

mā ... bhaiṣṭa / bhāyatha

KASAMATSU Sunao

1. Introduction The following is a passage from the Pūrvayoga of the Lotus Sutra:

KN VII: 188,1–2 *tatas tān puru-^[2]ṣān evaṃ vadet / mā bhavanto bhaiṣṭa. mā nivartadhvam. ayam asau mahājanapado 'tra viśrāmyata /* (= WT 166,16–17)

Then [the guide] says to the men: “Gentlemen, do not be afraid. Don’t turn back. Here, there is a big place. You should rest there.”

Although some of the Gilgit-Nepalese manuscripts show different readings, the meaning of the text itself is consistent.¹⁾ There are two more examples of *mā bhaiṣṭa* in KN XXIV: 441,2 *mā bhaiṣṭa kulaputrā mā bhaiṣṭa* “Do not be afraid, gentlemen, do not be afraid (= WT 363,17–18).” These readings would seem to be certain.

On the other hand, the metric portion corresponding to the above-mentioned reads *mā bhāyathā*: Saddhp VII 99b *mā bhāyathā harṣa karotha caiva /* “Do not be afraid, but make yourself rejoice (KN 197,1 = WT 173,21).”²⁾ Another attestation of *bhāyatha* is: Saddhp I 82c *mā bhāyatha* [WT °*thā*] *bhikṣava nirvṛte mayi* “Do not be afraid, oh *bhikkhus*, when I attain *nirvāṇa* (KN 26,4 = WT 24,12).” If these readings are genuine, they can be interpreted as examples of differences in the linguistic strata – and perhaps in the time of compilation – between the metric and prose portions. In the following, I will examine the issues surrounding *bhay / bhī* by briefly tracing this word’s history.

1.1. Summary

There are two present stems of *bhay / bhī*: *bhaya-^{ie}* and *bibhe-ⁱⁱ*, the latter being more commonly used. The root aorist forms remain in some older texts, but s-aorist forms are fairly common (→ 2.). The present *bhāya-ⁱⁱ* appears in Pāli literature, and the aorist forms are formed from this present stem (→ 3.). The *bhāya-ⁱⁱ* presents are common in the Mahāvastu (→ 4.), and it is certain that the metric portion of the Lotus Sutra was at a similar linguistic stage (→ 5.). This raises the question of the authenticity of the reading *mā bhaiṣṭa* found in the prose portions of the Gilgit-Nepalese recensions of the Lotus

Sutra. The *s*-aorist injunctive is the formal wording since the AV or ŚB (→2.), but conclusively the *mā bhaiṣṭa* – supported by almost all manuscripts – is a secondary alteration, and the original Lotus Sutra would read *mā bhāyatha* in both verse and prose consistently (→5.). This reading is maintained in the Khādaliq and Kashgar manuscripts.

2. Vedic literature There are two present stems in the RV. One is *bhaya*^{-1c}: RV I 85,8c *bhāyate* *vísavā bhūvanā marúdbhyas* “all beings fear the Maruts.” The other is *bibhe*⁻¹ⁱ: RV VIII 66,15b *kālayo mā bibhītana* “oh Kalis, you should stop being afraid.” In later texts, the latter form is used exclusively, ex. Kaṭhop I 12ab *svarge loke na bhayaṃ kiñcanāsti na tatra tvaṃ na jarayā bibheti* / “There is no fear in the heavens. There’s no you (i.e., death) there. As for old age, one does not fear.” The aorist seems to have been made of the root aorist in older times; the form remains in the injunctive,³⁾ ex. RV I 11,2ab *sakhyé ta indra vājino mā bhema śavasas pate* / “Oh Indra, in companionship with you who win the prize of victory, we fear not, oh lord of strength.” The root aorist further remains in TS, VS (ex. VS VI 35 *mā bher mā sámvikthāḥ* “Do not be afraid. Don’t tremble” ~ TS I 1,4,1k *mā + bher. mā sám vikthāḥ*), while MS, KS convey the *s*-aorist form of *mā bhaiḥ* (MS I 3,3: 31,4 *mā bhair. mā sámvikthāḥ* ~ KS III 10: 38,10 *mā bhair mā samvitthāḥ*, → **supplementary note**). On the other hand, a form expanded by *-īś/-īt* appears, ex. AV X 9,7c *māibhyo bhaiṣṭh* “Do not be afraid of these people.”⁴⁾ In ŚB, this *s*-aorist form is used exclusively. For example, ŚB III 9,4,18 quotes VS VI 35 and then rephrases it as *mā tvāṃ bhaiṣṭh mā sámvikthāḥ*. Then the above-mentioned *bhaiṣṭa*, attested in the Gilgit-Nepalese recensions, can be evaluated as an orthodox form of *bhay* / *bhī* (→1.0). So was this “classical” conjugation put to practical use during the BHS period?

