ASITA-DEVALA IN ISIBHĀSIYĀI

Lōlānji Gopal

The Isibhāsiyāi (Rṣibhāṣītā)¹ is one of the most ancient Jaina āgamic works. The Thānāṅga (Sthānāṅga)² mentions it as the third chapter of the Pāṇhāvāgaranaṁ (Praṅnayākaraṇa), the tenth aṅga. But the text of the Pāṇhāvāgaranaṁ, being a post-Gupta replacement of the original, does not contain this chapter. The Samavāyaṅga³ also knows the Isibhāsiyāi and describes it as containing forty-four ajjhayaṇa (adhyayaṇa). This tallies with the form of the Isibhāsiyāi which has forty-five sections.⁴ The text evidently was of considerable significance to the Jainas, because the scholiast, who wrote the Āvassayaniṣṭuti (Āvāṣyaka-nirvyakti) (erroneously taken as the celebrity, Bhadrabāhu), expresses his resolve to write a nījuttī on it also.⁵ The Śuyagaḍa (Śutraktāṅga)⁶ names certain earlier “Mahāpurusa 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 iḥa used here refers to Jaina canonical literature. But the author of the commentary explains it to signify Rṣibhāṣīta and other texts (Rṣibhāṣītādau). The text commanded respect in Jaina literature. It was accepted as a kālīya text which, though not included in the aṅgas, 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 Śuyagaḍa (Śutraktā), the Uttarajjhāya (Uttarādhyaṇa) and the Dasaveyāliya⁸ (Dafanaikaḷi). 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, Uttarajjhāya and Śuyagaḍa.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.
Asita-Devala in Isibhāsiyāi

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 Maśkhaliputta11 (Maskariputra Gośāla) and the Buddhists Mahākāsavā12 (Mahākāśyapa) and Sāippetra (Śāriputra)-buddha.18 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 uktāva-vādin in place of a rṣi and mentions, with a fair show of approval, his materialism. We have an ‘unjinistic’ recognition of farming as divā kīṣī14 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 Parāva, 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 Avasayanijjutti. In it the Isibhāsiyāi is identified at one place17 with the canonical Pāṇīna (Prākīrṇaka) named Devindathaya (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 Viyāhapanatti19 (Vyākkyā-prajñāpti) (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 Viyāhapanatti.

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 rṣis. Generally the word rṣi 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. Under the name of ṛṣi or pratyekabuddha the text records the views of forty-five thinkers, though in one case the actual name of the ṛṣi is not mentioned.

The text does not give enough details to identify the ṛṣis 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, Jāṇṇāvaka (= Vājñāvalkya), Bāhuya (= Bāhuka or Nala), Soriyāṇa (= Sauryāyani), Addālaka (= Uddālaka) and Arunā Mahāsālaputta (= Āruṇī). The Brāhmaṇa association is clear in the cases of Piṅgā, Isigiri, (Ṛṣigiri) and Sirigiri (Śrīgiri) who are called mahāna-parivṛṭyaga (brāhmaṇa-parivṛṭaka). Other names in this category are Asiya Davila (= Asita Devala), Āṅgarisi Bharaddāya (= Āṅgiras Bhāradvāja), deva Nārāya (= devaṛṣi Nārada), Divāyana (= Divaipāyana) and Mātaṅga. Vāu (= Vāyu), Soma, Jāma (= Yama) and Varuṇa are the four Lokāpālas (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 Madhurāyana (= Mathurāyana), Tārāyana (= Tārāgana, more probably sage Nārāyaṇa), Āriyāyana, Varisava-Kaṇha (= Varisakāṇha or Vārṣagāṇya, the ancient Śāmkhya teacher). About Harigiri, Kumbhaputta, Pupphasālaputta, Rāmaputta (correctly Rāmagutta), Gāhāvaiputta (= Gāthāpatisputra) Taruṇa, Ketaliputta and Vidu (= ? Vidura) we are less certain. Besides Vaddhamāna (= Vardhamāna Mahāvīra) and Pāsa (Pārśva), we have Māṃkhaliputta (= Gośāla Maskariputra), Sāṇiputta (= Śāriputra) Buddha and mahai Mahākāśava (= Mahākāśyapa). Vajjivyaputta possibly also had a Buddhist association and belonged to the Vajjī republic. Vāgalaciri (= Vakkalacirī), Jaina Rśyaśrīga, enjoyed a place of high respect in the eyes of the author of the text being referred to as viyatta bhagavan and uggatava. The other names in the text are Metajja (Maitreya), Bhayāli, Sāmjai (= ? Saṅjaya), Dagabhāla, Vārattaya Addaga, Indanāga (Indranāga) and Vesamaṇa (Vaiśravana).

