

## The Verb *\*addhabhavi* as an Artificial Formation

Oskar von Hinüber

The first part of the Saṃyutta-nikāya, the Sagāthavagga, stands apart from the rest of the text, which was obviously felt at an early date already as the structure of Buddhaghosa's commentary, the Sāratthappakāsinī, seems to indicate.<sup>1</sup> The content of many individual suttantas is particularly close to the world of Vedic concepts,<sup>2</sup> which sometimes is the key to understanding this Pāli text, as in the following verses, which has puzzled scholars for a long time, almost since the beginning of the commentarial tradition in the Aṭṭhakathā. Both form and meaning of the word *addhabhavi* occurring once in the Devatā-Saṃyutta of the Sagāthavagga have resisted convincing explanation so far:

*kiṃsu sabbaṃ addhabhavi, kismā bhīyo na vijjati*  
*kiss'assa ekadhammassa, sabb'eva vasam anvagū ti*  
*nāmaṃ sabbaṃ addhabhavi, nāmā bhīyo na vijjati*  
*nāmassa ekadhammassa, sabb'eva vasam anvagū ti.*

SI 39,3\*-6\*

What has weighed down everything? What is most extensive? What is the one thing that has all under its control? Name has weighed down everything; nothing is more

---

<sup>1</sup> O.v. Hinüber, *A Handbook of Pāli Literature* (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 2, Berlin 1996), § 74, 230 (p. 115). — The abbreviations follow the system of the Critical Pāli Dictionary (CPD).

<sup>2</sup> On the interrelationship between Vedic and Buddhist texts cf. J. Bronkhorst: *Greater Magadha: Studies in the Culture of Early India*, Handbuch der Orientalistik II, Indien, Vol. 19 (Leiden 2007), pp. 207–18.

extensive than name. Name is the one thing that has all under its control.<sup>3</sup>

The wording of this verse was established by Léon Feer in 1884 and confirmed without any substantial change by G.A. Somaratne in his edition of the Saṃyutta-nikāya (1998). There are, however, some variants worthwhile noticing. First, the Sinhalese and the Lan Na (northern Thai) manuscript tradition (“L”)<sup>4</sup> preserve older forms, here *kissā* instead of *kismā*, as do the Sinhalese manuscripts used by L. Feer, and, moreover, both Lan Na manuscripts kept in Vat Lai Hin<sup>5</sup> have *annagu* instead of *anvagu*. More important, there is a variety of variants for *addhabhavi*: traces of a reading *anvabhavi* pervade all manuscript traditions; *andhabhavi* survives in the Siamese edition (S<sup>c</sup>), in manuscript L<sup>1</sup> dated A.D. 1549 and in the third Lanna manuscript of Vat Phra Singh dated 1602,<sup>6</sup> while *anvabhavi* is found in the oldest dated manuscript L<sup>2</sup> copied in

---

<sup>3</sup> Translation by Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The Connected Discourses of the Buddha* (Oxford 2000), Vol. I, p. 130, who prefers to read *addhabhavi* as printed in both PTS editions (E<sup>c</sup>) against the form *anvabhavi* of the Siamese edition (S<sup>c</sup>), p. 380, note 121. — W. Geiger: *Saṃyutta-Nikāya: Die Lehrreden des Buddha aus der Gruppierten Sammlung* (1930) “... fortgeführt von Nyāṇaṇṇika (Wolfenbüttel 1990), p. 61: ‘Was hat alles gemeistert? Was ist es, außer dem nichts weiter vorhanden ist? Was ist das einzige, dessen Gewalt alle folgen? Der Name hat alles gemeistert; der Name ist es, außer dem nichts weiter vorhanden ist. Der Name ist das einzige, dessen Gewalt alle folgen.’” W. Geiger notes that the reading *addhabhavi*, etc., is uncertain and that he follows in his translation the commentary provisionally (“fürs erste”).

<sup>4</sup> The manuscripts are described by G.A. Somaratne: *The Saṃyuttanikāya of the Suttapiṭaka*, Vol. I, *The Sagāthavagga* (Oxford 1998), pp. xxi–xxvii.

<sup>5</sup> A third Lan Na manuscript from Vat Phra Singh, Chiang Mai, copied in A.D. 1602, not used for any edition so far, confirms both *kissā* and *annagu*.

