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Abstract

Comparing parallel Pāli and Sanskrit versions of the Buddha’s teachings reveal an underlying linguistic stratum which is a common source for both. Although we may never be able to ascertain the exact words of the Buddha, we know his teachings were transmitted orally by bhāṇakas (reciters) in one or more middle-Indic dialects. As the religion spread into different regions of India the words also changed, adapted to local dialects. When the teachings were committed to writing around the first century B.C., the Pāli and Buddhist Sanskrit forms were sometimes contradictory, reflecting the redactors’ different interpretations of the oral transmission. By comparing these different forms, it is possible to isolate a proto-form which explains the ambiguities and is closer to the original transmission. This is a case in point, comparing an incident from the Pāli Mahāparinibbāna sutta and its Sanskrit parallel, the Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra.

It is a well known fact of Buddhist history that the Buddha’s teachings were not written down for at least 300 years after his Parinibbāṇa; they were transmitted orally until some time in the first century B.C. when they were committed to writing in Śrī Lanka. Although the Pāli canon is accepted as a fairly accurate representation of the Buddha’s beliefs and teachings, there are still many ambiguities and inconsistencies in it, which have intrigued and puzzled commentators for generations. This is largely due to anicca, i.e. change; because of the natural evolution of language phonology, even the Buddha’s words, transmitted from generation to generation through the bhāṇaka (“reciter”) system can change. Fortunately, when there is more than one version of his teachings that have come down to us - as, for example, in the case of the northern Buddhist Sanskrit (BS)
canon, – we can compare this version with the Pāli and isolate what the original underlying words might have been. As Norman has pointed out (1993, 86), since both of these later versions were translations an investigation and reconstruction of the source transmission may clarify certain textual ambiguities. This is a case in point.

In the Mahāparinibbāna Sutta (DN 16), during the rainy season, the Buddha took up residence in the village of Beluva near Vesāli. There he becomes seriously ill, approaching death (bāḷhā vedanā vattanti māraṇaṇīkā, “excessive feelings occurred, close to death”). He decides that it would not be right for him to die without addressing his disciples, so, by an extreme act of will, he recovers. There follows (DN II 99f) a famous section of the sutta: Ānanda expresses his worry that the Buddha would die without “speaking concerning the Saṅgha” (bhikkhusaṅgham ārabba kaṅcideva udāharati) and Buddha says there is nothing more to say: he has already communicated all the teachings – he has no inside and outside teachings, as the heretics espouse (Buddhaghoṣa’s interpretation) and is not holding anything back (natthānanda tathāgatassa dhammesu ācariyamuṭṭhi – “there is no closed fist of the teacher in respect of the Dhamma truths”). There follows his famous instructions, “Be a light unto yourselves, a refuge for yourselves, with no one else as your refuge; live with the Dhamma as your light, the Dhamma as your refuge, with nothing else as your refuge”…”. He then goes on to explain how the monk is to accomplish these instructions, summarizing his mindfulness teachings, of body, feeling, mind and phenomena.

In this interchange with Ānanda the Buddha describes himself as an old man who has traversed his span of life and is now eighty years old. Just as an old cart keeps going by being held together (lit: “combined”) with thongs, so the body of the Tathāgata is held together in the same way:

seyyathāpi ānanda, jajjarasakaṭaṁ vedhamissakena yāpeti, evameva kho ānanda vedhamissakena maṁne tathāgatassa kāyo yāpeti.

The phrase vedhamissakena has puzzled translators as to its exact meaning for over a century. Rhys Davids, for example, in his translation (1881), takes it as meaning, “with much additional care”; he takes variant vegha as a misprint for avekṣā. But most follow Buddhaghoṣa’s
commentary in taking the word to mean “bonds” or “thongs”. In the *Sumaṅgalavilāsinī* he says:

*Vedhamissakenā⁴ ti bāha-bandha-cakka-bandhādinā paṭisāṅkharaṇena vedhamissakena | maññe ti jiṅna-sakaṭaṃ viya vedhamissakena maññe yāpeti | arahatta-phalaveṭhanena catuiriyāpatha-kappanaṃ Tathāgatassa hotī ti dasseti⁵.*

*Vedhamissakena* means through a series of strong bonds, by means of bonds, etc. for the purpose of repairs. *maññe…* means just like an old cart keeps on going, it seems, held together with bonds, so he explains, the performance of the Tathāgata’s four behaviours [i.e. sitting, standing, walking, lying] is [held together] by means of the bonds of the fruit of Arahantship.