Some of these names occur in some other Jaina texts as well. The Śūyagada (= 2nd cent. B.C.) mentions Asita, Devala, Dvaipāyana, Pārāśara, Nami-vidēhi Rāmagupta, Bāhuka and Nārāyaṇa as mahāpurisa 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 Isibhaśīyā. 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 Lokāpālas and Vaiśravana are of course Vedic divinities).
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In section 3 the name of the rśi in the introductory prose passage is ‘Asiya Davila’. The concluding prose sentence mentions him simply as Davila. Schubring 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 Isibhäsīyāi.

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 makes Asita and Devala two different persons. The commentator Śila-sūri (c. 3rd quarter of the 9th cent. A.D.) falls in line with the Sūyagaḍa. There is some other Jaina evidence in support of Asita alone being the name of an individual. The Isimanyāḍa instead mentions the name as Devilāsuta. There is no doubt that the Isimanyāḍa has Asita Devala of the Isibhäsīyāi in mind, because the introductory phrases in the two cases are closely parallel. 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 Isibhäsīyāi is the cessation of all moral impurities or sins (svaṭteṣvararata). The introductory prose passage begins by saying that those who are contaminated by moral impurities (levovarāṭa) revolve for a long time in this ocean of world. It seems that after the expression samsārasāgarān the expression antar india thetani is missing. Likewise, in the following sentence the word levovarāṭa also seems to have been dropped. 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-rśi, (thus) said’. The eleven verses which follow are supposed to record the teachings of Davila.

Thus it begins: He, who does violence (vihamśate) to the life of a small or big being, has his soul over-dominated by attachment and malignity (rāgadosa-bhibhātappā) and he is contaminated by sinful acts (iṣṭate pāvakammunā) (Verse 1).
He, who takes any belongings (pariggaham gitam), whether little or considerable, is contaminated by sinful acts on account of the guilt of stupefaction caused by greed (gehitucohyna do=vam)\(^{34}\) (Verse 2). He, who expresses anger (koham), 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 micchadamsayasalla.\(^{34a}\) This term appears as the last in the list of eighteen pûpas recognised in the Jaina tradition\(^{34 b}\) and signifies a false philosophy of life.

Verse 4 enumerates as moral impurities (leva) killing a living thing (pánativate), saying untruth (aliyanayam), stealing or taking what has not been given away (adattam), intercourse (mehuagamanam) and amassing property (pariggaham). Verse 5 mentions anger (koh), conceit (mano), deceit (mâyā), and greed (lobho) as moral impurities which are of various forms or types (bahuvaho, bahuvihāvidhī and bahuvihā). 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 efforts\(^{35}\) (Verse 6). As milk is destroyed after being associated with poison, attachment and malignity are the destroyer of conti-
nence (bambhaceram) (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 unhappi-
ness (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 sentence\(^{40}\), 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 renouncer\(^{41}\), 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 rsis 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. 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’. 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. Schubring points out that verse III. 1 and III. 2 of the text deal respectively with the guilt effected by prāṇatipāta and parigraha, i.e. the violation of the first and fifth mahāvrata (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. They refer to the guilt effected by the violation of the second (speaks the untruth—musāṃ bhāsā), third (takes what is not given—adinnāṃ gēnha) and fourth (enjoys intercourse—mehunaṁ sevā) vows. According to Schubring, 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 mahāvrata, 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 mahāvrata in his mind. In verse 3 he refers to the expression of anger (kohāṃ) 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 Evaṁ jāva mūchādamśayasaḥ, The author,
thus, intends to cover factors, the first three being mentioned in the first three verses, which go up to micchādāmsanāsālī. The Jaina tradition mentions eighteen pāpa-karmas. 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-dartanāsālī. Thus, according to the author of the text, Devala also spoke about the eighteen pāpakarmas, beginning from prāṇātipāta and ending with mithyā-dartanāsālī. The intention of the author becomes quite clear when in verses 4-5 he enumerates the guilt-contaminations as pāṇātivāto, alyanayanām, adattām, mehuṇagamanām, parigga-

hām, kohō, mano, māyā and lobha, 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, 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 prede-
cessors, 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 rṣi, and the conclusion. No amount of reasoning will convince anyone to believe that all the forty-four rṣis 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 rṣi, 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 rṣis 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.
Asita-Devala in Isibhāsiyāī