<sup>6</sup> The variant *aṭṭhabhavi* in the Sinhalese manuscripts used by L. Feer is almost certainly a mistake (writing or reading) for *aṇḍabhavi*, cf. note 16 below. — According to the variants listed in B<sup>c</sup> (edition of the Sixth Council 1954–56: “Chaṭṭha-saṅgāyana edition”) C<sup>c</sup> reads *anvabhavi*; S<sup>c</sup> has *andhabhavi*.

A.D. 1543.<sup>7</sup> The variation *anva-*, *andha-*, *addha-* and perhaps *aṇḍa-bhavi* points to a development typical for an artificial formation which can be observed in those words in Pāli which do not conform to the phonetic developments operating in Middle Indic and in addition defy explanation by analogy, such as the word *addhagu* replacing *anvagu* twice in the same verse in Burmese manuscripts<sup>8</sup> and thus showing a similar pattern as *anvabhavi*, *addhabhavi*, etc.<sup>9</sup>

In order to determine the starting point of this puzzling variety of forms, it is necessary, as a first step, to go back beyond the manuscript tradition and look into the commentaries on this verse. The earliest extant explanation is found in the *Sāratthappakāsinī*:

*anvavaggassa paṭhame: ... anvabhavīti nāmaṃ sabbaṃ  
abhībhavati anupatati. opapātikena vā hi kittimena vā  
nāmena mutto satto vā saṅkhāro vā natthi.*

Spk I 95,6-8

... the name overpowers, pursues everything. For there is neither being nor object without a spontaneous or artificial name.

The text in the Simon Hewavitarne Bequest Edition (SHB, C<sup>e</sup> 1924) concurs with *anva-*, while S<sup>e</sup> has *andha-*, and B<sup>e</sup> consistently inserted *addha-* as in the basic text of S.

<sup>7</sup> The reading *adanvabhavi* occurring once in L<sup>1</sup> in the first pāda looks like a crossing of *anva-* and *addha-*.

<sup>8</sup> Quoted from *ka* in B<sup>e</sup> (*ka* is for the better part identical with the edition of the Fifth Council [on stone-slabs]: W.B. Bollée, “Some less known Burmese Pāli texts”, in: *Pratidānam: Indian, Iranian and Indo-European Studies Presented to Franciscus Bernardus Kuiper on His Sixtieth Birthday* (The Hague 1968), p. 493–99, particularly p. 496), cf. *addhabhu* for *anvagu* in B<sup>e</sup> (1939) and in E<sup>e</sup> (1998) from B<sup>2</sup> (Phayre manuscript, copied A.D. 1841).

<sup>9</sup> On “artificial formations” such as *kismā* and *anvagu*, cf. O.v. Hinüber: *Das ältere Mittelindisch im Überblick* (Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften. Philosophisch-historische Klasse. Sitzungsberichte, 467. Band. Vienna, 2nd ed., 2001), § 301 (*kismā*); § 254 (*anvagu*).

The sub-commentary elaborates:

*addhabhavīti ... abhibhavati anupatāti etena abhibhavo  
anupatanam pavatti evāti dasseti*, Spk-pt B<sup>e</sup> I 132,5

The verb *anvabhavi* / *addhabhavi* is paraphrased in both commentaries by two words, *abhibhavati* and *anupatati*; the first seems to be chosen to describe the meaning, the second to explain the form of the preverb, which at the time of the Aṭṭhakathā almost certainly was *anvabhavi* as in the oldest manuscript of the Saṃyutta-nikāya. If this is correct there could have been awareness in the commentaries that the form *anvabhavi* was ultimately based on the aorist *anu-a-bhavi*, which, in stark contrast, is no longer possible to infer once the rather far removed *addhabhavi* intruded into and widely spread in modern editions. While the formal explanation of the commentary is correct, the semantics seem problematic, because the reason for taking *anubhavati* (“experience, enjoy”) and *abhibhavati* (“overpower”) as equivalents in meaning is not immediately obvious.

However, the same explanation is found in a second reference, this time in a paragraph of the Saḷāyatanavagga of the Saṃyutta-nikāya, which is certainly a part of this Nikāya younger than the Sagāthavagga:

*sabbaṃ bhikkhave andhabhūtaṃ ... cakkhu bhikkhave  
andhabhūtaṃ, rūpā andhabhūtā ...*

S IV 20,32–21,2

all is weighed down ... the eye is weighed down, forms are weighed down ...<sup>10</sup>

The reading *andhabhūta* is confirmed by the Sinhalese (C<sup>e</sup>), Siamese (S<sup>e</sup>) and Cambodian (K<sup>e</sup>) editions according to the variants listed in B<sup>e</sup>, which again prefers *addhabhūta* consistently, thus concurring with the Burmese manuscripts used in E<sup>e</sup> (1884).

