

## DHAMMAPADA AND COMMENTARY: SOME TEXTUAL PROBLEMS AND BROUGH'S COMMENTS ON THEM

by

MAHINDA PALIHAWADANA

The Prakrit version of the Dhammapada, which has been called the Kharosthī Manuscript of the Dhammapada (Senart, 1898; Luders, 1899)<sup>1</sup> or the Khotan Dharmapada (Bailey, 1945)<sup>1</sup> is an extraordinarily interesting document to the student of the Pali or Theravada Dhammapada. In his masterly edition of this work<sup>2</sup>, Professor John Brough has included a voluminous commentary in which he often discusses extremely important problems of textual criticism etc. which have a direct bearing on the Pali Dhammapada as well. While these erudite and instructive comments represent a monumental step forward in Dhammapada studies, they are quite unaccountably laced with not a few startlingly harsh comments on the traditional Pali commentary and on the literary qualities of the Dhammapada verses themselves.

The following paragraphs originate from a study of some of his comments—both the sober and the harsh. They are selected at random, and of course, by no means constitute a comprehensive comment on the work of Brough (which the present writer admires in all its aspects except one, namely the prejudicial and at times erroneous nature of the pungent criticisms mentioned above).

(1) Pali *bhamassu*—Dh. 371 b.<sup>3</sup>

Verse 371 of the Pali Dhammapada reads as follows :

jhāya bhikkhu mā ca pamādo/ mā te kāmaguṇe bhamassu cittaṃ/  
mā lohaguḷaṃ gilī pamatto/ mā kandi dukkham idaṃ ti ḍayhamāno//<sup>4</sup>

Its Prakrit version is as follows :

ja'i bhikhu ma yi pramati/ ma de kamaguṇa bhametsu cita/<sup>5</sup>  
ma lohaguḍa gili pramata/ kani dukham ida di ḍajamaṇo//

1. For bibliographical particulars of these works, see Brough's publication mentioned below (in Note 2), p. viii.
2. John Brough, The Gāndhārī Dharmapada (GD), edited with an Introduction and Commentary. London Oriental Series, Vol. 7 : London, Oxford University Press, 1962.
3. The sections are headlined by the word which is the focus of the textual discussion, referred to by the Dhammapada (Dh.), verse number (e.g. 371) and line (e.g. b, i.e., line 2).
4. Verses or parts of them are quoted as found in the Pali Text Society edition of the Dhammapada, London, 1914.
5. Brough, p. 129, GD, 75.

And the Sanskrit version is :

ātāpī vihara tvam apraniatto/ mā te kāmaguṇo matheta cittam/  
mā loha guḍām gileh pramattah/ krandaṃ vai narakesu  
pacyamānah//<sup>1</sup>

The Pali verse can be translated as follows, in line with the interpretation of the traditional commentary :

Meditate, O monk, and be not inattentive. Let not your mind whirl in the strand of sensuality. Do not swallow an iron-ball, being inattentive. Cry not, as you burn, "Oh, this is a misery!"

Brough, pp. 194 ff., discusses the difficulties which he sees in this verse, especially in line **b**, which he considers to be so "troublesome" that "it would be rash to be dogmatic about its original form". The gist of his case is : (1) There are grave doubts as to whether the verb in line **b** is *bhavassu* or *bhamassu*. "The Pali text was earlier printed with *bhavassu*"; *bhamassu* was "imported into the Pali editions" after Senart surmised in 1898 that the verb of the sentence under discussion was likely to be a causative form of the root *bhram-* (to whirl). (2) Whether the verb is *bhavassu* or *bhamassu* difficulties arise with regard to the sense and grammar of the word. (3) In regard to the grammar, the only interpretation that is at least comprehensible is the suggestion made by Weber and noted in Max Muller's translation in 1881. Assuming *bhavassu* to be the authentic form, he suggested that it may be the equivalent of Sanskrit *bhāvayasva*, imperative 2nd singular *ātmanepada* of the causative form of the root *bhū:* (to be), probably metrically shortened from *\*bhāvessu* to *bhavassu*. This would allow the alternatives: 'O bhikkhu, do not exercise your mind in the *kāmaguṇas* (acc. pl.)'; or 'O mind, do not exercise yourself (*te*) in the *kāmaguṇas*.' (4) The commentary "recklessly" interprets *bhavassu* (or *bhamassu*), an imperative in the second person, with *bhavatu* (or *bhamatu*), which is in the third person. (5) The commentary also has the word *te* before *kāmaguṇe* which makes it look like the acc. pl. of *tat*, whereas it makes better sense as the gen. sg. of *tvam*, in which case it should stand before *cittam*.

