

ASITA-DEVALA IN ISIBHĀSIYĀI

Lollanji Gopal

The *Isibhāsiyāi* (*Rṣibhāṣitāni*)¹ is one of the most ancient Jaina āgamic works. The *Thānāṅga* (*Sthānāṅga*)² mentions it as the third chapter of the *Paṇhāvāgaraṇāim* (*Pratnavyākaraṇa*), the tenth *āṅga*. But the text of the *Paṇhāvāgaraṇāim*, being a post-Gupta replacement of the original, does not contain this chapter. The *Samavāyaṅga*³ also knows the *Isibhāsiyāi* and describes it as containing forty-four *ajjhayaṇa* (*adhyayana*). This tallies with the form of the *Isibhāsiyāi* which has fortyfive sections.⁴ The text evidently was of considerable significance to the Jainas, because the scholiast, who wrote the *Avassayanijjutti* (*Avatya-niryukti*) (erroneously taken as the celebrity, Bhadrabāhu), expresses his resolve to write a *nijjutti* on it also.⁵ The *Sūyagaḍa* (*Sūtrakṛtāṅga*)⁶ names certain earlier “Mahāpuruṣa Arhats” who evidently belonged to the Vedic tradition and achieved the position of Arhats by resorting to ways and practices which generally are not approved by Jainism. The term *iha* used here refers to Jaina canonical literature. But the author of the commentary explains it to signify *Rṣibhāṣita* and other texts (*Rṣibhāṣitāḍau*). The text commanded respect in Jaina literature. It was accepted as a *kālīya* text which, though not included in the *āṅgas*, was approved for the study hours in the daily time-table.⁷

On the basis of ‘numerous indisputably genuine early reminiscences in language and style’ Schubring places it in the category of the most ancient Jaina āgamas such as the *Āyāra* (*Ācāra*, particularly its first part, the *Bambhacerāim*), the *Sūyagaḍa* (*Sūtrakṛta*), the *Uttarajjhāyā* (*Uttarādhyayana*) and the *Dasaveyāliya*⁸ (*Daṣavaikālika*). The *Isibhāsiyāi* doubtless has parallels in language and expression with these four texts. In the number of stanzas, the predominance of Ślokas and the extant of prose the *Isibhāsiyāi* is closest to the *Dasaveyāliya*; in the diversity of the metres it is like the *Dasaveyāliya*, *Uttarajjhāyā* and *Sūyagaḍa*.⁹ Like the *Bambhacerāim*, our text is characterized by an intermingling of prose with verse, in which ‘whole stanzas, half stanzas and single *pādas* alternate with unmetrical executions’.

The author of the text, as ascertained by Schubring, was close to Jina Pārśva from the doctrinal standpoint. This is indicated by the greater importance given to Pārśva in devoting a rather long passage for expounding his dictum.¹⁰ The text, moreover, does not separate the fourth and fifth vows separately as was the case with the *Cāturyāma-dharma* preached by Pārśva before Vardhamāna Mahāvīra. The *Isibhāsiyāi* was evidently still under the influence of Pārśva. It fuses the fourth and fifth vows into one.

The text breathes an atmosphere of liberal attitude which may have characterised the early days in the history of Jainism. It pays respect to many thinkers and religious leaders standing outside the Jaina fold by collecting their sayings to form a canonical work. Some of these belonged to the Vedic or Brahmanical tradition. We also find Maṃkhaliputta¹¹ (Maskariputra Gośāla) and the Buddhists Mahākāśava¹² (Mahākāśyapa) and Sāiputta (Śāriputra)-*buddha*.¹³ There are, in the text, certain views which could not have been tolerated in later days of Jainism, when orthodoxy had settled down and anything inconsistent with the set doctrines, dogmas and practices could not expect an honourable reference. Section 20 introduces an anonymous *utkaṣṭa-vādin* in place of a *ṛṣi* and mentions, with a fair show of approval, his materialism. We have an 'unjinistic' recognition of farming as *divvā kisi*¹⁴ and a reference to cosmogonic theories, including one about the origin of the world from water.¹⁵ Likewise, orthodox Jainism of later times could not have accepted the equation of Pārśva, Mahāvīra, and latter's adversary Gośāla Maskariputra, alike as *pratyekabuddhas*, which we find in our text. These 'strange things' in the text explain, according to Schubring, why it fell into 'nearly complete oblivion'¹⁶ and created uncertainty about it in later writings. This is exemplified by the confusion about it in Haribhadra's commentary on the *Āvassayanijjuttī*. In it the *Isibhāsiyāi* is identified at one place¹⁷ with the canonical *Paiṇṇa* (*Prakīrṇaka*) named *Devindatthaya* (*Devendra-stava*), and in another¹⁸ with the *Uttarajjhāyā*. We already have referred to the later confusion about the number of sections in the text.