<sup>10</sup> Translated by Bhikkhu Bodhi, as note 3 above, Vol. II, p. 1144. — The word *andhabhūta* occurs also in the *uddāna* of this section S IV 26,22\*.

The reading of the commentary differs from the wording of the basic text with:

*addhabhūtan ti abhibhūtaṃ ajjhotthaṭaṃ upaddutan ti attho.*

Spk II 363,12

... overpowered, covered; the meaning is “oppressed”.

The reading *addhabhūta* is preferred even in E<sup>e</sup> here against the Sinhalese manuscripts reading *andhabhūta* as at Spk I 95.

The sub-commentary explains:

*adhisaddena samānattho addhasaddo ti āha addhabhūtan ti abhibhūtan ti-ādi.*

Spk-pt B<sup>e</sup> II 289,1

The word *addha* has the same meaning as *adhi*, therefore he (Buddhaghosa) says *addhabhūta* means *abhibhūta*, etc.

This wording shows that the commentator read *abhibhūtaṃ* instead of *abhibhūtaṃ* in the Sāratthappakāsini.<sup>11</sup> The same wording of this explanation is found in the sub-commentary to the Papañcasūdanī (Ps-pt, see below) and echoed much later in Aggavaṃsa’s Saddanīti:

*adhi icc’ etassa bhūdhātumaye pare kvaci addhādeso hoti.*

Sadd 627,18ff., cf. 97,13ff.

*adhi* is, if followed by the root *bhū*, sometimes substituted by *addha*,

where Aggavaṃsa quotes the passage from the Majjhima-nikāya and both passages from the Saṃyutta-nikāya reading consistently *addha*-<sup>o</sup>. This explanation, and particularly Aggavaṃsa’s influential grammar, is the reason for the fairly regular prevalence of *addha*-<sup>o</sup> in the Burmese manuscript tradition probably at the latest since the twelfth century.

---

<sup>11</sup> Although *abhibhūtaṃ* is consistently preferred in all editions this must be changed to *abhibhūtaṃ*, see below. — The *pratīka* is *andhabhūtan ti* in S<sup>e</sup>.

There is no trace of a variant *\*anvabhūta* here or in the third and last reference from the Suttapiṭaka, the Devadahasuttanta of the Majjhima-nikāya:

*kathañca bhikkhave saphalo upakkamo hoti saphalaṃ padhānaṃ? idha bhikkhave bhikkhu na heva anaddhabhūtaṃ attānaṃ dukkhena addhabhāveti dhammikañ ca sukhaṃ na pariccajati, tasmīñ ca sukhe anadhimucchito hoti.*

M II 223,7–10

And how is exertion fruitful, bhikkhus, how is striving fruitful? Here, bhikkhus, a bhikkhu is not overwhelmed by suffering and does not overwhelm himself with suffering; and he does not give up pleasure that accords with Dhamma, yet he is not infatuated with that pleasure.<sup>12</sup>

With the commentary:

*tattha anaddhabhūtan ti anadhibhūtaṃ (S<sup>e</sup> anabhi-<sup>o</sup>, w.r.). dukkhena anabhibhūto (B<sup>e</sup> anadhi-<sup>o</sup>, w.r.) ... na taṃ addhabhāveti nādhivhavatīti (B<sup>e</sup>, S<sup>e</sup> nābhi-<sup>o</sup>, so read?) attho.*

Ps IV 10,11<sup>13</sup>

Here the sub-commentary is consistent with the explanation offered for the second Saṃyutta-nikāya reference:

*anaddhabhūtan ti ettha adhisaddena samānattho addhasaddo ti āha anaddhabhūtan ti anadhibhūtan ti. yathā*

<sup>12</sup> Translation by Bhikkhu Ñānamoli and Bhikkhu Bodhi, *The Middle Length Discourses of the Buddha* (Oxford, 2nd ed. 2001), p. 833; the translation by Isaline Blew Horner, *The Collection of the Middle Length Sayings*, Vol. III (London 1959), p. 10, "... a monk does not let his unmastered self be mastered by anguish ...", is closer to the original.