3. Pāli literature In Pāli literature, *bhāya*⁻¹ⁱ is found overwhelmingly, ex. SN I: 130,21^m *na socāmi na rodāmi na taṃ bhāyāmi āvuso* “I do not mourn. I don’t weep. I don’t fear you, my friend.” The aorist forms are made from the present stem, 2 sg. *bhāyi*, 2 pl. *bhāyittha*, which are frequent, but exclusively in prohibitive sentences. For example, in the Jātaka, the Bodhisattva who has become a virtuous white elephant appeases a man who has wandered into the forest where the Bodhisattva lives and says: Jā I: 320,21–22 *bho purisa, mā bhāyi, ahaṃ taṃ manus-*^[22]*sapathaṃ nessāmīti* “You, oh man, don’t be afraid. I’ll lead you to the path taken by humans.”

The most suggestive example is found in “The Tale of the Carpenter Boar (no. 283).” The Bodhisattva was born as a wild boar and was raised by a carpenter, which earned him

the name. When he was released into the forest, he met a group of his own kind. They were afraid of the tiger's attack, so the carpenter boar had them set up a lotus formation and encouraged them. "And when he had taken possession of about sixty or seventy warriors of the wild boar, and was walking about here and there, devising manoeuvres, saying, 'Do not be afraid [of tiger],' then dawn arose (Jā II: 406,11–13 *Tassa saṭṭhi-sattati-matte yodhasūkare ādāya tasmim̐ tasmim̐ iḥāne* ^[12] "*mā bhāyitthā*" 'ti kammaṃ vicārentass' eva vicarato aruṇaṃ ^[13] *uṭṭhahi*).'" The tiger's intentions were thwarted before his command, and he withdrew in vain. Wicked ascetic said: "Do not be afraid. Go! And when you howl and then leap, they will be afraid, broken, and then they will flee (Jā II: 407,21–23 *kūṭajaṭilo* "*mā bhāyi, gaccha* ^[22] *tayi naditvā pakkhandante sabbe bhītā bhijjivā palāyissan-* ^[23] *tūi āha*).'" Seeing the tiger attacking again, the wild boars talk to each other: 'The wild boars said, 'Lord, the great thief has returned.' The carpenter boar said, "You should stop being afraid. We'll catch him this time (Jā II: 407,25–26 *Sūkaṛā* "sāmi mahācoro punāgato" ti āhaṃsu. ^[26] "*Mā bhāyatha, idāni naṃ gaṇhissāmīti*").'" The difference in meaning between the aorist stem's prohibitive sense (*mā bhāyittha*) and the present stem's inhibitive function (*mā bhāyatha*) may still persist.

4. Mahāvastu As in Pāli, *bhāya*-ⁱⁱ presents are consistent⁵⁾: Mv II: 236,9^p *naiṣṭhā bhāyati, nāpi palāyati* // "She neither fears nor flees (= Ed. Marciniak II 294,12)"; Mv II: 358,19^m *śīlavāṃ* [Ed. Marciniak °ñ] *ca asantrasto na so bhāyati kadā ca na* [Ed. Marciniak *kadāci*] / "He who keeps the precepts does not shudder. He never fears. (~ Ed. Marciniak II 433,17).'" As to 2 sg. ipv., Mv II: 134,3^m *mā bhāya bhūmipati saṃjanayāhi harṣaṃ* / "Don't be afraid, oh king. Let joy arise (= Ed. Marciniak II 171,11)."