The Sinhala sources related to the Dhammapada,<sup>2</sup> which Brough has not consulted, (nor the others before him), provide decisive information in regard to the first three points. The Saddharmaratnāvaliya contains a translation of the line in question and the Dhammapada Purāṇa Sannaya has

1. Verse XXXI. 31 of Udanavarga, ed. Franz Bernhard, Göttingen, Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht, (p. 418, Band I).
2. There are three early Sinhala works related to the Dhammapada, (i) Dhampiyā Aḷuvā Gāṭapadaya (DAG) of King Kassapa V (913-923), (ii) Saddharma-ratnāvaliya (SRV) of Dharmasena (c. 12th or 13th century) and (iii) Dhammapada Purāṇa Sannaya (DPS) of unknown authorship (c. 13th or 14th c.). On the dates of these works, see C. E. Godakumbura, Sinhalese Literature, Colombo Apothecaries Co. Ltd., 1955, pp. 26, 31, 82.

the text as well as a word by word translation (*sannaya*). The latter is decisive enough to clinch the whole issue regarding the original form of the word debated as well as its sense and grammar. The translations given by these works are :

SRV : Do not cause your mind to turn in the five-fold strand of sensuality.<sup>1</sup>

DPS : Do not cause your mind to whirl in the five areas of sensuality.<sup>2</sup>

SRV uses *paṭatva(va)* to translate the verb of the Pali line. DPS uses *bamavayi*. In the latter, the verbal base (*bamava-*, which would correspond to *bhamāpaya-* of the Pali grammarians) restricts the form to the causative, and the termination (*-i*, corresponding to *-ti/-si* of Pali and Sanskrit) restricts it to the singular. And since the verb is used along with the prohibitive particle *naḥamak* it is further restricted to the second person of the imperative mood (which in Sinhala has no special terminations of its own.<sup>3</sup>). Hence the verb has to be analysed as imperative 2nd sing. from the causative base of the Sinhala root equivalent to *bhram-*, i.e., it answers to Skt. *bhramaya* and *bhramayasva*, the *pada* distinction having no practical significance at this stage in the evolution of Indo-Aryan.<sup>4</sup> It is therefore indubitable that the author of DPS understood the Pali word *bhamassu* as the equivalent of Skt. *bhramayasva*. This conclusion is further strengthened by the fact that the SRV translates *bhamassu* with *paṭatva(va)* which corresponds to Skt. *pravartaya/pravartayasva*, the grammatical and semantic equivalent of *bhramayasva*.

The verb *bhamassu* in Dh. 371 **b** then can be none other than the Pali equivalent of Skt. *bhramayasva*, causative imperative 2 sg. *ātmanepada* of the root *bhram-* through an intermediate form *\*bhamessu*. The surmised change of the causative base *bhame-* to *bhama-* before the ending *-ssu* (the like of which Brough has proposed for *bhavassu* which he prefers here) actually conforms to a development in Prakrit languages noted by Pischel.<sup>5</sup> The surmised intermediate form *\*bhamessu* is so close to the GD reading *bhametsu* that one is tempted to wonder whether the latter does not represent a form of the same word with a dissimilating *-ts-* for *-ss-*.

1. SRV, Anula Press, Colombo, p. 1058. Veragama Punci Bandara's ed, Lankabhinava Visruta Press, Colombo, 1894, differs in having *paṭatva* for *paṭatvaṇa* (p. 940). Each of these is a possible alternative to the other.
2. DPS, ed. K. Dhammaratana Sthavira, Colombo, The Mahabodhi Press, 1926, p. 162.
3. See Munidasa Kumaratunga, *Kriyā Vivaraṇaya*, K. A. Ariyadasa & Co., Maradana, Colombo, B.E. 2500 (= 1956-57), pp. 49 ff.
4. Ibid., p. 5.
5. R. Pischel, *Grammatik der Prakrit Sprachen*, Strassburg, 1900, p. 378, sections 553, 554. Here he notes the occurrence of *-a-* for *-e-* in Prakrit causative forms, which might have arisen from forms originally contracted and shortened before double consonants. The form *bhamavai* which he notes there is very close to Sinhala *bamavayi* (DPS).