In the Pāli editions, there are six different variant readings for this compound, reflecting the confusion of the first word⁶: *vedha-missakena, vegha-missakena, vekha-missakena, veṭha-missakena, vekkha-missakena, veḷu-missakena.*

Other translations reflect this confusion:

In a later translation of the sutta, T. W. Rhys Davids (1910, 107, with C. A. F. Rhys Davids) changes his earlier translation quoted above “…with much additional care…” to “…and just as a worn-out cart, Ānanda, can be kept going only with the help of thongs, so, methinks, the body of the Tathāgata can only be kept going by bandaging it up.”

Bhikkhu Ānāmoli (1972, 303) translates, “…just as an old cart is made to carry on with the help of makeshifts so too, it seems to me, the Perfect One’s body is made to carry on with the help of makeshifts…”

Vajira & Story (1998-2009) have: “Even as an old cart, Ānanda, is held together with much difficulty, so the body of the Tathāgata is kept going only with supports.”

Walshe (1995, 245) has, “Just as an old cart is made to go by being held together with straps, so the Tathāgata’s body is kept going by being strapped up,” and in a footnote says that the precise meaning of
vegha-missakena “seems to be unknown” (p. 569).

In a parallel passage in the Saṃyutta Nikāya, Satipaṭṭhānasamyutta, Bodhi (2000, 1637) translates, “Just as an old cart keeps going by a combination of straps, so it seems the body of the Tathāgata keeps going by a combination of straps.”

Philologically, most of this confusion can be resolved by positing the original word as either vleška or veštā, two words which both mean “band” or “noose” and seem to be phonologically related. The word vleška would evolve to vekkha (one of the variant readings) with šk > kka/kkha; vl > v (Pischel ¶302). The word veštā would evolve to vedha (Lüders ¶153/154; Norman 1969, 154; Pischel ¶304) – not one of the variant readings, although veṭha is and the change of intervocalic ťh to dh is quite common (Pischel ¶198). So the sequence veštā > veṭha > vedha is possible, although one would not expect to see vedha (one of the variants) for vedha (it is possible, but rare per Pischel ¶225). Clearly, the number of variants shows that none of the redactors understood the word’s history or its proper Prakrit spelling.

How do we get the other variants (vegha/vekha/velu)? vekha and vekkha are clearly the same word without the k – doubling and vegha is just the voiced form of it. The change of vedha/veṭha to velu is possible phonologically (Woolner ¶16) which may explain the latter form, although it doesn’t make semantic sense (velu means “bamboo”), unless the straps are made of bamboo. Gombrich (1987) has argued for the reading vedha, taking it to mean “trembling,” but his position is not very convincing. Authors T. W. & C. A. F. Rhys Davids (1910), translate vegha-missakena as “with the help of thongs”, but the source of vegha seems to be Buddhaghoṣa’s commentary, as this meaning is not attested anywhere else. Kern (quoted in PED under vegha) believed vegha was derived from Skt. vighna (Pkt: veggha/viggha; not, however, one of the variants in the Pāli MSS.) and this is the meaning (“obstacle”, “hindrance”) used by Vajira & Story in the translation referred to above.

The Prakrit word vekkha or veṭha/vedha/vedha is a pretty good guess for the first word of the compound as it is supported philologically, semantically and in the commentarial tradition (although the form was wrong, the meaning was right). The second word in the compound –
missakena – (lit., “mixed with” or “combined with”) is also problematic and the BS version of the sūtra may help to show its original form, and also support our interpretation of the first word.