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 pāvakammaṇṇa 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 digest, we have been able to reconstruct some parts of the eraswhile Devala-dharmaśītra. The text, it is revealed, possessed one full chapter concerning pāpadosās. Prāyatecita, doubtless, had formed an important part of the dharmaśītra literature. But only a few Smṛtis refer, and that too very briefly, to the pāpas. The account of pāpadosās in the Devaladharmasūtra is without any parallel in any other Brahmanical text. It classifies pāpadosās 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 pāpadosās. Thus, the chapter on pāpadosās 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 Isibhaśīyaī 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 Jaina 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 ahimsā and aparigraha are treated, it is clear that the original emphasis was on rñadoṣa (attachment and malignity) and geñi (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 Jaina scheme. He included a verse on koha (anger) and finally gave up the exercise by remarking that in this way it goes up to micchādāmsasāśala.

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 geñi (greed). Geñi (Skt. grddhī) does not appear in the Jaina 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 tṛṇā or tṛṇa. We cannot rule out the possibility that some of the lost verses contained a similar reference to grddhī. Further onward, in verse 10, the pāpa, which has been underlined, is followed by moha. Moha also does not figure in the Jaina list of the 18 pāpasthānakas. But it has been included by Devala in the list of twelve pāpadosās which arise out of the mind.
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Verses 6 and 11, though touched by the author of the Isibhaśiyāi, retain words with a specific usage characteristic of the Brahmanical tradition to which Devala belonged. The second line of the verse 6 reads: uttamaṭṭha varagāhī viśīpttīte pārīvāc. In the expression uttamaṭṭha, aṭṭha has been used in the sense of one of the pursuits of life (purasārthas). In the Jaina texts the usual term in such a context would be esāṇa. The expression uttamaṭṭha here stands for mokṣa which is described as the highest or ultimate pursuit of life. The verb pārīvāc is to be derived from the Sanskrit verb pārīvṝj and is to be connected with the words pārīvṝjyā, pārīvṝj, pārīvṝjya and pārīvṝjaka. 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 pārīvṝjaks was fairly prevalent. In the wake of the popularity of the Śraṇānic 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 pārīvṝjaka seems to have been more in vogue. In one surviving excerpt from the Devaladharmasūtra, the duties and rules relating to a pārīvṝjaka were prescribed. Thus, it can be seen that verse 6 of our text advises that pursuing the ultimate puruṣārtha (mokṣa) one should become a pārīvṝjaka (enter the fourth āśrama) and exert himself.

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 aitavārya-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. 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 Isibhaśiyāi. It describes rāga (attachment) and dosa (doṣa, 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 doṣa and caryā on the one hand and celibacy on the other. Among the many meanings of Brahmān are ‘Supreme Being’, ‘religious austerities’, and ‘intellect’. The caryā of Brahmān 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.
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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 rṣi 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 rṣis, whose original writings are not available, the section under study is to be compared with the views of Devala as recorded in a dharmasūtra named after him. This dharmasūtra was partly in prose sūtras and partly in verses. The surviving prose passages of the Devaladharmaśūtra show a peculiar style. We often find long sentences, wherein the details are in the form of adjectives qualifying the main noun. 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 samsārasāgaraṃ and thāṇam. The style comes out beautifully in the third sentence which has a long string of adjectives describing the characteristic of a savalavocarae person. We cannot argue, in the absence of the full text of the Devaladharmaśūtra, 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 Devaladharmaśūtra 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 Devaladharmaśūtra 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 evāṃ jāva micchādaṃsaṇasalle show that the author cut short the portions dealing with the enumeration of the factors causing pāvas. 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. This similarity in the style suggests that our author had before him the original Devaladharmaśūtra 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 lipate pāvakammuṇā 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