A pointer to the date of the text is the reference to Gośāla Maskariputra. The *Viyāhapannatti*¹⁹ (*Vyākhyā-prajñapti*) (c. 2nd-3rd cent. A. D.) represents him as a renegade disciple of Mahāvīra for that passage, but in our text he does not suffer from any such humiliation. On the contrary he enjoys an honoured position as a *pratyekabuddha*. This transformation in his status in Jaina perception must have taken a long period. Thus, the *Isibhāsiyāi* is to be placed a few centuries before the selfsame (and other passages are similar in vein and style) in the *Viyāhapannatti*.

The emphasis on ethical thought is the main characteristic of the text. It brings out the common points in the ethical ideas of the early religions of different traditions. The metaphysical and doctrinal details and differences, which dominate later sectarian and scholastic texts, did not receive any importance from the author of this text. This also is a significant pointer to the early date of the text.

Our text purports to collect the views of *ṛṣis*. Generally the word *ṛṣi* is used for a sage. It is supposed to be synonymous with *muni*. But, in our text it is employed in the special sense of a *pratyekabuddha*. A *pratyekabuddha* is a person, who, having realised the highest knowledge, acquired the status of the *buddha* for himself but, unlike the *buddha*, did not found a school or community. That the

pratyekabuddhas of our text had no intention to teach, though they had their own characteristic views, is clear from the fact that the word *buitam* (dictum) and not *pannattam* (teaching) is used for them.²⁰ Under the name of *r̥ṣi* or *pratyekabuddha* the text records the views of forty-five thinkers, though in one case the actual name of the *r̥ṣi* is not mentioned.

The text does not give enough details to identify the *r̥ṣis* or to locate them in time and place in all the cases. However, some of them can be easily identified with personalities mentioned in early texts of the Brahmanical tradition, for example, Jaṇṇāvakka (= Yājñavalkya), Bāhuya (= Bāhuka or Nala), Soriyāyaṇa (= Sauryāyani), Addālaka (= Uddālaka) and Aruṇa Mahāsālaputta (= Āruṇi). The Brāhmaṇa association is clear in the cases of Piṅga, Isigiri, (R̥sigiri) and Sirigiri (Śr̥igiri) who are called *māhaṇa-parivvāyaga* (*brāhmaṇa-parivṛājaka*).²¹ Other names in this category are Asiya Davila (= Asita Devala), Aṅgarisi Bharaddāya (= Aṅgiras Bhāradvāja), *deva* Nārāya (= *devar̥ṣi* Nārada),²² Divāyaṇa (= Dvaipāyana) and Mātāṅga. Vāu (= Vāyu), Soma, Jama (= Yama) and Varuṇa are the four Loka-pālas (Regents of the Quarters) in the Brahmanical pantheon from very early times. Some names, for which we cannot adopt a very definite view (but some of them can still be identified), are Madhurāyaṇa (= Mathurāyaṇa), Tārāyaṇa (= Tārāgaṇa, more probably sage Nārāyaṇa), Āriyāyaṇa, Varisava-Kaṇha (= Varisakaṇha or Vārṣaganya, the ancient Sāṃkhya teacher). About Harigiri, Kumbhaputta, Pupphasālaputta, Rāmaputta (correctly Rāmagutta), Gāhavaiputta (= Gāthāpati-putra) Taruṇa, Ketaliputta²³ and Vidu (= Vidura) we are less certain. Besides Vaddhamāna (= Vardhamāna Mahāvīra) and Pāsa (Pārśva), we have Maṃkhaliputta (= Gośāla Maskariputra), Sāiputta (= Śāriputra) Buddha and *mahai* Mahākāsava (= Mahākāśyapa). Vajjiyaputta possibly also had a Buddhist association and belonged to the Vajji republic.²⁴ Vāgalacīri (= Vakkalacīri), Jaina R̥ṣyaśṛṅga, enjoyed a place of high respect in the eyes of the author of the text being referred to as *vijatta bhagavaṃ* and *uggatava*. The other names in the text are Metajja (Maitreya), Bhayāli, Sāṃjai (= Saṃjaya),²⁵ Dagabhāla,²⁶ Vārattaya Addaga, Indanāga (Indranāga) and Vesamaṇa (Vaiśravaṇa).

Some of these names occur in some other Jaina texts as well. The *Sūyagaḍa*²⁷ (c. 2nd cent. B. C.) mentions Asita, Devala, Dvaipāyana, Pārāśara, Namī-videhī Rāmagupta, Bāhuka and Nārāyaṇa as *mahāpurisā* who achieved the highest knowledge, even though they followed ways not approved by Jainism. Confirmation of the names from other Jaina writings and non-Jaina texts makes a strong case for the historicity of most of the names mentioned in the *Isibhāsiyāi*. In the case of some others, we can postulate a quasi-historical existence, as they were handed down by a long and persistent tradition. (The four Lokapālas and Vaiśravaṇa are of course Vedic divinities).

In section 3 the name of the *ṛṣi* in the introductory prose passage is 'Asiya Davila'. The concluding prose sentence mentions him simply as Davila. Schurbring²⁸ feels no difficulty in taking Asita Devala to be the original of Asiya Davila. There cannot be any objection to equating Asiya with Asita. But Devala, as the original of Davila, is not so easy to explain. However, considering the major changes occurring in the name of other sages in the text and the form Davila (as intermediary between Devala and Davila), the restoration is to be accepted.