Waldschmidt published the BS version of the Mahāparinirvāṇa sūtra in 1950-51 in three volumes. The first gives the actual text preserved from the Turfan Expedition and the second and third volumes give his reconstruction, with a lot of help from the Tibetan version (preserved in the Vinayakṣudrakavastu of the Kanjur). The BS version of this passage reads¹¹:

\[(punar) aparam ānanda tathāgato vrddho jīrṇatāṃ) prāpto 'ṣī)tike vayasi vartate dvaidhāniśrayena yāpy(ate | tadyathā jīrṇam sakātām dvaidhāniśraye)ṇa y(ā)pyata evam eva (tathāgato vrddho jīrṇatāṃ) prāpto) 'ṣī)tike vayasi vartate dvaidhāniśrayena yā(ypate ||)

“Moreover, Ānanda, the Tathāgata is old, he has reached old age, he is 80 years old, he lives by reliance on two things (dvaidha-niśrayena)¹². Just like an old cart exists dependent on two things, thus the Tathāgata, old, who has reached old age, is now 80 years old, [and] exists dependent on two things.”

The underlined part is the original Turfan text; the rest is reconstructed from Tibetan and Pāli.

The compound here has undergone a remarkable transformation: against vedhamissakena we have dvaidhāniśrayena. Could these two compounds be related? I think they are.

First, what does it mean, “dependent on two things/twofold form”? Tibetan has the same thing¹³, rnam pa gnyis la brient nas ‘tso’o, “he lives depending on two ways/manners/forms.” Waldschmidt translates his synopsis of the Chinese versions as …an zwei Gegenstände lehnt (p. 199) “leans on two things” (it is, however, not in the Chinese version, so presumably he is translating the Tibetan; see below). Rockhill (1884,131) translates the Tibetan as “Just as an old cart is only kept in order by binding (tight) together the two portions of it, so the Tathāgata, having reached fourscore years, his body bent down and decrepit, only lives holding the two parts together (with difficulty)¹⁴. These “two things/parts” are not explained. Perhaps they are the two wheels of a two-wheeled cart? In the next sentence the Buddha tells Ānanda not to grieve and explains how everything conditioned must come to an end, a sentiment which seems to have no relation to the previous statement¹⁶.
The word *dvaidha* appears to be a misconstruing of the Prakrit *vedha* (or *vedha*), which the writer tried to back-form into BS: anteriorizing the *dh* > *dh*, restoring *e* > *ai* (which of course doesn’t exist in Prakrit) and changing the *v* > *dv*. Normally *dv* at the front of a word goes to *v* (Woolner ¶42; Pischel ¶298), but there are lots of instances where *dv* goes to *b* (Pischel ¶300; e.g. *dve* > *be*; *dvitīya* > *bīa*; *dvāra* > *bāra*; Pischel ¶437) and sometimes *b* is written for *v* (Pischel ¶201, footnote 1; Pischel ¶559; e.g. *dviguṇayati* > *biuṇei*, written as *viuṇei*) which is orthographically and phonologically very similar. It seems likely, therefore, that the author, not able to understand *vedha*, changed it to *dvaidha*, which at least was understandable in microcosm, although not in context.

The second word in the compound, *niśrayena*, probably occurred in Prakrit as *Nissaena*17 or *Nissaṇa*, with the – *y* – representing a dropped intervocalic consonant replaced with a weakly articulated glide (Pischel ¶187). The Pāli redactor interpreted this as *missakena*, taking the nasal for *m* – and adding in the dropped intervocalic stop – *k* – (Woolner ¶9; Pischel ¶186), leaving the double sibilant, and arriving at *missakena*, “mixed”, from the Skt. *miśra*, from a lost root √*miś*. The BS redactor took the nasal as *n* –, the double sibilant as derived from – *śr* – (Woolner ¶49; Pischel ¶315) and the lost intervocalic as – *y* – which is always dropped (Woolner ¶9; Pischel ¶186) and arrived at *niśrayena*, “leaning on”, “depending on”, “with the support of18”, which makes much more sense in the context.

We have now arrived as close as we can get to the “original words” of the Buddha. The words transmitted were probably *vedhaNissaena* or *vedhaNissaṇa* (or *vekkha* –, *vedha* –, as above) which were variously interpreted as we have seen above, but whose meaning (at least in the Pāli recensions) was clear: “depending on straps”. We may now translate the sentence in question again: “Just as an old cart keeps on going with the support of straps, so Ānanda, the body of the Tathāgata keeps on going in dependence on straps.” Pāli got the first word of the compound (*vekkha* or *vedha* = “straps”) right and the second (*missakena* = “mixed with” or “combined with”) wrong. BS is the opposite: the first word *dvaidha* (“two things”) was wrong, but *niśrayena* (“in dependence on”), the second word, was right. The compound goes back to a hypothetical original Skt. proto-form *veṣṭaniśrayena* (or *vleṣkaniśrayena*), which in the Prakrit the Buddha spoke had evolved as I have described above.
Although the Pāli understood the meaning correctly, both the BS recensions and the Tibetan (which was itself a translation of the BS) didn’t. In the Chinese versions we find the following:

From the *Dīrghāgama* (*Yóuxíng* or *Mahāparinirvāṇa Sūtra*, 遊行經), translated by Buddhayaśas (佛陀耶舍 Fótuó yé shè), in 412-413 A.D.