<sup>13</sup> The text of E<sup>c</sup> concurs with the Aluvihara edition of Ps (1926), which predates E<sup>c</sup>, and with C<sup>c</sup> (SHB, 1952).

āpāyiko attabhāvo mahatā dukkhena **abhibhuyyati na tathā**

...

Ps-pt B<sup>e</sup> II 215,25

Lastly, a verse from the Suttanipāta can be added, if *addhā bhavanto* printed thus as two words in all editions (probably influenced by the Mahānidessa) is taken to be one word with a metrical lengthening for *addhabhavanto*, as correctly seen by K.R. Norman:<sup>14</sup>

*athappiyaṃ vā appiyaṃ vā | addhābhavanto abhisambhaveyya.*

Sn 968

Then being predominant (*addhābhavanto*) he should endure the pleasant and unpleasant.

(trans. K.R. Norman)

By far the oldest commentary on any form of *addhabhavati*, the Mahānidessa, predating Buddhaghosa by some centuries, says on this verse:

*addhā ti ekaṃsavacanaṃ ... abhisambhavanto vā abhibhaveyya abhibhavanto* (B<sup>e</sup> *adhi*-<sup>o</sup>, w.r.) *vā abhisambhaveyya.*

Nidd I 490,29–91,2

By explaining *addhā* as a separate word, the Mahānidessa confirms both that *addhā plus bhavati* was understood as meaning *abhibhavati* and that the Vedic meaning of the verb was obsolete, while nothing in the commentary on *addhā* points to a connection with *adhi*-<sup>o</sup> as yet, which gradually became the predominant explanation in later commentaries.

The Paramatthajotikā II, as expected, follows both the Mahānidessa and Buddhaghosa, and does not offer anything new:

---

<sup>14</sup> K.R. Norman (trsl.), *The Group of Discourses* (Sutta-nipāta) (Oxford 2nd ed. 2001) [reviews of the first ed. of 1992: L.S. Cousins, *JRAS* 4 (1994), pp. 291ff.; J.W. de Jong, *IJJ* 38 (1995), pp. 283–85]; cf. also K.R. Norman, “On translating the Suttanipāta”, (*BStRev* 21.1 (2004), pp. 69–84) with a long note on *addhabhavanto*, pp. 391ff.

*addhābhavanto ti evam piyāppiyaṃ abhibhavanto ekamsen’  
eva abhibhaveyya.*

Pj II 573,15ff.

Again, here is no trace of a variant *anva-*<sup>o</sup> / *andha-*<sup>o</sup>.<sup>15</sup> The explanation *ekamsena* (“definitely”) is borrowed from the Mahāniddeśa and shows that this commentary was used.

So far the evidence points to two separate strands of the text tradition, one reflected only in the verse from the Sagāthavagga, the second comprising the remaining three references<sup>16</sup> of this rare verb.

As discussed at length by K. R. Norman in his note on Sn 968, the irregular sound change of *ajjha-* < *adhy-a-* to *addha-* under the influence of Sinhala Prakrit suggested in the *CPD* should be rejected.<sup>17</sup> However, the development of Sanskrit *adhy-a-* to Pāli *addha-* as assumed by K. R. Norman is equally impossible and unnecessary,<sup>18</sup> once the text tradition is investigated.

<sup>15</sup> The consistent use of *addha-* may be due to the fact that the text tradition of the Suttanipāta is Burmese according to H. Smith in W. Stede (ed.), *Cullaniiddeśa* (London 1918), p. xvi with note 2.

<sup>16</sup> A fourth reference may be due to a mistake for *aṇḍabhūta*, which is found in S<sup>c</sup> *kāyo addhabhūto pariyanaddho*, S III 1,20 (*aṇḍabhūto ti aṇḍo viya bhūto dubbalo*, Spk II 250,11), cf. *CPD* s.vv. *aṇḍabhūta* and *addhabhūta* “the relation between *aṇḍabhūta* and *addhabhūta* (resp. *andhabhūta*) in the canonical texts before the time of the Ct. is difficult to determine” (pp. 123bff.), cf. also the title of the *Aṇḍabhūta-ja*, which occurs also as *Andhabhūta-ja* in Sinhalese manuscripts and literature: Charles Edward Godakumbura, *Catalogue of Ceylonese Manuscripts: The Royal Library, Copenhagen. Catalogue of Oriental Manuscripts, Xylographs etc. in Danish Collections*, Vol. 1 (Copenhagen 1980), p. 41b: “[T]he change of orthography is possibly the result of Sinhalese scribes copying from Burmese MSS”; K. D. Somadasa, *Catalogue of the Hugh Nevill Collection of Sinhalese Manuscripts in The British Library*, Vol. III (London 1990), p. 79 (Or. 6604[54]).