Here I intend to discuss the identity of "Asita Devala" with particular reference to his characteristic ideas as stated in the *Isibhāsiyāi*.

At the very outset it is to be pointed out that, though Asita Devala is mentioned as the name of a single person, the *Sūyagaḍa*²⁹ makes Asita and Devala two different persons. The commentator Śīla-sūri (c. 3rd quarter of the 9th cent. A.D.) falls in line with the *Sūyagaḍa*.^{29a} There is some other Jaina evidence in support of Asita alone being the name of an individual. The *Isimaṇḍala* instead mentions the name as *Devilāsuta*.³⁰ There is no doubt that the *Isimaṇḍala* has Asita Devala of the *Isibhāsiyāi* in mind, because the introductory phrases in the two cases are closely parallel.³¹ In Brahmanical tradition Asita Devala sometimes appears as one single name. But Devala alone is generally used as the name for an ancient sage respected as an authority alike in the Āyurveda and the Sāṅkhya, besides being a Smṛti writer. Hence, we would not involve ourselves in the discussion whether there were more than one Devala, or the first Devala made contributions to many areas of knowledge. The varied contributions of Devala are reflected in the quotations from the *Devaladharmasūtra* surviving in medieval commentaries and digests.

The main burden of the teachings of Asita Devala in the *Isibhāsiyāi* is the cessation of all moral impurities or sins (*savvaleovavarata*). The introductory prose passage begins by saying that those who are contaminated by moral impurities (*levovalittā*) revolve for a long time in this ocean of world. It seems that after the expression *samsārasāgaram* the expression *aṇupariyaṭṭanti* is missings. Likewise, in the following sentence the word *levovaratā* also seems to have been dropped.³² The second sentence says, by way of contrast, that the person whose moral impurities have ceased, having crossed the world, reaches a permanent abode and remains there. A number of adjectives describe the happy state of such a person. The text adds that, 'having resolved to become a man free from all moral impurities, Asita Davila, the *arhat-ṛṣi*, (thus) said'. The eleven verses which follow are supposed to record the teachings of Davila.

Thus it begins: He, who does violence (*vihimsate*) to the life of a small or big being, has his soul over-dominated by attachment and malignity (*rāgadosā-bhibhūtappā*) and he is contaminated by sinful acts (*līppate pāvakammunā*)³³ (Verse 1).

He, who takes any belongings (*pariggahaṃ giṇhate*), whether little or considerable, is contaminated by sinful acts on account of the guilt of stupefaction caused by greed (*geḥimucchāya doseṇaṃ*)³⁴ (Verse 2). He, who expresses anger (*kohaṃ*), on his own or for another person, is contaminated by sinful acts on account of the chains caused by it (Verse 3).

After this we have a note saying : 'In this manner up to *micchādamsaṇasalla*.^{34a} This term appears as the last in the list of eighteen *pāpas* recognised in the Jain tradition^{34b} and signifies a false philosophy of life.

Verse 4 enumerates as moral impurities (*leva*) killing a living thing (*pañātivatē*), saying untruth (*aliyavayaṇaṃ*), stealing or taking what has not been given away (*adattaṃ*), intercourse (*mehuṇagamaṇaṃ*) and amassing property (*pariggahaṃ*). Verse 5 mentions anger (*kohe*), conceit (*māṇo*), deceit (*māyā*), and greed (*lobho*) as moral impurities which are of various forms or types (*bahuviho*, *bahuvidhavidhī* and *bahuvidhā*). Hence, having considered them to be the cause for augmenting sinful acts, one should be a noble seeker of the best goal and should become a wandering ascetic for vigorous efforts³⁵ (Verse 6). As milk is destroyed after being associated with poison, attachment and malignity are the destroyer of continence (*bambhacera*) (Verse 7).^{35a} As the best of milk by stupefaction is turned into curd, so the sinful acts increase on account of the guilt of greed (Verse 8).³⁶ The jungle trees in a forest, when burnt by the wild fire, grow again, but, in the case of people exhumed by the fire of anger, it is very difficult to be free from unhappiness (Verse 9).³⁷ Even the fiercely burning fire can be extinguished by water, but the fire of delusion cannot be extinguished by all the water in the sea (Verse 10).³⁸ He, who has realised the nature of the shackles of birth and death, has broken the (cycle of) birth and death and is free from the dust (of action), achieves final beatitude (Verse 11).³⁹

At the end we have a summarised sentence⁴⁰, the full form of which appears earlier at the end of the first section. The fuller sentence is to be translated thus : 'I say, "Thus becoming enlightened, indifferent (to worldly attachment), freed from sins, restrained, taking all objects to be the same, and a renouncer⁴¹, he does not come again for the activities of this (world)."'