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 ṭṭṭi. There is no such explanation of the Vihimaggapāsā (Ś 1363 = A. D. 1441) of Jinaprābha mentioning fifty as the number of sections in it.
5. Āvassaya-nijjutti, II. 6.
6. Ibid., III. 4.1-4 Ete puvoṇ mahāpurisā ēhitā iha saṃmatā.
7. Nandī (Agamodaya Samiti) 202 b; Pakkhiya (Devchand Lalbhai Pustakoddhara), 4, 66a.
11. Section 11.
13. Section 38.
14. Sections 26 and 32.
15. Section 37—Savvamīnām purā udgamāsi tti.
18. Ibid., VIII. 5.
19. Ibid., 15.
21. Ambaṇa is also called pārivaṇyaga. His interlocutor is Jagadādharaśyana (=Yaugadādharaśyana).
22. Schubring, op. cit., pp. 4-5 prefers to identify him with Prince Nārāya of Bāravai.
23. Schubring, op. cit., p. 4 suggests it to be a perplexity varient of Tetaliputta in section 10.
24. Schubring (ibid.) describes him as the head of the school of the Vāṭsi putras, i.e. Vatsiputra.
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 Šamjaya = Samyata.
27. I. 3. 4.1-4.
29. I. 3.4.3—आसिले देवले चेव दीवायण महारसी।

पराते काल भोज्या भोयाणि दुर्विनायम य।
29. अथ आसिले नाम महर्षिस्तहा देवले दीपावनाध तथा परातराध्य इश्वेवादयः शीतोढक बीज

हरितानिकर्मोपाबिक सिद्धा इति भूयते।
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 Isibhāṣiyāi has bhaviyavam khalu bho savvalavavateṇam, whereas the Isimāṇḍalā reads bhaviyavam bho khalu savva-kāma-viraṇa’eyam ajjhayaṇam bhāṣittu Devalasya rāyārisi 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 *grdhhi*, 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.


35. लम्बा ते त विरक्तिबता पावकम्बड़वर्णः।
उत्तमसूक्तास्मी वियवर्तताएः परिवर्त्तः॥

35a. *bhirē dūns jāva paṇṇa viṇāsasvayamśvartitāḥ.*
एवं रागो व दोषो व बद्धविशविनासणा।

36. जावा ब्हीरों पस्थाण तु मुच्छण जायते दौँः।
एवं गेह्यप्रोपर्णो पावकम्ब पवशुतः॥

37. रण्णे वत्रिणाणि दश्यारो रोहिते वणपादति।
कोहिदिगालिल दृश्याणि दुःखाणि विश्वुति।
*The Sanskrit Tīkā cannot make out any sense in the second line of the verse and remarks: दुःखानं दुःखानं दुःखानं दुःखानं दुःखानं दुःखानं कस्तु नाम दुःखानं प्रवेयागमित्तद्रिद्ययस्मृ ! 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. सक्ष्मा वशी चिन्हारुः बारिणा ज्ञति बोँः॥
संवेदिन्द्रलेण वि मोहपरी दुःखिणवारोः॥
*The Sanskrit Tīkā does not take any notice of verses 10 and 11.*

39. झस्य एवं परिरात्य जातधर्मचयणः।
सं छिन्नजातिमर्य सिद्धि गच्छति गीर्यः॥

40. एवं से बुढ़े िश्रो पुणर्वि इच्छत्यं हस्यमागच्छति ति समुः॥

41. *Tāi* may be rendered as either *tyāgī* or *trāyī*. In the second case it will mean protector.

42. Schubring, op. cit., p. 9.


44. Schubring, op. cit., p. 3.


जो मुसं भासाए किचि अयं वा जह वा बढ़ु !
अयणं बहुः परस्स वा लिन्याए पान्कम्मणा ॥
अदितं रेण्यों जो उः "( )" ॥
मेंयेन सेविछ जो उ तेरिछे दिवंग माणुसं ॥
जान-दोस, अभिपूं अयणा लिन्याए पान्कम्मणा ॥


49. A. M. Sethiya, *op. cit.*

50. From the seventh to the seventeenth we have māna, māyā lobha, rāga, doṣa, kleśa, abhyākhyāna, piśunatā, paraśarīvāda, rati-arati and māyā-mṛṣā.

51. *Op. cit.*, p. 11 : ‘waving 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 Rṣi Keteliputta besides Tetaliputta’.

52. Our reconstruction is to be published shortly.

53. For a similar use of the verb pravrjet see Jābālopaniṣad, 4—vani bhūto
pravrjet; Baudhāyana-dharmasūtra, II. 10.2, 18—brahma-caryavān pravrja-tityekeśam.


55. Vīriyattā (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.


57. This seems to have been the original and early meaning of the term brahma-cārya. This will be an indicator of an early date for Devala.

58. See, for example, passages on the four vṛṣas in our article on “Devaladharmasūtra on Vṛṣas and Jātis”, *Dr. R. N. Dandekar Felicitation Volume*, Delhi 1984, pp. 239-245.

59. Both employ the terms mucchā, gehi, dōseṭam and pāvakamma in a specific sense.