In view of all this, the situation most likely is the exact reverse of what Brough surmises: *bhavassu* probably is the intrusive form; the currency of *bhamassu* is proven from as far back as the 12th century and Senart's insight as to its grammar was on the right track.

A question that naturally arises is : how does this *bhamassu* differ from the simple imperative 2 sg. *ātm.* form of the root *bhram-* ? It does not differ at all, except that the mode of derivation is different (i.e., simple imperative : *bhrama-sva* > *bhama-ssu*; causative imperative : *bhram-aya-sva* > \**bham-e-ssu* > *bhamassu*). Most likely it was this factor that led to all the needless confusion. However, those who have rendered the line after the traditional interpretation do not show any sign of this confusion : Cf., e.g., the following :

Adikaram : Let not thy mind wander among pleasures;<sup>1</sup>

Ananda Maitreya : Let not your heart whirl in sensual pleasures;<sup>2</sup>

Buddhadatta : Do not let your mind revolve around the sensual pleasures;<sup>3</sup>

—all of whom have taken *cittam mā bhamassu* as “do (you) not let the mind wander”, exhortatively.

But why does the commentary explain *bhamassu*, which is causative imperative 2nd person, with *bhamatu*, which is a simple imperative third person form—even though it is exhortative or prohibitive in sense? At first sight it might look “reckless”, but on second thought, one would not deem the commentary to be all that rash. After all, “May your mind not whirl in sensuality” is not so radically different from “Do (you) not cause your mind to whirl in sensuality”, especially when these words appear in a Buddhist context which will not concede a “thinker” distinct from the thought (or a “you” other than your thinking or your “mind”).<sup>4</sup>

The commentator's chief interest is to explain the underlying idea. We may say that the exact significance of his comment is :

In saying “Do not cause your mind to whirl . . .” what the verse means is : “May not your mind whirl.....”

- 
1. E. W. Adikaram, *Dhammapada, Text and English Translation*, Colombo, M. D. Gunasena & Co. Ltd., 1954, p. 140.
  2. B. Ananda Maitreya Thera, *Dhammapada (Law Verses)*, Metro Printers, Ltd., Colombo 1978, p. 73.
  3. *Dhammapadam, An Anthology of Sayings of the Buddha*, ed. and trs. by A. P. Buddhadatta Mahathera, Aggarama, Ambalangoda, Ceylon. (Undated publication containing only the English Translation) p 27.
  4. Cf. *Visuddhimagga*, xix, 20 (Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. 41, p. 517) *kammasa kāraṇa natthi* etc.

In the process of putting the matter this way, the object of the sentence explained has become the subject of a clause in the explanatory sentence, and, in a Pali commentary, this can happen without even repeating the word for “mind”, because that word (*cittam*) has the same form in both the nominative and the accusative.

To come to the fifth point in our summary of Brough’s comments, it is actually only a minor syntactical irritant rather than a real problem. Like the same word functioning as subject and object, this really stems from the technique the commentator adopts—who not infrequently quotes without comment those words of a verse that he regards as easily understood, and lets his comments on the other words to merge with these uncommented “quotes”.

To illustrate this let us examine the comment on Dh. 371 b “*ma te kāmāgune bhamassu cittam*”. This is how the commentarial sentence on this is structured :

*bhamassū ti : pañcavidhe ca (te) kāmāgune (cittam) (mā) bhamatu.*

We may translate this as follows :

*bhamassu* etc : And, in the strand of sensuality, which is five-fold, may (your) (mind) (not) whirl,

Or, to clarify the commentator’s purpose and technique better, we may translate it as :

The meaning of the part of the verse with the key-word *bhamassu* is :  
And, in the strand of sensuality, which is five-fold, may (your) (mind) (not) whirl.