We have to discuss the extent to which these passages represent Asita Devala's own words and ideas. According to Schubring the whole text was composed by one single author; the parallelism in the structure of the individual chapters proves this 'no less than the throughout uniform style and the numerous self-quotations'.⁴² He admires the text as being original and attractive.⁴³ The 'charm of novelty' of the text reveals itself when contrasted with the 'uniform creation' of contemporary parallel texts which are only 'more or less cleverly and transparently composed compilations'. Our author has adorned the passages borrowed from the words of the *ṛsis* by covering them with 'the plumage of its own'. This has camouflaged the

original words of these *ṛṣis* to such an extent that their disciples 'would indeed have stood perplexed before these splinters from the thought-workshop of the master'.

For determining the original views and expressions of any *ṛṣi* in this text, we have to concentrate on the motto and the exposition parts of the concerned section. The sections do not show a uniform style in regard to these two. They are in any of three forms, prose, verses, or both mixed together. The variation is more noticeable in the case of motto.⁴⁴ The variations, as against a stereotyped uniformity, may be construed to show that the form and expressions in the different sections result from the peculiarities in the original expression of the teachings of the different *ṛṣis*.

The nature of the text compelled the author to make 'greater borrowings' from the original. Schubring has suggested that in the motto and exposition portions, stanzas, in a metre other than the *śloka*, would generally appear to have been borrowed by the author from some other source. Likewise, some prose passages are parallel to passages in other texts and were 'more or less conscious reminiscence.'⁴⁵ These two criteria of the metre of the stanzas and the expressions in the prose passages do not help us much in the case of the section on Devala and we will have to analyse the content of the section for internal indications.

In the section we notice a visible attempt to cast Devala's ideas into the mould of Jainism. Schubring⁴⁶ points out that verse III. 1 and III. 2 of the text deal respectively with the guilt effected by *prāṇātīpāta* and *parigraha*, i.e. the violation of the first and fifth *mahāvratas* (vows) in Jainism. The second of the four manuscripts of the text, which Alsdorf photographed in Jain Bhandar in 1957, inserts three verses between lines *a* and *b* of verse 2.⁴⁷ They refer to the guilt effected by the violation of the second (speaks the untruth—*musam bhāsae*), third (takes what is not given—*adinnaṃ gṛhṇai*) and fourth (enjoys intercourse—*mehuṇaṃ sevai*) vows. According to Schubring⁴⁸, these verses 'do not make the expression of an old text.' He admits that the insertion of these stanzas, relating to the second, third and fourth vows, is logical in itself. But, considering the approach of the author in a parallel situation in an earlier section of the text (I. 19ff), where he mentions only the first, third and fourth vows, we can say that it was not imperative on his part to include these five lines to cover the second, third and fourth vows. The Sanskrit *Tīkā* also does not take cognisance of these five lines. It seems that somebody, with a view to fitting the stanzas into the Jaina formulation of *mahāvratas*, added these lines.

An analysis of the subsequent portions of the text makes it clear that the author did not have the model of the *mahāvratas* in his mind. In verse 3 he refers to the expression of anger (*kohaṃ*) as a factor causing contamination with sinful acts, on the same footing as the killing of beings and the taking of belongings. Verse 3 is followed by the expression *Evam jāva micchādamsaṇasalle*. The author,

thus, intends to cover factors, the first three being mentioned in the first three verses, which go up to *micchādamsanasalle*. The Jaina tradition mentions eighteen *pāpa-karmas*.⁴⁹ Of these the first is *prāṇātipāta* (verse 1 of our text), the second, third and fourth are respectively *mṛṣāvāda*, *adattādāna* and *maithuna* (five lines in the manuscript mentioned above), the fifth is *parigraha* (verse 2 of our text), the sixth is *krodha* (verse 3 of our text) and the eighteenth is *mithyā-darśanaśālyā*.⁵⁰ Thus, according to the author of the text, Devala also spoke about the eighteen *pāpakarmas*, beginning from *prāṇātipāta* and ending with *mithyādarśanaśālyā*. The intention of the author becomes quite clear when in verses 4-5 he enumerates the guilt-contaminations as *pāṇātivāto*, *aliyavayaṇam*, *adattam*, *mehuṇagamanam*, *parigraham*, *koho*, *māṇo*, *māyā* and *lobho*, which occur in the same order as the first nine *pāpa-karmas* in the Jaina tradition. Clearly, he was straining hard to present Devala's verses on *lepas* within the pattern of Jaina enumeration of *pāpakarmas*.

Schubring points out quite a few mistakes and contradictions in the text,⁵¹ some of which were due to the defective tradition on which the author drew, while he was doubtlessly responsible for some others. It is, however, not possible to fix the responsibility on the author or tradition in each case. But, it is to be noted that the author was not satisfied to work as a mere cataloguer or compiler of the views of others. He had a definite plan or purpose and he asserted his rights as an author to realize it. As pointed out earlier, he wanted to emphasise the ethical parts in the teachings of the thinkers. The omission of other aspects of their teachings was bound to project a partial or lopsided picture of their total teachings. In his effort to project the ethical problems of the ideas of his predecessors, with the view to bringing home the homogeneity and universality of the ethical core of different religions, our author could have inadvertently, and in some cases deliberately, ironed out the divergent details. This possibly happened in the case of Devala's teachings also.