<sup>17</sup> “Old error for *ajjhabhavi*, cf. *sinhal. d < j*”, *CPD* s.v. *addhā-bhavati*.

<sup>18</sup> *A Dictionary of Pāli (NPDE)* by Margaret Cone seems to follow the errors of the *Critical Pāli Dictionary* and Sn (trsl.): “or *adhi-ā-bhavati*, prob. formed



The starting point for an explanation of the form *anva-° / addha-°* must be sought in the aorist *addhabhavi* as also clearly seen by K.R. Norman. This aorist, however, is not built on \**adhy-a-bhavi*, but on *anv-a-bhavi*, the aorist of *anu-bhū*, as indicated by variants still preserved in the manuscripts and supported by the commentary on the Sagāthavagga. Although the verb *anubhavati* is by no means rare in Pāli, and although even the commentary was aware of this form, if the interpretation of *anupatati* suggested above is correct, the original reading *anvabhavi* was gradually superseded by *andhabhavi* and finally completely replaced by *addhabhavi* in the authoritative Chaṭṭha-saṅgāyana edition of 1954–56 thus ending (for the time being) a long development beginning even before Buddhaghosa. At the same time, it is at first difficult to understand why *anvabhavi* is paraphrased by *adhibhavati* or *abhibhavati*, but not by *anubhavati*.

The reason for this surprising explanation becomes obvious at once if the Buddhist verse preserved in the Sagāthavagga is compared to a parallel from the late Vedic Chāndogya-Upaniṣad:

*mano vāva vāco bhūyaḥ. yathā vai dve vāmalake dve vā  
kole dvau vākṣau muṣṭir anubhavati evaṃ vācaṃ ca nāma  
ca mano anubhavati.*

ChUp 7.3.1

The mind is clearly greater than speech, for as a closed fist would envelop a couple of myrobalans or jujubes, or a pair of dice, so indeed does the mind envelop both speech and name.

(trans. Patrick Olivelle)<sup>19</sup>

This translation follows the commentarial tradition of Śaṅkara who explains in his Chāndogyopaniṣadbhāṣya: ... *vibhītakaphale muṣṭir anubhavati muṣṭis te phale vyāpnoti muṣṭau hi te antarbhavataḥ*.

---

from aor. where there is assimilation rather than palatalization". Neither the preverb *-ā-* nor the assimilation exist in this form, cf. note 26 below.

<sup>19</sup> Upaniṣads, Oxford World's Classics (Oxford 1996), p. 158.

This is indeed the key to understanding the verse from the Sagāthavagga, which almost seems to be an answer to the Upaniṣad by putting, however, in contrast the “name” above the “mind”: “the name encompasses everything, there is nothing beyond the name”, as it is said in the Buddhist context. Although the translation of the verse offered by Bhikkhu Bodhi and others changes only marginally with the correct “encompass” replacing “weigh down,” “predominate” (CPD) or “control” (NPDE), the exact meaning can be seen only before the Vedic background of the verse.

This particular meaning of the verb *anubhavati* does not survive in classical Sanskrit or in Pāli, where “to reach, to get, to experience” (CPD) or “experiences, enjoys, suffers” (NPED) are given, which concurs with the meanings enumerated in Sanskrit dictionaries, which, however, also list the specialized meaning found only in the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad, which was overlooked in all Pāli dictionaries and translations alike it seems.

This Vedic meaning of *anu* +  $\sqrt{bhū}$  was obsolete once the Vedic language ceased to be fully understood, and this word thus shared the fate of other parts of the Vedic vocabulary in Pāli, such as the derivatives of Vedic  $\sqrt{aj}$  still found in old layers of Pāli, but no longer understood properly.<sup>20</sup> One of the best examples is the frequently discussed Vinaya term *pārājika*, the name of the offences entailing expulsion from the Saṃgha by “being driven away” derived from Vedic *parā-√aj* as seen already at the very beginning of European research on Buddhism.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>20</sup> O. v. Hinüber, “A Vedic Verb in Pāli: *udājita*”, in: *Ludwik Sternbach Volume* (Lucknow 1981), pp. 819–22 = *Kleine Schriften* (Stuttgart 2009), pp. 616–19.

