (*luṭṭha*, *loṭṭha*, *loḍa*, *loḍha*) which are found in Middle Indo-Aryan.<sup>2</sup>

It is possible that the word *saṃvelli*, which seems to be a garment worn by wrestlers, is also to be derived from the root *veṣṭ* (via *\*vel < veḷ*). It is also possible that we should consider here the variants *vegha-*, *vekha-*, and *veṭha-missa* at Th 143, which in EV I I derived from *veṣṭa*.<sup>3</sup> Professor Gombrich suggested that the correct reading was *vedha* “trembling”,<sup>4</sup> but this leaves the problem of the retroflex consonant in one of the v.l. unexplained.

#### 6. *seṭṭhi* “dregs”

This word is not listed in PED. It occurs in a list of things which are said in the Aggañña-sutta (§ 16)<sup>5</sup> to have been thrown at those indulging in *methuna*. Buddhaghosa explained it as ashes.<sup>6</sup>

It is to be derived < Skt *\*śiṣṭi < śiṣ* “to remain”, and means “remainder, dregs”. One might argue that Buddhaghosa’s gloss is justifiable, as ashes are the remainder from a fire, but the usage in New

<sup>1</sup> K.R. Norman, “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies I”, *JOI(B)* IX, 1960, pp. 268–73 (CP I, pp. 15–20 [p. 16]).

<sup>2</sup> K.R. Norman, “Middle Indo-Aryan Studies IV”, *JOI(B)* XIII, 1964, pp. 208–13 (CP I, pp. 36–41 [p. 38]).

<sup>3</sup> K.R. Norman, *Elders’ Verses I*, p. 154 (ad Th 143).

<sup>4</sup> RFG, “Old bodies like carts”, *JPTS* XI, 1987, pp. 1–4.

<sup>5</sup> *aññe paṃsum khipanti aññe seṭṭhiṃ khipanti aññe gomayaṃ khipanti*, D III 88,30 = 89,5.

<sup>6</sup> *seṭṭhin ti chārikam*, Sv 869,24.



Indo-Aryan<sup>1</sup> suggests that it is liquid dregs which are intended. If this is so, then Buddhaghosa was merely guessing the meaning from the context, perhaps with the knowledge of a marriage ceremony where ashes were thrown.

Cambridge

K.R. Norman

## A CITATION FROM THE \*BUDDHAVAMSA OF THE ABHAYAGIRI SCHOOL

It is well known that the Theravādins of Sri Lanka were divided into two main rival branches, the Mahāvihāravāsins (“Residents of the Great Monastery”) and the Abhayagirivāsins (“Residents of Abhayagiri [Monastery]”), and that after more than a thousand years of contention for legitimacy and patronage, the former won out, and the latter disappeared.<sup>1</sup> The Theravāda that we know today is the Mahāvihāra tradition, as settled in the main by the prolific commentator Buddhaghosa in the 5th century; the later Pāli literature of the sub-commentaries (*ṭīkā*s) and manuals, although subject to a variety of influences, also belongs to the Mahāvihāravāsini lineage.

No undisputed Abhayagiri text has survived. The Pāli *Saddhammopāyana*<sup>2</sup> and the *Questions of Upāli*<sup>3</sup> and *Vimuttimaggā*,<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For the two schools, see André Bareau, *Les sectes bouddhiques du Petit Véhicule (Publications de l'École Française d'Extrême-Orient XXXVIII)*, Paris, 1955, chapters XXIX and XXX. A third branch, the Jetavanīyas or Sāgalikas (Bareau, ch. XXXI) seems to have played a less significant role. For the Abhayagiri, see *Encyclopaedia of Buddhism*, Vol. 1, fasc. 1, [Colombo] 1961, pp. 21–25 (“Abhayagiri”), 25–28 (“Abhayagirivāsins”), and Walpola Rahula, *History of Buddhism in Ceylon*, Colombo, [1956] 1966, pp. 83–85, 92–99, etc.

<sup>2</sup> Translated into English by Ann Hazelwood, *JPTS* XII, pp. 65–168.

<sup>3</sup> See H. Bechert (ed.), *Upālipariprocchāsūtra, ein Text zur buddhistischen Ordensdisziplin*, aus dem Chinesischen übersetzt und den Pāli-Parallelen gegenübergestellt von Valentina Stache-Rosen, Göttingen, 1984, pp. 12–15, 28–31.

<sup>4</sup> Translated into English by N.R.M. Ehara, Soma Thera, and Kheminda Thera, *The Path of Freedom (Vimuttimaggā)*, [Colombo, 1961] Kandy, 1977; for a recent note see H. Bechert, “Vimuttimaggā and Amatākaraṇṇanā”, in N.H. Samtani and H.S. Prasad (edd.), *Amalā Prajñā: Aspects of Buddhist Studies (Professor P.V. Bapat Felicitation Volume)*, Delhi, 1989, pp. 11–14. Selected portions of the work are preserved in Tibetan translation: see P. Skilling, “The

<sup>1</sup> See CDIAL 12480.