The attempt on the part of the author to present the teachings of Devala to suit his convenience is to be seen in the structure of the section. Like all other sections in the text it has three distinct parts : the motto, the exposition separated from it by the name of the *ṛṣi*, and the conclusion. No amount of reasoning will convince anyone to believe that all the forty-four *ṛṣis* formulated their views in the stereotyped form in which they occur in our text. This holds good for the section on Devala also. The absurdity is apparent in the case of the concluding sentence. Though it purports to be an utterance of a particular *ṛṣi*, it has a set formula of words, so much so that the author dispenses with the formality of reproducing it in full in all the sections and instead gives the opening and concluding expression. Clearly the sentence recording the concluding resolve of the different *ṛṣis* could not have been identical, even if we admit the closest similarities in their views. Thus, in the present section also we see the working of the hands of the author who wanted to present Devala's teachings according to his scheme and structure.

The very first line of the introductory prose passage shows that the central point in Devala's teachings is *leva* (*lepa*), contamination of sin. Verses 4 and 5 confirm it. The first three verses explain *leva* by employing the descriptive expression *lippata pāvakammunā* as the refrain. Later on, verses 6 and 8 also speak of the *pāvakamma* getting augmented.

The original work of Devala is not available. On the basis of quotations in later commentaries and digests we have been able to reconstruct some parts of the erstwhile *Devala-dharmasūtra*.⁵² The text, it is revealed, possessed one full chapter concerning *pāpadoṣas*. *Prāyaścitta*, doubtless, had formed an important part of the *dharmaśāstra* literature. But only a few *Smṛtis* refer, and that too very briefly, to the *pāpas*. The account of *pāpadoṣas* in the *Devaladharmasūtra* is without any parallel in any other Brahmanical text. It classifies *pāpadoṣas* broadly into three on the basis of their origin from mind, speech, or body. These three are further divided respectively into twelve, six and four sub-types. Each of these is first defined and explained in prose passages in the form of *sūtras*. They are followed by verses explaining or illustrating in a more popular style the nature of the different *pāpadoṣas*. Thus, the chapter on *pāpadoṣas* would appear to be one of the more significant portions of the *Devaladharmasūtra*. It was quite proper, then, on the part of the author of the *Isibhāsiyāi* to include an account of the contamination caused by sin on the basis of the treatment of the subject by Devala.

We have seen above that in the first three verses of our text there was a deliberate attempt to accommodate Devala's views in the Jain pattern. But, in this process, the original kernel of Devala's writings peeps out. Thus, in the first two verses, though the violations of the vows of *ahiṃsā* and *aparigraha* are treated, it is clear that the original emphasis was on *rāgadoṣa* (attachment and malignity) and *gehī* (greed) as factors causing contamination of sinful acts. The author could not pursue this exercise of his for long, probably because there was not enough material in Devala's verses amenable to the Jain scheme. He included a verse on *koho* (anger) and finally gave up the exercise by remarking that in this way it goes up to *micchādamaṣaṇasalla*.

This incongruity becomes still more clear in the subsequent verses. Verse 8 again refers to the increase in sinful acts on account of the guilt of *gehī* (greed). *Gehī* (Skt. *grddhi*) does not appear in the Jain list of eighteen *pāpas*. It does not occur in the *Devaladharmasūtra* either. But, we find that in the extant quotations from Devala, the verses describing *lobha* contain three which bring out the significance of *trṣṇā* or *trṣā*. We cannot rule out the possibility that some of the lost verses contained a similar reference to *grddhi*. Further onward, in verse 10, the *pāpa*, which has been underlined, is followed by *moha*. *Moha* also does not figure in the Jain list of the 18 *pāpasthānakas*. But it has been included by Devala in the list of twelve *pāpadoṣas* which arise out of the mind.

Verses 6 and 11, though touched by the author of the *Isibhāsiyāi*, retain words with a specific usage characteristic of the Brahmanical tradition to which Devala belonged. The second line of the verse 6 reads: *uttamaṭṭhavaraggāhī vīriyattāe parivvāe*. In the expression *uttamaṭṭha*, *aṭṭha* has been used in the sense of one of the pursuits of life (*puruṣārthas*). In the Jaina texts the usual term in such a context would be *eṣaṇā*. The expression *uttamaṭṭha* here stands for *mokṣa* which is described as the highest or ultimate pursuit of life. The verb *parivvāe* is to be derived from the Sanskrit verb *parivraj*⁵³ and is to be connected with the words *parivrajyā*, *parivrāj*, *parivrāja* and *parivrājaka*. They refer to a wandering mendicant, recluse, or ascetic who has renounced the world. In the religious atmosphere prevailing at the time of the appearance of the Buddha, the order of the *parivrājakas* was fairly prevalent. In the wake of the popularity of the Śramaṇic systems, the Brahmanical tradition made an effort to contain and control it by recognising it as the fourth stage of life (*āśrama*). The fourth *āśrama* in later times was generally termed *sannyāsa*, but in earlier times the appellation *parivrājaka* seems to have been more in vogue. In one surviving excerpt from the *Devaladharmasūtra*⁵⁴, the duties and rules relating to a *parivrājaka* were prescribed. Thus, it can be seen that verse 6 of our text advises that pursuing the ultimate *puruṣārtha* (*mokṣa*) one should become a *parivrājaka* (enter the fourth *āśrama*) and exert himself.⁵⁵