We note here (i) explanations are given (a) of the general idea and (b) of the notion “strand of sensuality”, amplifying the latter with the words “which is five-fold”;

(ii) the three words which we have put within brackets are not commented upon;

(iii) *te kāmāgune* is cited in the commentary exactly as in the verse, i.e., the position of *te* is not altered to suit the prose syntax;

and (iv) the words explained as well as the explanatory words (*kāmāgune*/*pañcavidhe*; *bhamassu*/*bhamatu*) merge with the words left unexplained (*te*, *cittam* and *mā*) to form a complex commentarial sentence in which is embedded the original sentence of the verse commented upon,

i.e., in

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
bhamassū	ti:	pañcavidhe	ca	te	kāmaguṇe	citta	mā
9							

bhamatu,

3, 6, 5, 7, 8, 9 constitute the essence of the explanatory sentence

and

8, 5, 6, 1, 7 constitute the sentence explained, (where, as usual in Indian verse, metrical considerations influence the order of words and *te* is found "at the wrong place", before *kāmaguṇe* and not before *cittam*).

Although this is somewhat complicated, there is no "problem" or ambiguity here, as we can see from the old Sinhala works quoted above, both of which have understood *te* as a genitive (Sinh. *tage/ topage*). Of course the comment would have been smoother if it read:

*bhamassū ti pañcavidhe ca kāmaguṇe mā te cittam bhamatu . . .*

In the available commentary we do not get that smooth flow of words. In this respect, the Pali commentaries often fail to fulfill our expectations, and, in particular, the Dhammapada commentary is hardly the work that one would consider an exemplar in the field of style.

In view of the above it must be said that all of Brough's objections against the text and commentary of Dh.371 *b* are untenable. However, on 371 *d* he makes a valid comment, namely that *mā* at the beginning of the line, metrically redundant and unnecessary for bringing out the intended sense, is presumably a later addition, as the Prakrit version, (as well as the Sanskrit one,) indicates.

(2) *sammattam* — Dh. 287 a

Dh. 287 reads:

*tam putta-pasu-sammattam byāsatta-manasam naram/  
suttam gāmam mahogho va maccu ādāya gacchati/*

(That man of entangled mind, inebriated by sons and cattle  
Death carries away, like a great flood a sleeping village.)<sup>1</sup>

Brough, p. 276, says that the reading (*putta-pasu-*)*sammattam* is questionable. He makes the following points:

- (1) It is "intrinsically very inferior in the context" because the sense it gives ("intoxicated") is repeated in the next line by the word *byāsatta-manasam* ("of entangled mind").

1. Translation from a forthcoming work on the Dhammapada by J. R. Carter and M. Palihawadana.

- (2) GD 334 reading *samadha* does not seem to be the equivalent of *sammattam*. As for the Udāna Varga I.39 reading *sammattam* found in Chakravarti's edition<sup>1</sup> of 1930, it is "apparently" given as a restoration and "may therefore be due only to the influence of the Pali editions".
- (3) Fausboll's *editio princeps*<sup>1</sup> 1855 showed a preference for *sammattam* and this "dominated the Pali editions ever since".
- (4) In the PTS edition of the Dh. Commentary too *sammattam* is found in the passage that explains the meaning of this verse. Here, the commentator tries to bring out the thoughts of the kind of person mentioned in the verse: "My sons are handsome . . . my cow is a good milker" etc.—scarcely enough wealth to be "intoxicated" (*sammatta-*) by. What is more likely is that the commentator was thinking of the man as having "come by" (*sampatta-*) or being "endowed with" (*sampanna-*) such possessions and being led astray by them due to mental distraction. Of these three words, *sammattam*, *sampattam* and *sampannam*, the MS sources are unanimously in support of *sampattam* (and the reading *sampannam*, quoted by the PTS ed. from a Sinhala edition, looks like a reasonable emendation of *sampattam*). The reason why the PTS editor preferred *sammattam* was the authority of Fausboll.
- (5) The parallel verse in the Mahābhārata<sup>2</sup> has *sampannam* instead of *sammattam*. And this is also adequate for the sense.

Brough therefore thinks that there is "a very strong *prima facie* case for *sampannam* as the correct word in the Pali verse also".