譬如故車方便修治得有所至. 吾身亦然.”Just like an old cart is expediently repaired and adjusted so that it may reach its destination, my body is similar…19”

From the *Fó bān ní huán*, (佛般泥洹經, a *Parinirvāṇa Sūtra*) translated by Bofazu (白法祖) in 290-306 A.D.

如故車無堅強. 我身體如此無堅強.”Like an old cart which has no strength, my body is like this, without any strength…20”

From the *Bān ní huán jīng*, (般泥洹經, a *Parinirvāṇa Sūtra*), by an unknown translator, 317-420 A.D.

形如故車. 無牢無強.”My body is like an old cart without durability or strength…21”

We of course do not have the text from which they were translating, but it appears that they too did not understand the actual words, but got the overall meaning right; or they condensed and paraphrased, as the earliest translators were wont to do (Zürcher, 1991).

The Perils of Transmission

We do not know very much about the “original language” that Buddha spoke, if in fact he spoke only a single language, which is doubtful; as Norman has pointed out (1990, 144) he may well have adopted his particular dialect to his audiences’ understanding, depending upon where he taught. That he spoke Prakrit(s), we are relatively certain (Edgerton 1953 (vol. 1), ¶1.15f; Lüders 1954, 8; Norman 1990, 146; von Hinüber 1994, 5) and we know a lot about the historical evolution that the language took as it developed from Sanskrit into the various Middle Indo-Aryan Prakritic forms – Māhārāṣṭrī, Śaurasenī, Ardha-Māgadhī,
Māgadhī, etc. This short article shows the perils of the transmission, - it is a well known linguistic fact that, as Sanskrit evolved, it simplified (for a short summary, see Massica 1991, 166-87), and many of the derived forms are capable of multiple interpretations. One may well argue that the redactors got the overall meaning right – which is only in part true in this case, as BS and Tibetan were “wrong”. But there are far more serious issues at stake. Norman has pointed out (2006A, 136) that even a compound as common as bodhisatta, is capable of being understood in many different ways because of the ambiguity of the word satta. So, in addition to the “agreed upon” meaning, of a being en route to awakening (derived from bodhi-sattva), it could also mean bodhi-śakta (a person capable of awakening), and bodhi-sakta (a person devoted to awakening). The Tibetans took it as none of these, translating the word as byang chub sems dpa’ (lit: “awakening-mind-hero”) which derives from the Skt. bodhi-satvan (“warrior” or “hero” of awakening) and there are several other possibilities including bodhi-satya (he whose truth or promise is awakening); bodhi-śākta (he whose power is awakening, with the ā > a because of the double consonants, per Pischel ¶83); and bodhi-satta (from sattā, he whose excellence is awakening).

In the philosophy of Buddhism the important question is whether a bodhi-satta is a “being of awakening” – i.e. already enlightened, or only en route. As a bahuvrīhī compound, bodhi-sattva actually suggests that the being is already enlightened (bodhiḥ sattvo yasya saḥ, “he whose spiritual essence is awakening”) but the compound could also be dissolved otherwise: (bodhiṃ sattvo yasya saḥ, “he whose essence [goes] towards awakening”). Most of the other compounds emphasize the not-yet-achieved goal of enlightenment, while the Tibetan is ambiguous. The point is, all these meanings are derivable from the same compound, bodhi-satta.