Verse 11 says that he who has understood the nature of the chains of birth and death, breaks the cycle of birth and death and is taintless, attains *siddhi*. The word *siddhi* in a general sense often means fulfilment or success. But it has a restricted and specialised meaning as well. In the Yoga system *siddhi* (or *aśvarya-guṇa*) refers to superhuman powers or faculties, which are supposed to be eight in number. The *Devaladharmasūtra* evidently contained a detailed account of the Yoga and Sāṅkhya systems.⁵⁶ Here *siddhi* seems to have been used in the technical sense common to the Yoga system and the *Devaladharmasūtra*.

Verse 7 reveals the original words of Devala which seem to have escaped the changing hands of the author of the *Isibhāsiyāi*. It describes *rāga* (attachment) and *dosa* (*dveṣa*, malignity) as the destroyer of *bambhacera* (*brahmacarya*). The use of the term *bambhacera* is significant. It stands for the first stage or order in the life of an individual (*āśrama*), the life of celibacy passed by a Brāhmaṇa boy in studying the Vedas, or celibacy, chastity, etc. The context, however, does not have any reference to the first stage of life alone. Likewise, the passage will not yield a happy meaning if *brahmacarya* is restricted to celibacy inasmuch as there is no direct and intimate connection between *dveṣa* and *caryā* on the one hand and celibacy on the other. Among the many meanings of Brahman are 'Supreme Being', 'religious austerities', and 'intellect'. The *caryā* of Brahman will, therefore, signify religious study or self-restraint. This use of the term *brahmacarya* in this verse appears to have survived from the original verse of Devala.⁵⁷

Against the background of these indications of the original Brahmanical core of Devala surviving the Jaina revision, we may refer to certain features of style and structure, which, though not conclusive, are compatible with the known features of Devala's writings in the available excerpts.

First is the introductory prose passage. It is admitted that this portion of the text was intended to introduce the views of a ṛṣi and hence would appear to have been formulated mostly by the author of the text. As against the other sections in the text associated with other ṛṣis, whose original writings are not available, the section under study is to be compared with the views of Devala as recorded in a *dharmaśūtra* named after him. This *dharmaśūtra* was partly in prose *sūtras* and partly in verses. The surviving prose passages of the *Devaladharmasūtra* show a peculiar style. We often find long sentences, wherein the details are in the form of adjectives qualifying the main noun.⁵⁸ This is also a feature of the introductory prose passage in the section associated with Devala. In the partly damaged second sentence we have several words qualifying *saṃsārasāgaram* and *thānam*. The style comes out beautifully in the third sentence which has a long string of adjectives describing the characteristic of a *savvalavovarae* person. We cannot argue, in the absence of the full text of the *Devaladharmasūtra*, that these expressions or sentences occurred in the original, but, we can suggest that the author of our text possibly tried to present the introduction, which purports to record the motive or resolve of Devala, in the peculiar style he noticed as characterising the prose passages in Devala's original work.

Another prominent feature of the style of the *Devaladharmasūtra* is that it first enumerates all the important points or subdivisions in a summarised form and in subsequent verses, elaborates, explains, and illustrates them. Although the full text of the *Devaladharmasūtra* is unavailable, in all the cases where we are able to reconstruct a chapter, this style is evident. In our text the section on Devala also seems to possess this characteristic. This point is all the more significant because our author was not under any obligation to reproduce all the passages from Devala's original. He was presenting the views of Devala, within the framework of his text and the task taken up by him. Verses 1-3 followed by the remark *evam jāva micchādamsaṇasalle* show that the author cut short the portions dealing with the enumeration of the factors causing *pāvaś*. Verses 4-5 retain the style of enumeration in a pronounced manner. The subsequent verses (6-11) are evidently in the nature of further explanation and elaboration of the points or factors listed in the earlier verses. To illustrate our point, we may refer to verses 8 and 9 which bring home the force of *gehi* and *koha* mentioned as factors causing *pāva* in verses 2 and 3. A comparison of the phrasing of verses 2 and 8 will show the intrinsic connection between the two.⁵⁹ This similarity in the style suggests that our author had before him the original *Devaladharmasūtra* from which he drew. No doubt it may be argued that this characteristic is shared by early Indian thought as projected in some

of the earlier works belonging to different branches of learning. However, it must be remembered that it was not an invariable feature of Indian thought and texts, and, when compared with texts of a similar nature, the *Devaladharmasūtra* has it in a very pronounced manner.