<sup>21</sup> The correct formal explanation of the word found by Eugène Burnouf (1801–1852): *Introduction à l’histoire du buddhisme indien* (Paris 1844); 2nd ed. 1876 (repr. Cambridge 2013), p. 268, was accepted by Robert Cæsar Childers (1838–1876) in 1875 as “doubtless correct”, and supported by Hendrik Kern (1833–1917): *Toevoegselen II* (1916), p. 19, but forgotten after Sylvain Lévi (1863–1936): “Observations sur une langue précanonique du bouddhisme”, *JAs* 1912, pp. 495–514, p. 505 following T. W. Rhys Davids (1834–1922): *Vinaya Texts* (Sacred Books of the East XIII, Oxford 1881), Vol. I, p. 3, n. 2

The lost Vedic meaning of the word *anvabhavi* left the commentators obviously helpless, and they had to struggle with the explanation of this word because the meaning of *anubhavati* current in later times was incomprehensible in this particular context. The problem was solved by taking *anvabhavi* as meaning *abhibhavati*.

---

where Burnouf's explanation is rejected and the one of the commentarial tradition preferred, because according to Rhys David the root  $\sqrt{aj}$  is Vedic only and never occurs with the preverb *parā-*. In 1888 Rhys Davids could not know that there are besides *parā-√aj* also *ud-√aj*, *nir-√aj*, and *pra-√aj* surviving in Pāli. Of course, the word formation of *pārājika* cannot be explained on the basis of *parā-√ji* (*parā-jit* or *parājita* > \**parāji[tika]*; *parājayika* > *pārājayika*), cf. also the surveys by A. Heirman, "On *pārājika*" *BStRev* 16.1 (1999), pp. 51–59, and O.v. Hinüber, "Die Sprachgeschichte des Pāli im Spiegel der südostasiatischen Handschriftentradition", *AWL* 1988, no. 8, p. 3, note 2. — The starting point of the traditional Theravāda explanation seems to be ambiguous forms such as *parājeti*, corresponding to Sanskrit \**parā-ājayati* (causative) or *parā-jayati: sāmikaṃ parājeti ... parajjati*, Vin III 50.8ff. "he has the owner driven away ... is driven away (himself)" (< *parā-ajyate*, Saddanāṭi index s.v. *parajjati* [1966], not recognized in the *Pāli Tipiṭakaṃ Concordance* [1969] s.v. *parājeti*) with the commentary *parājeti = jināti*, *parajjati = parājayam pāpunāti*, Sp 339,12–20 followed in the translation I. B. Horner, *The Book of the Discipline*, Vol. I (London 1938), p. 82ff. "defeats ... is defeated". The correct derivation from  $\sqrt{aj}$  is neither recognized in the commentary nor in the translation. In later Pāli *parajjhati*, Ja II 403,22 (read *parajjati*; Burmese mss. *parājeti*), is used as a passive form of *parā-ji* in the Paccuppannavatthu. On the quite different and later explanation of *pārājika* by the Mahāsāṃghikalokottaravādins see G. Roth, *ZDMG* 118 (1968), p. 341. — Other examples of Vedic usage preserved in Pāli are certain meanings of the word *gāma* discussed in O.v. Hinüber, "Building the Theravāda Commentaries: Buddhaghosa and Dhammapāla as authors, compilers, redactors, editors and critics", *JABS* 36 (2013 [2015]), pp. 3–37, particularly pp. 17ff.; cf. further Th. Oberlies, "Die Prakrit-Sprachen und das vedische Sanskrit", in: *Toḥfa-e-dil. Festschrift Helmut Nespital* (Reinbek 2001), pp. 36–372 and Th. Oberlies, *Pāli: A Grammar of the Language of the Theravāda Tipiṭaka* (Indian Philology and South Asian Studies 3, Berlin 2001), p. 9.

This idea is certainly much older than Buddhaghosa's version of the *Atṭhakathā*, because the first indirect hint to this understanding of *anvabhavi* is found in the *Mahāniddeśa*, which presupposes a text having *addhābhavanto* and lists *abhibhavati* as a synonym and thus links *anvabhavi* to *addhābhavanto* by this explanation.