There are two examples of the expanded form in *hi*. It is possible that one of them retains the inhibitive function, but it is not clear. To a doe who wants to avoid death because she is pregnant, the deer king says: Mv I: 363,1^p *tāva mā bhāyāhi. anyaṃ visarjayiṣyaṃ* // "Anyway, stop being afraid. I will send you another deer." But it seems difficult to apply to another example: Mv III 408,11–12^p *bhagavān āha* // *ehi kumāra mā bhāyāhi idan tam anupadrutaṃ* "'Come, boy,' said the Bhagavant, 'Don't be afraid of this distressing thought (= Ed. Marciniak III 526,15).'" As to 2 pl.: Mv III: 303,17^p *mā bhāyatha vāṇijā tti na bhavati vo upadravaṃ* / "Don't be afraid, merchants," [they said], "there's no misfortune for you (~ Ed. Marciniak III 387,15 ... *na vo tti na upadravaṃ*).'" There are no examples of prohibitions based on aorist stem.⁶⁾

5. Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-sūtra As discussed in sections 3 and 4, the conjugation of *bhāya-*ⁱⁱ is common from Pāli to the Mahāvastu. It is likely that the same linguistic situation existed in the original Saddhp. At least in the metric portion, both editions and manuscripts consistently have *bhāyatha* (or °*thā*, m.c.). Then the aorist would be expected to be made from this present stem as in Pāli literature.

However, the readings are different. The Saddhp contains only five examples of the finite verb form of *bhay / bhī*, two of which are in the metrical portion (KN *bhāyatha*) and three in the prose portion (KN *bhaiṣṭa*). On the other hand, the corresponding Central Asian manuscripts, Khādaliq and Kashgar, consistently use the present stem, *bhāyatha*, which conflicts with Gilgit and many Nepalese traditions that use the *s*-aorist.

KN I ^m : 26,4 <i>mā bhāyatha</i> [WT 24,12 <i>bhāyathā</i>] ⁷⁾	Kashg 33b4-5 <i>bhāyatha</i>
KN VII ^m : 197,1 = WT 173,21 <i>mā bhāyathā</i> ⁸⁾	Kashg 188a6 <i>bhāyatha</i>
KN VII ^p : 188,2 = WT 166,16 <i>mā ... bhaiṣṭa</i> ⁹⁾	Kashg 182a2 <i>mā ... bhāyatha</i> ¹⁰⁾
KN XXIV ^p : 441,2 = WT 363,17f. <i>mā bhaiṣṭa</i> ¹¹⁾	(missing)
KN XXIV ^p : 441,2 = WT 363,18 <i>mā bhaiṣṭa</i> ¹²⁾	Kashg 423b1 <i>mā bhāyatha</i>

What are the implications of this difference? In the following, I will attempt to provide an explanation for the different readings presented by the various manuscripts.

In the archetypal stage of the Lotus Sutra, it is assumed to have been *bhāyatha*, both in verse and in prose. The Kashgar recension is generally regarded as the most faithful to the original. Sometimes the Gilgit-Nepalese recension adopts *bhāyathā* m.c. in the verses.

The readings found in the Kawaguchi manuscript in the prose portion are valuable. Kawaguchi's VII: 73a3 *kāyadhvaṃ* is clearly intended to be a middle-voice imperative ⁺*bhāyadhvaṃ* derived from the Middle Indic present stem *bhāya-*ⁱⁱ. The parallel passage in Cambridge 61b4 *ṣadhva(ṃ)*, also shows traces of a middle-voice imperative ending. The same is true of Kawaguchi's XXIV: 165b5 *bhayadhvaṃ*.¹³⁾ These readings can be interpreted as a hyper-Sanskritization of the Middle Indic *bhāyatha*.