Although the ultimate insights that the Buddha saw cannot be adequately expressed in language, language is all that we have to introduce us to his philosophy and teachings. And the foundation of language rests on its individual lexemes and morphemes. It is clear that in order to understand exactly what the Buddha said and what he meant, philological tools are essential (Norman 2006C). One of the Buddha’s greatest insights was that of anicca, impermanence: we suffer because of our mental propensity to try and make things permanent which never can be (like atta, the self) and liberation is freedom from that
dependence. Language also inexorably changes over time, but fortunately often according to fixed rules. Although we can probably never recover the exact words of the Buddha, we can, using the comparative method of historical linguistics (Campbell 2004, 122f), trace back some of the changes the words have undergone and by doing so, help to clarify what the Buddha originally meant, if not said. What this study shows is that underneath the Pāli and Buddhist Middle Indic recensions there is another layer – earlier and closer to the Buddha’s historical time - which gave birth to both recensions and that this layer can be uncovered and reconstructed. This method can be very useful in resolving some long-standing ambiguities in the Canon.

Abbreviations

BS = Buddhist Sanskrit

DN = Dīgha Nikāya

P. = Pāli

Skt. = Sanskrit

Sv = Sumanāgalavilāsinī by Buddhaghoṣa (Rhys-Davids and Carpenter, J. E. 1886-1932)

√ = Sanskrit or Pāli root.
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Notes

1DN II 100, attadīpā viharatha attasaraṇā anaññasaraṇā, dhammadīpā dhammasaraṇā anaññasaraṇā...depending on whether one translates dīpa as "light" or dvīpa as "island", "help" or "protector". The word dīpa is another illustration of problems in the transmission of the Buddhadhamma. As Bhapat shows (1957, 11-13), an argument can be made to take the word as "island" (Skt. dvīpa > P. dīpa) if all the contexts of its use in the Theravādin canon and Buddhaghoṣa’s commentary are taken into consideration. However, others, including some Chinese translators have interpreted it as “light” (Skt. dīpa = P. dīpa) which it also could be. J. C. Wright (2000, 481-503) makes a strong case for translating dīpa as “light” (echoing the phrase ātma-jyotis, “light of the self” in the Brhad-āranyaka-upaniṣad) and atta- as ātta- “bereft of” and renders the famous passage above as: “Therefore, Ānanda, (I say only) sojourn ye here, bereft of your Lamp, bereft of recourse, with no other recourse, with Dhamma as lamp, with Dhamma as recourse, with only this recourse.” (488-89). This has the added merit of explaining the Buddha’s use of the word atta- which in this context seems paradoxical, since the summum bonum of Buddhism is anatta, not atta. With regard to dīpa vs. dvīpa, since the Buddha was no doubt aware of the homophone, perhaps he wanted both meanings to be understood?

2DN II 100, 13-16

3Page 37: … and just as a worn-out cart, Ānanda, can only with much additional care be made to move along, so, methinks, the body of the Tathāgata can only be kept going with much additional care.
4Buddhaghoṣa has chosen one of the variant readings; see below for a full list.
5Sv 256, 2-5.
8I am indebted to Ole Holten Pind (email), for his suggestion re: vleska.
9Pischel derives veḷu from *velnu (¶243) which is much more likely than veṭha > vedha > velha (Pischel ¶242) > loss of aspiration > vela. This still requires an explanation for the change of a > u which is common in some Prakrits (Apabhraṃśa and Gāndhārī and also in Ardha-Māgadhi; Pischel ¶105), but is not attested for veḷu.
10Norman has commented on the reliability of the commentarial tradition in the face of wrong or problematic readings on a number of occasions (1990, 2001, 2006B).
11Waldschmidt 1951 (vol 2.), 198. Brackets in original. They are accompanied by footnotes – omitted here – which refer to the material the author used for text reconstruction. The underlined portion has been added by the author; it indicates the extent of the original Turfan text, as per vol. 1, p. 18.
12Reading dvaidha for dvaidhā per Waldschmidt, 1950 (vol.1), p.18 footnote 7.
14Brackets in original. A very loose translation of the Tibetan: rnam pa gnyis la brten nas ’tso’o, ,dper na shing rta rnyid pa rnam pa gnyis la brten nas brtan pa de bzhin du, “he exists depending on two things, for example, just like an old cart is propped up in dependence on two things.”
15See Murthy (1987:41) for a description and illustration of the ancient gorathā two-wheeled bullock cart, “perhaps the oldest and commonest wheeled vehicle known in India”, depicted at Sanchi and other places.
16Translation of these two sentences follow:
14.19 Moreover, Ānanda, the Tathāgata is old, he has reached old age, he is 80 years old, he lives by reliance on two things (dvaidha-niśrayena). Just like an old cart exists dependent on two things, thus the Tathāgata, old, who has reached old age, is now 80 years old, [and] exists dependent on two things.