In three of the four references of the strange verb *anva-bhavati*, the forms continued to develop to such a degree that the original shape of the word was completely buried. Only in the *Sagāthavagga* was the form *anva-bhavi* protected, probably by the verb *anupatati* in the commentary, which kept the ultimate derivation from *anu-a-bhavi* alive. This, however, cannot be the oldest form, because *anva-*<sup>o</sup> regularly develops into *anna-*<sup>o</sup> in Pāli as in Sanskrit *anvagāt* > Pāli *annagu*. Therefore, *anvabhavi*, the only surviving form, is already a very early back formation from *\*annabhavi*, if the similar change in the absolutes from *-ttā* into *-tvā* is compared.<sup>22</sup>

This process would lead to a new and artificially created verb *\*anva-bhavati*, perhaps in order to separate *\*anva-bhavati* semantically and formally from *anu-bhavati* in Pāli, thus preserving the (at the time still known) Vedic meaning “to encompass”, different from Pāli *anubhavati* “to reach, to get, to experience.” The new verb *anva-bhavati* might have been shaped on the model of forms such as *anvagata* beside the aorist *anvagam*<sup>23</sup> and *anvagu* or *ajjha-patto* < *ajjhapattā*, which are reduplicated aorists (*adhy-a-paptat*) transformed into past participles *ajjha-*

<sup>22</sup> Experimenting with artificial forms can be traced back to the time of Aśoka, cf. O.v. Hinüber, “Linguistic Experiments: Language and Identity in Aśokan Inscriptions and in Early Buddhist Texts”, *Re-imagining Aśoka: Memory and History*, ed. by Patrick Olivelle, Janice Leoshko, Himanshu Prabha Ray (Delhi 2012), pp. 195–203.

<sup>23</sup> Ja V 172,17\*, 18\* (E<sup>e</sup> = C<sup>e</sup> [SHB] = B<sup>e</sup> s.v.l.), cf. *CPD* s.v.; a manuscript from Vat Lai Hin copied in 1550 has *anugataṃ* instead of *anvagataṃ* (O.v. Hinüber, “Die Pali-Handschriften des Klosters Lai Hin bei Lampang in Nord-Thailand” (Wiesbaden 2013), no. 98).

*patta*,<sup>24</sup> but analysed (synchronically) as verb forms with a preverb *ajjha-* while based (diachronically) on a preverb plus augment.

Therefore \**anvabhūta* (*addha-/andha-bhūta*) found in the Saḷāyatana-avagga of the Saṃyutta-nikāya might have been formed first, on which again the other forms such as \**anvabhāveti* (*addha-bhāveti*) in the Devadahasuttanta of the Majjhima-nikāya or \**anvābhavanto* (*addhābhavanto*) in the Suttanipāta could be built. If so, the translation and interpretation of the respective texts would change marginally with the original meaning being: “the eye is encompassed ... by what? By birth ...” (*kena andhabhūtam? jātiyā ...*) in the Saḷāyatana-avagga of the Saṃyutta-nikāya, and “he has the un-encompassed self encompassed by suffering” in the Devadahasuttanta of the Majjhima-nikāya.

In course of time, it seems, when all knowledge of the Vedic vocabulary had finally faded away and the intention lying behind the creation of the verb \**anvabhavati* was forgotten, a transformation process started perhaps from the Devadahasuttanta of the Majjhima-nikāya, where the supposed original \**ananvabhūtam* is followed by *anadhimucchito* which is clearly parallel (“not encompassed ... not infatuated”). The similarity of the ligatures *-nva-* and *-ndha-* in many old scripts may have facilitated a reinterpretation of the no longer understood *ananvabhūta* as *andha-*<sup>o</sup> influenced by the following *adhi-mucchito*.<sup>25</sup> This text may have induced the commentary to explain the participle formally as *an-adhibhūtam* and as meaning (*dukkhena*) *anabhibhūtam*. Only at the level of the sub-commentary does the interpretation as *adhibhūta* begin to spread. It makes sense that the sub-commentary to the Devadahasuttanta says *adhisaddena samānattho addhasaddo*, because Buddhaghosa’s text

<sup>24</sup> O.v. Hinüber, “Reste des reduplizierten Aorists im Pāli”, *MSS* 32 (1974), pp. 65–72 = “Traces of the Reduplicated Aorist in Pāli”, in *Selected Papers*, 2nd ed. 2005, pp. 52–61, cf. also Oberlies, *Pāli*, as n. 21 above, p. 242, n. 1.