On points 2-4 one would like to note the following:

- (2) The Udāna Varga edition of Franz Bernhard also has *sammattam* for the parallel Sanskrit verse (UV I.39), and it cannot be said that that editor is influenced by Chakravarti. If Chakravarti's reading was a restoration, the evidence that Bernhard supplies (p.110) amply bears out the soundness of his judgment in this particular instance.
- (3-4) The textual tradition of Sri Lanka from as far back as the 10th century consistently supports *sammattam* for both the Dhammapada and the commentary. The tenth century work, Dhampiyā Aṭuvā

---

1. For bibliographical details see Brough, p. ix.

2. Mahābhārata, xii, 169.17, quoted by Brough, p. 267.

Gāṭapadaya (DAG)<sup>1</sup> and the 14th century work, Dhammapada Purāṇa Sannaya (DPS)<sup>2</sup> both have the reading *sammattam* and it is an easily observable fact that they regularly follow the commentary. What they preserve is a foolproof reading, attested twice over in each of these texts—since each of them also contains a Sinhala rendering whose correspondence to *sammattam* is unmistakable,<sup>3</sup> whereas it can in no way be squared with *sampattam*. Most of the modern editions<sup>4</sup> also have the reading *sammattam* and none of them can be said to have been dominated by Fausboll's opinion.

However, it is true that the older Sri Lanka editions<sup>5</sup> of the commentary have the word *sampannam*, although without exception they have *sammattam* in the Dhammapada verse. It is therefore necessary to examine how *sampannam* comes into the commentary. It occurs in these editions in the commentarial sentence explaining the word *sammattam*. This is how that commentarial sentence runs:

*putta-pasu-sammattam ti . . . . putte ca pasū ca labhitvā* “mama puttā abhirūpā . . . . mama gorā . . . . arogā mahābhāravahā, mama gāvī bahukhīrā ti evam puttehi ca pasūhi ca (*sampannam*) naram . . . . (“one intoxicated with sons and cattle” means the person who is (endowed) with sons and cattle, thinking, “my sons are handsome, my bullocks healthy and capable of carrying heavy loads, my cows yield much milk . . . .”).

Now, if these editions preserve in *sampannam* a correct reading, it is clear that that adds no weight at all to the argument that the verse also should have the same word. On the other hand, the thoughts ascribed to the person in the commentarial sentence in fact are to explain his “intoxication” and in view of that *sammattam* is the word to be expected in preference to *sampannam* even in the commentary

1. Ed. Mada-uyangoda Vimalakirti Sthavira and Nahinne Sominda Sthavira, M. D. Gunasena Co Ltd., Colombo, 1967, p.247.
2. Ed. Kamburupitiye Dhammaratana Sthavira, Mahabodhi Press, Colombo, 1926, p. 126.
3. DAG : *putta-mada pasu-madayen mat-hu*; DPS : *vesesin mat vū*.
4. E.G. Simon Hewavitharne Bequest Pali Text Series, Vol. vi, Colombo, 1956, p. 26; A. P. Buddhadatta Mahathera, Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, M. D. Gunasena & Co. Ltd., Colombo, 1956, p. 688; Morontuduwe Dhammananda Thera, The Dhammapada with a Sinhalese Translation, Commentary and Annotation entitled Saddharma Kaumudī, Mahabodhi Press, Colombo, 1928, p. 173; Adikaram (Note 13 above), p. 107; Moragalle Siri Nanobhasatissa Sthavira, Dhammapada Vivaraṇaya, M. D. Gunasena & Co. Ltd., Colombo, 1962, p. 557.
5. I.e., (1) Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, printed by G. E. Munasinha at the Jinalankara Press, Colombo, 1908, Part 7, p. 544; (2) Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, ed. Kahawe Siri Ratanasara Thera, Simon Hewavitharne Bequest Pali Text Series, Vol. xiii, Colombo, 1922, Part II, p. 552; (3) Dhammapadaṭṭhakathā, ed. W. Siri Siddhattha Dhammananda Mahathera and M. Siri Nanissara Thera, printed by J. D. Fernando, Granthaparakasa Press, Colombo, 1931, p. 535.



and not *vice versa*, i.e., one would expect (intoxicated) rather than (endowed). In fact, the later Sri Lanka edition, viz: that of A. P. Buddhadatta (1956), has the commentary too to read *sammattam* (p. 688).

As for the single cow, the Sri Lanka editions actually have “sons and cattle . . . my sons . . . my bullocks . . . my cows”. In any case, we cannot uphold the position that our texts are not likely to speak about a man of modest means being “intoxicated” with the sense of its ownership. The fable of the hermit who was more attached to his loin cloth than a king to his kingdom is more likely to reflect the Buddhist (and much of the Hindu) vision of possibilities in this regard.