14.20 Therefore Ānanda, do not grieve, do not be weary. Why is that? Because it is to be understood that what is born, exists, is made, is compounded, is experienced, – that which is dependently arisen, must end, is liable to change, is subject to adversity (virodha) and dissolution, – that they are not destroyed – this is not possible.

14.19 punar aparam ānanda tathāgato vṛddho jīrnatāṁ prāpto 'ṣīte vayasi vartate dvaidhāniśrayena yāpyate || tadyathā jīrṇaṁ saktam dvaidhāniśrayena yāpyata evam eva tathāgato vṛddho jīrnatāṁ prāpto 'ṣīte vayasi vartate dvaidhāniśrayena yāpyate ||

14.20 mā tasmāt tvam ānanda sócā mā klāma || kasmād eva tat || kuta etal labhyāma yat taj jātaṁ bhūtam kṛtaṁ saṃskṛtaṁ vedayitaṃ praktiṣyasamutpannam kṣayadharmaṁ vyaadharmaṁ virodhadharmaṁ pralokadharmam na prarujyate || nedaṁ sthānam vidyate ||

from Waldschmidt 1951 (vol 2.), 198. Internal brackets showing reconstruction have been removed. Parts of the above are reconstructed based on Tibetan and Pāli sources. Note: BS Pralokadharmam seems to be a misreading for palokadhhamma – paloka meaning dissolution, from Skt. pra+\(\text{luj} = \text{pra+vruj}.

17 I use the symbol \(N\) to refer to anusvāra or any of the homorganic nasals (\(-m-, -m-, -n-, -n- (-\text{n}-), -n-, (-n-) or -n- (-\text{n}-)). Bracketed symbol is the IPA (International Phonetics Alphabet) designation.

18 See the Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit Dictionary under niśraya. Edgerton gives the main meaning as “support”; niśraya is also a technical term for the four requisites of a Buddhist monk: a place to sleep, food, garments and medicine. No doubt the Buddha was aware of the pun.

19 T01n0001_p0015b02-03. Pirú gu chē fāngbiàn xiūzhì dé yóusuǒ zhì. Wūshēn yīrán...

20 T01n0005_p0164c15-16. Rú gu chē wú jiānqiáng. Wǒ shēnǐ rúcǐ wú jiānqiáng...

21 T01n0006_p0180a26-27 || Xíng rúgu chē. Wú láo wú qián...The dates of these works are as given in Waldschmidt 1944, 2.

22 Norman first looked at bodhisatta in 1993 (p. 87), but cf. Har Dyal who suggested in 1932 (p. 7-9) that the compound went back to bodhisakta (“devoted to bodhi”) and in the Tibetan, to bodhisatvan. Rahula (1978:51) agrees with Dyal. Basham (1981:22) also refers to
Dyal and suggests the meaning is “One who is intent on (achieving) awakening.” He does not believe the Tibetan translation is valid because it is over a thousand years old; however he misses the point that each of the versions of – satta, whether –sattvam (“being of awakening” or “essence of awakening”), – satvan (“hero of awakening”), – sakta (“devoted to awakening”), or – śakta (“capable of awakening”) are equally plausible, as they all change into the same Prakritic form – satta by phonological rule. Vettner (1988:97 footnote 16) believes that the word bodhisatta goes back to bodhisakta and means “striving for awakening.”

Vettner (1988:97 footnote 16) believes that the word bodhisatta goes back to bodhisakta and means “striving for awakening.”

Adhigato kho myāyam dhammo gambhīro duddaso duranubodho santo paṇīto atakkāvacaro nipuno paṇḍitavedaniyo. This Dhamma that I have attained is deep (gambhīro), hard to see (duddaso), hard to understand (duranubodho), peaceful (santo) and excellent (paṇīto), unattainable by mere reasoning/difficult to know/beyond logic (atakkāvacaro, lit, “not in the realm of reasoning”), subtle (nipuno), to be experienced by the wise (paṇḍitavedaniyo).