<sup>25</sup> A confusion of *-va-* and *-dha-* is widely spread in the Buddhist text tradition, cf., e.g., Stephen Hillyer Levitt, “Is It a Crow (P. *dhamka*) or a Nurse (Skt. *dhātrī*), or Milk (Skt. *kṣīra*) or a Toy-Plough (P. *vaṃka*)?”, *JLBS* 16 (1993), pp. 56–89.

already has *anaddhabhūtan ti anadhibhūtaṃ*. Although the commentary to the Saḷāyatanavagga has *addhabhūtan ti abhibhūta*,<sup>26</sup> the sub-commentary introduces *adhi-* here as well, using the same text as in the sub-commentary to the Devadahasuttanta. Only in the Devadahasuttanta the form *addha-*<sup>o</sup> intrudes into the text, while the Saḷāyatanavagga preserves the older *andha-*<sup>o</sup>.<sup>27</sup> This shows that the commentaries influenced the wording and opened the way for further changes in the texts themselves. In course of time the form *addha-* reached even the verse in the Sagāthavagga, which originally stood apart.<sup>28</sup>

Summing up, it is possible to trace the origin and development of the modern form *addhabhavati*.<sup>29</sup> The connection of the verse from the Sagāthavagga with ideas expressed in the Chāndogya-Upaniṣad is beyond reasonable doubt and another close link between the Vedic and Buddhist traditions. At the same time, this link establishes the verb *anubhavati* “to encompass” as the starting point and not *adhi-bhavati*. The Pāli verb *anvabhavati* / *addhabhavati* was created as an artificial formation by reinterpreting one particular form of this verb, *anv-abhavi*, as *anva-bhavi*, most likely in order to preserve the particular meaning Vedic *anubhavati* (“to encompass”) by formal differentiation from Pāli *anubhavati* (“experiences, enjoys, suffers”). Therefore, all attempts at a phonetic explanation of the preverb *addha-* as continuing *adhi-* start

<sup>26</sup> The wording *abhibhūtaṃ ajjhotthaṃ (upaddutaṃ)*, Spk II 363,27, is corroborated by *ajjhotthaṃ abhibhūtaṃ*, Sv 799,11, and later by Dhammapāla’s explanation of *ajjhabhū*, It 76,6\* *abhibhavi ajjhotthari*, It-a II 75,5, which almost excludes an original reading *adhi-* instead of *abhi-bhūta* at Spk II 363,27. At the same time, the aorist *ajjhabhū* shows that *adhy-a-bhū* did not develop into *addha-*<sup>o</sup> in Pāli, see n. 18 above.

<sup>27</sup> Examples for a variation *-ddha-* / *-ndha-* are listed in CPD s.vv. *upanaddha*, *kaṇṇ’addhika* and in NPED s.v. *naddhi*.

<sup>28</sup> For *anvabhavi* > *addhabhavi*, cf. *anvāgatā*, Ja IV 385,18\* > *addhāgatā* in the Sinhalese manuscripts C<sup>ks</sup>. The oldest dated manuscript from Vat Lai Hin confirms *anvāgatā*, cf. *Pali-Handschriften*, as n. 23 above, no. 108.

<sup>29</sup> It is no longer necessary to classify this word as “unklar” as in *Mittelindisch*, as n. 9 above, § 248.

from a wrong presupposition and, consequently, cannot possibly work. Even if some details of this development, which continues right into the twentieth century, necessarily remain conjectural due to the lack of sufficient material, the broad lines can be clearly recognized.

This gradual transformation of the original *\*annabhavi* via *anvabhavi* and *andhabhavi* finally ending up in *addhabhavi* was obviously a protracted and slow process, still mirrored, not only in our manuscript tradition, but even in modern editions, with particularly the Burmese tradition continuing to change *andha-* into *addha-* sometimes as late as in the Chaṭṭhasaṅgāyana edition of 1954–56, thus following, here as well, the unfortunate tendency to level quite a few historical forms.<sup>30</sup> Thus this example demonstrates again how Pāli, which continues to develop, if only marginally, is full of life right into our present time.<sup>31</sup>

---

<sup>30</sup> Some examples are listed in O.v. Hinüber, “Sprachgeschichte,” as n. 21 above, p. 25ff.

<sup>31</sup> This article is based on a lecture delivered under the title “Scribes, leaves and libraries. The ancient Pāli tradition of Southeast Asia” on 22 August 2014 at the 17th Congress of the International Association of Buddhist Studies held from 18 to 23 August 2014 in Vienna.