A few other features of the passages attributed to Devala in our text may also be noted. We are conscious that they are found associated with many other early texts and are not so characteristic of the passages surviving in the name of Devala to drive home the connection between the two only on the basis of these features,

The first is the metre *śloka* employed in our text. Though the metre has been used in the *Devaladharmasūtra* also, it is the most convenient and popular metre for this type of writings and occurs in Sanskrit, Pali and Prakrit texts alike.

The second pronounced feature noticeable in our text is the repetition of the same phrases in the fourth part of the verse as refrain. In verses 1 to 3 we find the words *līpate pāvakammujā* being repeated thus. In verses 4 and 5 *levo* occurs seven times evidently for emphasising its importance. This feature can also be seen in many other texts with a religious, philosophical, diadectical, or ethical theme which resort to a similar style for creating greater effect.

Another significant feature of the style in our text is the use of homely simile and illustration for clarifying the point. In verses 7 to 10 the illustrations are derived from the phenomena of milk being destroyed as a result of contamination with poison, milk turning into curd, forest trees being burnt by jungle fire and fire being controlled with the help of water. This feature is characteristic of many early Indian texts, particularly those which have to explain a difficult philosophical idea in an easy manner or which seek to create greater impact in emphasising the importance of a religious or ethical precept.

Notes and References

1. *Isibhāsiyāim. A Jaina Text of Early Period*. Ed. Walther Schubring. L. D. Series 45, Ahmedabad, 1974. It was originally published in *Den Nachrichten der Wissenschaften zu Gottingen*, 1942, pp. 489-576. The Sanskrit commentary was published in the same *Akademie*, 1951, pp. 21-52. The second edition of the text published from Hamburg in 1969 contains its German translation as well.
2. *Sthāna*, 10, *sūtra* 755.
3. *Samavāya* 44.
4. According to Schubring, *op. cit.*, p. 2, the difference in the number of sections is to be explained by the fact that section no. 20 of the text does not correspond to the pattern of other sections, each of which is associated with the utterance of a *ṛṣi*. There is no such explanation of the *Vihimagga pavā* (Ś 1363 = A. D. 1441) of Jinaprabha mentioning fifty as the number of sections in it.

5. *Avassaya-nijjutti*, II. 6.
6. *Ibid.*, III. 4.1-4 *Ete puṇṇi mahāpurisā āhitā iha sammata.*
7. *Nandī* (Agamodaya Samiti) 202 b; *Pakkhiya* (Devchand Lalbhai Pustakoddhara), 4, 66a.
8. *Op. cit.*, p. 2.
9. *Ibid.*, p. 7.
10. Section 31. Pages 66-69.
11. Section 11.
12. Section 9.
13. Section 38.
14. Sections 26 and 32.
15. Section 37—*Savvamiṇaṃ purā udagamāsi tti.*
16. *Op. cit.*, p. 9.
17. On *Avassaya-nijjutti*, II. 6.
18. *Ibid.*, VIII. 5.
19. *Ibid.*, 15.
20. Schubring, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
21. Ambaḍa is also called *parivvāyaga*. His interlocutor is Jagamdhārāyaṇa (= Yaugamdhārāyaṇa).
22. Schubring, *op. cit.*, pp. 4-5 prefers to identify him with Prince Nārāya of Bāravaī.
23. Schubring, *op. cit.*, p. 4 suggests it to be a perplexity variant of Tetali-putta in section 10.
24. Schubring (*ibid.*) describes him as the head of the school of the Vātsī-putras, i. e. Vatsīputra.
25. Schubring, *op. cit.*, p. 7 equates him with a king whose name is Sanskritized as Samyata.
26. Schubring (*ibid.*) identifies him with Gaddabhāli, the teacher of Saṃjaya = Samyata.
27. I. 3. 4.1-4.
28. *Op. cit.*, p. 5.
29. I. 3.4.3—आसिले देविले चेव दीवायण महारिसी ।
गरासरे दगं भोच्चा बीयाणि हरियाणि य ॥
- 29a. अपि च आसिलो नाम महर्षिस्तथा देविलो द्वैपायनश्च तथा पराशराख्य इत्येवमादयः शीतोदक बीज-हरितादिपरिभोगादेव सिद्धा इति श्रूयते ।
30. Here it is said that King Devilāsuta nearly married his own daughter. We do not have any confirmation of this fact about Asita, Devala, or Asita Devala from any other source and are not in a position to offer any explanation of it.
31. The *Isibhāsiyāi* has *bhaviyavvaṃ khalu bho savvalevāvvaṇaṃ*, whereas the *Isimaṇḍala* reads *bhaviyavvaṃ bho khalu savva-kāma-viraena'eyam ajjhayaṇaṃ bhāsittu Devilāsuya rāyarisi siva suhaṃ patto.*