In the archetype, the reading “*mā + bhāyatha*” would have been normal usage. The ‘classical’ *s*-aorist injunctive, *bhaiṣṭa*, found in almost all Gilgit-Nepalese manuscripts, can only be interpreted as the result of revision by scribes who were confident of their Sanskrit grammar. In the end, the difference in *bhāyatha* :: *bhaiṣṭa* between the metric and prose portions of KN / WT is a secondary one that emerged in much later period, and

cannot be adopted as an indicator of the difference in grammar (and thus stratigraphy). In the present study, I am inclined to the position that both the metric and prose portions consist of almost similar linguistic layers. On the other hand, manuscripts that retain the original (or middle Indic) wordings are of high material value. In addition to the older manuscripts (Lüshun, Khādaliq, and Kashgar; Gilgit manuscripts), the readings conveyed by the Kawaguchi manuscript are worth re-examining.

Supplementary note: Mahābhārata The Saddhp manuscript scribes adopted (or revised) the *mā bhaiṣṭa* reading because, of course, this *s*-aorist was used in Sanskrit literature. For example, MBhār III 154,20c *mā bhaiṣṭa rākṣasān mūḍhāt* “Do not be afraid of the foolish *Rākṣasa*.” For the second person singular, the wording *mā bhaiṣīs* is expected: MBhār II 40,19cd *pitṛṣvasāraṃ mā bhaiṣīr* ity uvāca janārdanaḥ // “Janārdana (i.e., Arjuna) said to her aunt, “Do not be afraid.” In this case, I would like to note different reading *mā bhais tvam* devī. As far as I can see, there are a lot of examples of *mā bhais*, such as: MBhār I 128,8c *mā bhaiḥ prāṇa-bhayād rājan* “Do not be afraid for [your] life, oh king”; MBhār I 140,7a *mā bhais tvam vipulaśroṇi* “Do not be afraid, you, lady with the broad hips.” This wording is also used in the inhibitive context: MBhār I 205,11ab *śrutvā caiva mahābāhur mā bhair* ity āha taṃ dvijam / “On hearing [the words], the mighty-armed one said the brahmana, “Stop being afraid.” This *mā bhais* conform to Vedic grammar, to the wording found in the *Maitrāyaṇīya* and *Kāṭhaka* schools. As a matter of fact, this *s*-aorist form is the one that is universal in MBhār. The use of the MS-KS-derived wording of *mā bhais*, rather than the classical *s*-aorist form, is suggestive of the origins of the people who were responsible for the transmission of the MBhār.

Notes

1) Gilgit recension reads as followings: Gilgit A: 91,25–26 ... *mā yūyaṃ bhaiṣṭa*: *mā nivartadhvam*.^[26] *ayam asau mahājanapado 'tra viśramata* /. Gilgit A: 91,26 *viśramata* is suggestive. The present stem of *śram* has been (°) *śrāmya*-^{ti} since Vedic literature, but (°) *śrama*-^{ti} appears after Post-Vedic literature (ĀgnivGS II 7,6:5.6 *śramet*, cf. Pāli *vissamati*; Mv III 350,18^p *viśrama*). Gilgit A *viśramata* and Kashg 182a3 *viśramatha* probably convey the authentic reading of the original stage of the Lotus Sutra, cf. Cambridge 61b4 *viśramet*. On the other hand, Kawaguchi's 73a3 *viśrāmata*, T8 49b2 *viśrama*(ta), Beijing's 161,20 *viśrāmyanu*, and Kolkata's 85b4 *viśrāmyat[r]a* can be understood as indicating the various stages of successive attempts to proofread the original form. The British Library's 77b1 *viśrāmyata* = KN 188,2 = WT 166,17 can be regarded as the final stage.

2) This reading suits *Indravajrā* form. But if we refer to Gilgit A: 97,10 *mā bhāyatha karṣu karoṭha caiva* and Kashg 188a6–7 *mā bhāyatha harṣa karoṭha prāṇinām*, the reading °*thā* is lengthened *metri*