Thus the fact that *sampannam* appears better in the context and more logical according to our way of looking at things is immaterial. In fact, the amazing comments of Professor Brough in relation to Dh. 302 (“unlikely to have possessed greater poetic distinction than its undistinguished predecessors”—p. 256), Dh. 285 (“incompetent poet who saw nothing wrong in filling a hole in his verse by adding the absurd detail that the lotus is plucked with the hand”—p.269) etc. show that he himself would not always expect to find literary appropriateness in a Dhammapada verse.

To sum up: It seems best to regard Dh. *sammattam*, GD *samadha* (= *samrddha*—?) and MB *sampannam* as three distinct and equally valid versions. It would be quite arbitrary to choose one out of them as superior and hence more authentic.

(3) *duppabbajjam* etc.: Dh. 302

Dh. 302 reads:

*duppabbajjam durabhiramam | durāvāsā gharā dukhā |*  
*dukkho'samāna-samvāso | dukkhānupatita'ddhagu |*  
*tasmā na ca'ddhagu siyā | na ca dukkhānupatito siyā ||*

The parallel GD and UV verses are:

*drupravai durabhiramu | dru'ajavasana ghara |*  
*dukkhu samana-savaso | dukkhanuvadida bhavae || (GD 262)*  
*duspravrajyam durabhiramam | duradhyāvasitā grhāh |*  
*dukkhāsamānasamvāsā | dukkhās' copacitā bhavāh || (UV XI 8)*

In his comments on GD 262, Brough (p.256) observes: "There seems to be little chance of reaching agreement about either the form or the meaning of the original verse". Although he says this, he also surmises (p.257) that *siyā* of the Pali version represents part of the "original" verse and that the words between the two occurrences of *dukkhānupatita* were lost in the other versions. In effect then he sees the "original" as a six-lined verse closely resembling the Pali version. It is probably the problematic nature of the grammar and exegesis of the Pali verse that makes him say: "For the surviving versions no method of interpretation has been yet suggested . . . which does not put a considerable strain on the language". He then adds the startling comment: ". . . . . the most likely hypothesis is that the composer was merely an incompetent craftsman".

Let us see how the Pali commentary sets about its task on this verse. True enough, the commentary is somewhat complicated and perhaps even inelegant, but it is not unintelligible—and it is debatable whether the grammar it seems to assume for the difficult first line is as unsupportable as Brough's comments would suggest. The commentator seems to construe the words of the verse thus:

(*pabbajjam nāma*) *duppabbajjam*, *durabhiramam*; *gharā* (*nāma*) *durāvāsā*, *dukkhā*:  
*dukkho asamāna-samvāso dukkhānupatitā addhagū* (plural):  
*tasmā na ca addhagū* (sing) *siyā*; *na ca dukkhānupatito siyā*.

According to his interpretation we would have to translate this as follows:  
 To be gone forth with difficulty (is the going forth), to be relished with difficulty. To be lived in with difficulty are households . . . . A suffering it is to live with those who are not like (-minded). Beset with suffering are travellers. Therefore be not a traveller, and be not beset with suffering.

The commentary evidently understands the theme to be the inescapability of suffering for the layman and arduousness for the monk. It takes travel as a metaphor for Samsara. It would appear that the commentary—or at least the original tradition which it represents—saw in the first line a "contracted sentence" with a neuter singular *pabbajjam* (in place of the commoner feminine *pabbajjā*) as implied subject, whence its *duppabbajanti* . . . . *pabbajjam nāma dukkham* (This parallels its interpretation of line 2: *gharā nāma durāvāsā*). The form *duppabbajjam* was evidently taken as a *nyat krdanta* (= \**dupravrajyam*—cp the UV version). Even if we agree with Brough that *duppabbajjam* is a "rather mysterious" form, it is difficult to go all the way with him to conjecture that it perhaps stands for an archaic—*pravrajam* replaced by the absolutive *pravrajya* and a superfluous final -*m*.

