

Genuineness of Uttarādhyayana-sūtra IX. 34-36

J. P. THAKER

WHILE teaching Prākṛit texts to his post-graduate students, the present writer is confronted with several problems of textual criticism. One of these is discussed in the following lines :

The ninth chapter of the *Uttarādhyayanāsūtra* presents a nice dialogue between king Nami of Mithilā and Indra, disguised as a Brāhmaṇa, who tries to dissuade the king from renouncing householdership for monk-hood, a parallel to which dialogue can be found in the well-known story of Janaka Videhin of the *Mahābhārata* as also in the Buddhist *Jātaka* No. 539 named *Mahājanaka*.

Verse 32 of this chapter contains Indra's advice to the king not to leave for monkhood unless he subdues, as a true Kṣatriya, all those kings who do not bow down to him :

“ जे केइ पत्थिवा तुज्झं नानमन्ति नराहिवा ।
वसे ते ठावइत्ताणं तओ गच्छसि खत्तिया ॥ ”

Verses 34-36 form Nami's reply to this test :

“ जो सहस्सं सहस्साणं संगामे दुज्जए जिणे ।
एगं जिणेज्ज अप्पाणं एस से परमो जओ ॥ ३४ ॥
अप्पाणमेव जुज्झाहि किं ते जुज्जेण वज्झओ ।
१अप्पाणमेवमप्पाणं २जइत्ता सुहमेहए ॥ ३५ ॥

1 v.l. अप्पाणमेव अप्पाणं & अप्पाणमेवमप्पाणं.

2 v.l. जिणित्ता.

पंचिदियाणि कोहं माणं मायं तदेव लोहं च ।

दुजयं चेव अप्पाणं सव्वं अप्पे जिए जियं ॥ ३६ ॥ ”

Some scholars seem to have been confused in the intricacy of the sense of these verses and especially 36*ab* is believed to have confounded the matter all the more by its presenting a sudden change in metre and certain nouns ending in म् with no verb or participle for completing the sense.

JACOBI remarks on verse 36 : “ The first line of this verse is in the Āryā metre, the second in Anuṣṭubh; the whole will not construe, but the meaning is clear. There are numerous instances in which the metre changes in the same stanza from Āryā to Anuṣṭubh, and vice versa, so frequent they are that we are forced to admit the fact that the authors of these metrical texts did not shrink from taking such liberties. ”

CHARPENTIER refers the reader to these remarks of JACOBI ‘concerning the metre’ and adds : “ but the sense of the whole verse is not clear, and the construction is extremely confused. ”

The commentators—even Śāntisūri (11th century) and Nemicandra (1073 A.D.)—interpret ‘अप्पाणं’—आत्मानं—in verse 36 as मनः, the mind. They, too, appear to have been confused by the ending in म् of all the nouns occurring in the first three quarters and try to solve the difficulty by arguing that “ सर्वत्र च सूत्रत्वात्तत्पुंसकनिर्देशः ”, i. e., the employment of neuter in the case of all these nouns of masculine gender is due to the licence enjoyed by the ancient authors !

Prof. L. ALSDORF has contributed very nice articles on the *Uttarādhyayanāsūtra*, in one of which, entitled “ Namipavvajjā : Contributions to the study of a Jaina Canonical Legend ”, published in the *Indological Studies in Honour of W. Norman Brown* (American Oriental Society, New Haven, 1962), he has made a praiseworthy effort to solve this intricacy. He starts with these remarks :

“ This (i. e. JACOBI’s remark) is certainly wrong. The Āryā metre alone would suffice to prove that the line in question is an interpolation; but its contents, too, make this quite certain : the king’s answer is solely concerned with the fight against the ātman; *krodha māna māyā lobha* are totally out of place here. The clumsy interpolation might alone account for the impossibility to construct the stanza, of which CHARPENTIER also complains; but there is probably more behind it.”

Regarding 35cd he says : “ Though constructible and intelligible, it is hardly genuine; why should it be stressed (*eva!*) that the monk must fight his *ātman* with his *ātman*? What, after all, does this really mean ? ”

By changing the order of the quarters of the *Anuṣṭubh* lines of verses 35 and 36 the learned professor sets up the following coherent stanza which he believes to be the only original one in place of the two verses :

अप्पाणमेव जुज्झाहि ! सव्वं अप्पे जिए जियं ।
दुज्जयं चेव अप्पाणं जइत्ता सुहमेहए ॥

Then, he says, if a scribe had this text before him, began copying it, and after अप्पाणमेव inadvertently got into the next line, the result would be :

अप्पाणमेव अप्पाणं जइत्ता सुहमेहए,

which the next copyist would ingeniously correct to :

अप्पाणमेवमप्पाणं जइत्ता सुहमेहए.

He further supposes that a copyist compared this contaminated text with a correct manuscript and remembering the verse

इमेण चेव जुज्झाहि किं ते जुज्जेण बज्झओ

occurring in the *Acārāṅgasūtra*, he contaminated this with

अप्पाणमेव जुज्झाहि सव्वं अप्पे जिए जियं

to अप्पाणमेव जुज्झाहि किं ते जुज्जेण बज्झओ,

i. e., our 35ab. This left him, as the argument advances, with the two quarters सव्वं अप्पे जिए जियं and दुज्जयं चेव अप्पाणं of the correct manuscript, which he, fairly stupidly, combined into an inconstructible line and placed at the end. The result was *three* lines, and to make up for the apparent deficiency of a fourth, a none too intelligent reader hit upon the insertion of the *Āryā* line.

In short, according to Prof. ALSDORF verse 34 is the original answer taken by the poet from the great stock of contemporary gnostic poetry, while the second one is an amplifying apt quotation, possibly also going back to the original author of the *samvāda* but more likely a redactorial or even later addition.