causa. See also Saddhp I 82c *bhāyatha*. 3) See Narten *s*-Aor. 180–182. 4) There is a difference in wording between “prohibitive” and “inhibitive” in the Vedic literature, ex. AV V 30,8a *mā bibher ná mariṣyasi* “Stop being afraid. You will not die.” For a brief explanation of this issue, see Gotō 2013, Morphology, p. 90. 5) There is an irregular *bhā⁻ⁱ* (Mv III: 403,17^p *mā bhāhi* (= Ed. Marciniak III 522,7)), but it is excluded from consideration here. 6) BHSD says that the aorist form of *bhāyati*, *bhāyi*, is attested in Mv II: 308,16, but this is doubtful: Mv II: 308,16^m *yathā ca prabhā na bhāyi anya kācid* “May no other light shine.” 7) The manuscripts are almost identical in *bhāyathā* (Gilgit A: 17,28 = Cambridge 9b5 = British Library 14a4–5 = Kolkata 12b5 = T8 8b5 = Kawaguchi 11a1). This reading gives the opening of _ _ U __. Furthermore, the British Library 14a4–5 *mā bhāya¹⁵thā bhikṣava nirvṛte mayi* / suits the *Indravamśa* form (= KN / WT). Otherwise Kashg 33b4–5 *bhāyatha*. 8) The readings are divided into *bhāyathā* (British Library 80a4 = Kolkata 88b7 = Beijing 167,23 = Kawaguchi 76a2 ~ T8 51a6 (*bhā*)*yathā* ~ Cambridge 64a5 *nāyathā* (sic.)) and Gilgit A: 97,9 = Kashg 188a 6 *bhāyatha*. The reading of *bhāyathā* given by newer manuscripts would suit the *Indravajrā* scheme. 9) Almost all Gilgit-Nepalese manuscripts suggest *bhaiṣṭa* generally: Gilgit A: 91,25 *bhaiṣṭa* = British Library 77a6 = Kolkata 85b3 = T8 49b2 ~ Beijing 161,19 *bhaiṣṭā*. But Kawaguchi 73a3 *kāyadhvaṃ* ~ Cambridge 61b4 *ṣadhva(m)* are intended to be the middle-voice imperative of *bhāya*-stem, **bhāyadhvam*. Central Asian manuscripts read *bhāyatha* (Kashg 182a2 *bhāyatha* = Khādaliq Fragment 44, Verso 6). 10) Khādaliq Fragment 44 verso 6 +++[va]den mā bhavaṃtaḥ satvā bhāyatha mā nirrvartatāha mā saṃtrāsam ā[pa]dya[thā]. 11) The mss. readings are consistent with *bhaiṣṭa* (Cambridge 144b2 = British Library 160b5 = Kolkata 197b1 = Beijing 365,18 = T8 110a7). But Kawaguchi 165b5 *bhayadhvaṃ*. Gilgit and Kashgar are missing. 12) The mss. readings are consistent with *bhaiṣṭa* (Cambridge 144b2 = British Library 160b5 = Kolkata 197b1 = Beijing 365,18 = T8 110a7) except Kashg 423b1 *bhāyatha* and Kawaguchi 165b5 *bhayadhvaṃ*. 13) It is unlikely that the Rg-Vedic *bhaya^{-e}* was available at the time of the Kawaguchi manuscript. It would be a form based on an analogy from the noun *bhaya*- “fear.”

Abbreviations

AV: Atharava-Veda. **Beijing:** Saddhp. ms. edited by Jiang Zhongxin, see Jiang Zhongxin 1988. **BHS:** Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit, see Edgerton 1953. **British Library:** Saddhp. ms. kept in the British Library (Or. 2204), see Mizufune 2011. **Cambridge:** Saddhp. ms. kept in the Cambridge University Library, see Kotsuki 2010. **Gilgit:** Gilgit recension of Saddhp, see Watanabe 1975. **Jā:** Jātaka, see Fausbøll 1877–1896. **Kashg:** Kashgar recension of Saddhp. **Kaṭhop:** Kaṭha-Upaniṣad. **KN:** Saddhp, edited by Kern and Nanjio, see Kern and Nanjio 1908–1912. **Kolkata:** Saddhp. ms. kept in the Asiatic Society, Kolkata (No. 4079), see Kotsuki 2014. **KS:** Kāṭhaka-Saṃhita ᵐ: metric portion. **MBhā:** MahāBhārata, see Sukthankar et al. 1933–1966. **MS:** Maitrāyaṇī Saṃhitā. **ms(s):** manuscript(s). **Mv:** Mahāvastu. **P:** prose portion. **RV:** Rg-Veda. **Saddhp:** Sanskrit text of *Saddharmapuṇḍarīka-Sūtra*. **ŚB:** Śatapatha-Brāhmaṇa. **SN:** Saṃyutta-Nikāya, see Feer 2006. **T8:** Saddhp. ms. kept in the University of Tokyo (No. 414), see Kotsuki 2003. **TS:** Taittirīya-Saṃhitā. **VS:** Vājasaneyi-Saṃhitā. **WT:** Saddhp edited by Wogihara and Tsuchida, see Wogihara and Tsuchida 1934.