A study of the early Sinhala works on the Dh reveals a few other interesting points in regard to this difficult verse. These are:

- (1) DAG<sup>1</sup> quotes a commentarial clause *samannāgatā pi hutvā* which differs from the text of the present commentary *samanā pi hutvā*.
- (2) DPS<sup>2</sup> has line *f* without the initial *na ca*—which in fact regularizes the metre in respect of this line. In the Sannaya (word by word translation), it restores *na ca*, obviously taking the phrase as “understood” from the previous line.
- (3) Both DAG<sup>3</sup> and DPS<sup>4</sup> take *asamāna-samvāsa* of line *c* as meaning “living with those who are not like-minded.”

Yet another point worthy of mention is that the commentary understandably uses the word *bhaveyya* (√*bhū-*) to explain *siyā*. That the other versions replaced *siyā* with *bhava*<sup>5</sup> is further evidence for the interchange of material between the commentarial and textual traditions which Brough has elsewhere described (e.g., with reference to GD 153 and the Dh. commentary on verse 41—p.225 f.)

(4) *mantabhāni* — Dh. 363b.

Dh 363 *ab* reads *yo mukha-saññato bhikkhu | mantabhāni anuddhato* which, if we were to follow the commentary, we would have to translate: “The bhikkhu who is restrained of tongue, who speaks with wisdom, free from haughtiness . . .”

For *mantabhāni* of this context, the parallel GD verse has *manabhani*, a word which occurs twice in that work. The correspondences are as follows:

Dh	GD	UV
363 mantabhāṇi	54 manabhāṇi	viii. 10
227 mitabhāṇi	237 manabhāṇi	xxviii 8
		xxix 45 alpabhāṇi

Brough, p.248, observes the fact that in spite of extant MS evidence, the Tibetan translation of UV xxix.45 shows that it has been made from an original with *manda-* instead of *alpa-*. At one stage in the UV textual tradition then, *mandabhāsin/mandabhānin-* seem to have occurred where GD has *manabhani*, i.e., Prakrit *mana-* seems to reflect an original *manda-*. Brough surmises that

1. p. 254    2. p. 132    3. *ibid.*    4. *ibid.*

5. See Brough, p. 257. The optative *siyā* was replaced by a form of *bhū-*, either the optative *bhave* (let one be) or the imperative *bhava* (you be!); but such a verb would have become meaningless when the negative particle *na* was lost with the other words between the 2 occurrences of *dukkhāmpatita*; it then probably came to be regarded as the noun *bhava* (existence), as in the UV version.

in Pali *manta-bhāni* too, *manta-* is the equivalent of Sanskrit *manda*, and the compound means “speaking in moderation”, as does *mitabhāni-*, the other Pali equivalent of GD *manabhani*.

Since normally *manda* would occur in Pali unchanged, how is one to explain this *manta(bhāni)*? Brough thinks that it is a “hyper-Palism”, a redactors’ creation made through a desire “to produce a more literary appearance in the text”.

And why does the Pali commentary explain *manta-* wrongly as “wisdom”? Brough argues that the commentator was unaware of this development of *manda* into *manta* and thought that *manta* here is the same word that occurs elsewhere in Pali in a stock phrase *mantā vuccati paññā*: “*mantā* means wisdom”. (This *mantā* is actually a nominative plural meaning the Vedic *mantras* or “sacred texts (of wisdom)”. So the stock phrase meant: “The term *mantā* is a synonym for wisdom,” but later Pali tradition took it as a feminine singular literally meaning “wisdom”).<sup>1</sup>

One can agree with the substance of Brough’s textual criticism without necessarily subscribing to the motives he attributes to the Pali redactors. Curiously, though, since Dh. 363 has the word *mukha-saññato* (“restrained in speech”) also in the first line, reconstructing the “original” by substituting *manda-* for *manta-* in the second line gives the very tautology on whose grounds he objects to the form *sammattam* in verse 287.

---

1. The Sinhala sources are not helpful on this point. DAG does not comment on the word. In DPS printed text, p. 159, the Pali verse has *mattabhāni*—but the Sannaya gives the commentarial meaning “speaking with wisdom”—which suggests that *matta* in the verse is either a misprint or a case of miscopying. In several modern editions also *matta-bhāni* occurs, but with the same inconsistency of interpretation as in DPS, i.e. there is no evidence of any firm MS support or of serious reflection on the form or meaning of the word. Worthy of note however is Dr. Adikaram’s translation (p. 137) “who speaks little”, adopting the reading *mattabhāni*.