32. Schubring, *op. cit.*, p. 103.
33. Verse 2 has *lippae* in place of *lippate*.
34. Here and in verse 8 *gehi* is to be rendered as *grddhi*, from the root *grdh* to covet, desire, strive after greedily.
- 34a. *Salla* (= *Salya*) meaning a spear, dart or arrow also stands for an extraneous substance lodged in the body and giving it very great pain. Figuratively it signifies any cause of poignant or heart-sending grief. The word also means sin or crime.
- 34b. A. M. Sethiya, *Jaina Siddhānta bola saṅgraha*, Vol. 3, p. 182.
35. तस्मा ते तं विक्किञ्चिता पावकम्मवड्ढणं ।
उत्तमदुवरगाही वीरियत्ताए परिव्वए ॥
- 35a. खीरे दूंसि जघा पप्प विणासमुवगच्छति ।
एवं रागो व दोसो व बम्भचेरविणासणा ॥
36. जघा खीरं पधाणं तु मुच्छणा जायते दधि ।
एवं गेहिप्पदोसेणं पावकम्मं पवड्ढती ॥
37. रण्णे दवणिणा दड्ढा रोहंते वणपादवा ।
कोहग्गिणा तु दड्ढाणं दुक्खा दुक्खाणं णिव्वुती ॥
The Sanskrit Tika cannot make out any sense in the second line of the verse and remarks : मुनेस्तु क्रोधाग्निना दग्धानां दुःखानां निवर्तनं प्रत्यागमो न भवति । कस्तु नाम दुःखानां प्रत्यागममिच्छेदित्यस्पष्टम् । The commentator fails to notice that in the earlier two verses also the comparisons are not completely parallel in the use of the expressions, even though the main points are clear.
38. सक्का वण्ही णिवारेतुं वारिणा जलितो बहिं ।
सव्वोदहिजलेणा वि मोहग्गी दुण्णिवारओ ॥
The Sanskrit Tika does not take any notice of verses 10 and 11.
39. जस्स एते परिन्नाता जाती-मरणबंधणा ।
से छिन्नजातिमरणे सिद्धिं गच्छति णीरए ॥
40. एवं से बुद्धे णो पुणरवि इच्चत्थं हव्वमागच्छति त्ति बेमि ।
41. *Tāi* may be rendered as either *tyāgī* or *trāyī*. In the second case it will mean protector.
42. Schubring, *op. cit.*, p. 9.
43. *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9.
44. Schubring, *op. cit.*, p. 3.
45. *Ibid.*, p. 9.
46. *Op. cit.*, p. 126.

47. *Ibid.*, pp. 126-127—

जो मुसं भासए किचि अप्पं वा जइ वा बहु ।
 अप्पण' अट्टा परस्स वा लिप्पए पाव-कम्मणा ॥
 अदिन्नं गेण्हइ जो उ....().... ।
 मेहुणं सेवइ जो उ तेरिच्छं दिव्वं माणुसं ।
 राग-दोस, अभिभूय' अप्पा लिप्पए पाव-कम्मणा ॥

48. *Ibid.*, p. 127. He refers to the metrical defect in lines 2, 3 and 5 and to the use of *kammaṇā* instead of *kammaṇā* of verses 1-3.
49. A. M. Sethiya, *op. cit.*
50. From the seventh to the seventeenth we have *māna*, *māyā lobha*, *rāga*, *dveṣa*, *kleṣa*, *abhyākhyāna*, *piṭunatā*, *paraparivāda*, *rati-arati* and *māyā-mṛṣā*.
51. *Op. cit.*, p. 11 : 'wavering in the judging of the *riddhi* (9 and 45), and the error concerning the *agandhana* (45), the repeated use of the same motto in 26 and 32, the transformation of current names, the Ṛṣi Ketaliṣṭha besides Tetaliṣṭha'.
52. Our reconstruction is to be published shortly.
53. For a similar use of the verb *pravraj* see *Jābālopaniṣad*, 4—*vanī bhūtoḥ pravrajat*; *Baudhāyana-dharmasūtra*, II. 10.2, 18—*brahmocaryavān pravrajatītyekeṣām*.
54. *Kṛtyakalpataru*, Vol. XIV, p. 49.
55. *Vīriyattāe* (Skt. *vīryārtham*) may be taken to make an indirect allusion to Jainism. Mahāvīra is the name of the twenty-fourth *tīrthāṅkara* of the Jainas, who is often glorified as the real founder of Jainism.
56. Śāṅkara on *Vedāntasūtra*, I. 4. 28. One of the earliest full account of the eight *siddhis* is associated with the *Devala-dharmasūtra*. Our article "Devaladharmasūtra on Aiśvarya" appears in *Śrī Dīnēśacandrikā : Studies in Indology* (D. C. Sircar Felicitation Volume), pp. 153-58.
57. This seems to have been the original and early meaning of the term *brahmacharya*. This will be an indicator of an early date for Devala.
58. See, for example, passages on the four *varṇas* in our article on "Devala-dharmasūtra on Varṇas and Jātis", *Dr. R. N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume*, Delhi 1984, pp. 239-245.
59. Both employ the terms *mucchā*, *gehi*, *doseṇam* and *pāvakamma* in a specific sense.