Bibliography

- Edgerton, Franklin. 1953. *Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Grammar and Dictionary*. 2 vols. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Fausbøll, V. 1877–1896. *The Jātaka*. 7 vols. London: Pali Text Society.
- Feer, Leon. 2006. *Samyutta-Nikāya*. Part I. Lancaster: Pali Text Society.
- Gotō, Toshifumi. 2013. *Old Indo-Aryan Morphology and Its Indo-Iranian Background*. Wien: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- Hoffmann, Karl. 1967. *Der Injunktiv im Veda*. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- Itō Zuiei 伊藤瑞叡 et al. 1993. *Bonbun Hokekyō Wogihara, Tsuchida-bon sōsakuin* 梵文法華經荻原・土田本総索引. Tokyo: Benseisha.
- Jiang Zhongxin, ed. 1988. *A Sanskrit Manuscript of Saddharmapuṇḍarika*. Beijing: China Social Science Publishing House.
- , ed. 1997. *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Fragments from the Lüshun Museum Collection: Facsimile Edition and Romanized Text*. China/Tokyo: Lüshun Museum/Soka Gakkai.
- Kern, H. and Bunyiu Nanjio, eds. 1908–1912. *Saddharmapuṇḍarika*. Bibliotheca Buddhica X. St. Petersburg: Commissionnaires de l'Académie Impériale de Sciences.
- Kotsuki, Haruaki. 2003. *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from University of Tokyo General Library (No. 414): Romanized Text*. Tokyo: Soka Gakkai.
- . 2010. *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from Cambridge University Library (Add. 1684): Romanized Text*. Tokyo: Soka Gakkai.
- . 2014. *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the Asiatic Society, Kolkata (No. 4079) Romanized Text*. Tokyo: Soka Gakkai.
- Marciniak, Katarzyna. 2019. *The Mahāvastu: A New Edition*. Vol. III. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XIV, 1. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- . 2020. *The Mahāvastu: A New Edition*. Vol. II. Bibliotheca Philologica et Philosophica Buddhica XIV, 2. Tokyo: International Research Institute for Advanced Buddhology, Soka University.
- Mizufune, Noriyoshi. 2011. *Sanskrit Lotus Sutra Manuscript from the British Library (Or. 2204): Romanized Text*. Tokyo: Soka Gakkai.
- Narten, Johanna. 1964. *Die sigmatischen Aoriste im Veda*. Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz.
- Senart, Émile. 1997. *Le Mahāvastu*. 3 vols. Tokyo: Meicho-Fukyu-kai.
- Sukthankar, V. S. et al. 1933–1966. *The Mahābhārata*. 19 vols, bound in 22. Poona: Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute.
- Toda, Hirohumi. 1981. *Saddharmapuṇḍarīkasūtra: Central Asian Manuscripts Romanized Text*. Tokushima: Kyoiku Shuppan Center.
- Tsukamoto, Keishō et al. 1977–1982. *Sanskrit Manuscripts of Saddharmapuṇḍarika*. Tokyo: Publishing Association of Saddharmapundarika Manuscripts.
- Watanabe, Shoko. 1975. *Saddharmapuṇḍarika Manuscripts Found in Gilgit*. Part 2, *Romanized Text*. Tokyo: Reiyukai.
- Wogihara, U. and C. Tsuchida. 1934. “*Saddharmapuṇḍarika-Sūtram*.” Tokyo: Sankibo Buddhist Book Store.

(This research was supported in part by KAKENHI, No. 20K00067)

Key words *bhay/bhī, prohibitive, inhibitive*, Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit

(Associate Professor, National Institute of Technology, Sendai College, Hirose, PhD)