This is indeed a highly intelligent conjecture having a touch of probability. It must be confessed, however, that it is not thoroughly convincing. In the first place, the sudden shift to the *Āryā* metre need

not confuse us regarding the genuineness of the verses. JACOBI's remark, which Prof. ALSDORF considers to be 'certainly wrong', does not appear to the present writer to be so condemnable. For we find in the ancient texts copious instances of flying over from one metre to another in one and the same verse. In fact, this was a usual practice of ancient authors with whom matter was always more important than the form. They never bothered for the metre which they waived or changed in order to express their ideas exactly as they struck them. Their utterances, however, usually came out in an easily flowing metrical or semi-metrical form. Moreover, if a later reader wants to insert a line to complete the verse, why should he coin an *Āryā* line and not an *Anuṣṭubh* one, provided, of course, that he wishes to put a quotation there? Because though *Āryā* developed at a later stage, *Anuṣṭubh* is the easiest metre and a later inserter would be more conscious of metrical homogeneity than the original author.

Secondly, the expression 'the monk must fight his *ātman* with his *ātman*' is confusive. *Ātman* is not at all to be regarded here as an entity separated from one's own self, or rather oneself. This fight against the *Ātman* can in reality be fought only by oneself; in such an internal fight one cannot expect any help from external allies! One has to vanquish oneself by oneself. One remains all alone in this struggle against one's own self, or rather oneself! This is not at all a new thing for an Indian, whose civilization is nourished by this same teaching through all the traditions of this hoary land of various philosophical trends.

Under the circumstances how can it be argued that "*krodha māna māyā lobha* are totally out of place in an answer solely concerned with the fight against the *ātman*?" In fact victory over one's *Ātman* means self-restraint which naturally includes subduing of or full control over the feelings of *krodha* etc.

Further, the line 'अप्पाणमेवमप्पाणं जइत्ता सुहमेहए' (35cd) can yield, without hampering in the slightest degree its natural course, another sense: It can be rendered as 'आत्मानम् एव आत्मानम् जित्वा सुखम् एषते'— 'One can secure (highest) bliss by conquering oneself and oneself alone.' Almost all commentators have explained one 'अप्पाणं' as 'तृतीयार्थे द्वितीया', but Mahopādhyāya *Bhāvavijayagaṇin*'s commentary [Ātmānanda Grantharatnamālā No. 32; Ātmānanda Sabhā, Bhāvanagar, 1918, Vol. I, leaf 225] mentions only one 'अप्पाणं':

“एवं च 'अप्पाणमेव' ति आत्मानं 'जइत्त' ति जित्वा.....”

This may be regarded to imply that the commentator is not inclined to take one 'अप्पणं' as a case of Accusative used for Instrumental, as others have done. To him, therefore, the repetition of 'अप्पणं' is just for stressing upon the victory over oneself. This interpretation does not suffer from even the slightest tinge of improbability. On the contrary, it avoids the confusion created by the statement "by conquering the self *by the self*."

In his attempt to find out the probable manner in which the text might have taken its present corrupt (?) form the learned professor has resorted to the similarity between the verses of the *Uttarādhyaṇasūtra* and the *Ācārāṅgasūtra*. The present writer, however, strongly feels that since such repetitions of both thought as well as expression are frequently met with in the ancient texts of Indian traditions, all such cases need not be deemed as mere scribal mischiefs.

In his humble opinion the *Āryā* line can easily be joined with the preceding and the succeeding *Anuṣṭubh* ones in a quite congenial way. Though the nouns ending in ॠ occurring therein are taken by the commentators to be in the Nominative case, the present writer thinks that there is no necessity of making an altogether separate sentence thereby. It is better to take them all to be in the Accusative case itself. The whole answer comprising three verses becomes thereby quite clear and coherent in sense all throughout. It may be translated as under :

"If he who vanquishes a million (warriors) in a fight very difficult to win should conquer *himself* alone, this is his supreme victory. Struggle against your own self; of what avail would be your external fighting (*i. e.*, fighting against the external foes referred to in Indra's speech in verse 32) ? A man can attain bliss *by himself conquering himself* [or, by winning over himself and himself alone]—(*i. e.*, by subduing) the five senses, wrath, pride, delusion as well as avarice—his self which is indeed so difficult to conquer; if the self is conquered, everything is conquered."

This way of interpretation is quite natural and suitable to the spirit of Indian traditions. What is meant here is this : Indra has asked Nami to conquer the kings before leaving for monk-hood. Nami replies that for one who has understood the real state of things fighting against the external foes will mean mere waste of energy and time. For there will result no peace out of these fights trimming with nothing else but violence. In order to attain real bliss one should struggle against

the internal foes such as the senses, wrath, pride, delusion and avarice. Victory over one's own self—full control over oneself—is possible only by this process. Thus it is extremely difficult to conquer one's own self. This internal victory is the greatest victory that one can achieve, far greater than vanquishing a million warriors on the field of battle. In a nutshell, once the self is controlled, everything else comes under your sway, of its own accord.

In this way, this reply of Nami is an excellent piece of teaching, the very essence of all teachings of the ancient traditions of India imbibed through ages. It should be noticed that this is spoken by king Nami, the counterpart of the celebrated Janaka, on the eve of retirement from worldly life. Naturally, therefore, in reply to Indra's test regarding victory over others, he stresses upon the ideal of a monk, viz., complete self-control, which is the most difficult to secure. In the first verse Nami points out that he has left off all worldly fights and has decided to be fully self-controlled. In the second one he stresses upon the futility of worldly victories and pronounces his decision to turn to the internal world for further victory, which is the only way to real peace and bliss. In the last verse he elucidates what actually he has to do for complete success in this greatest enterprise and proclaims again, in other words, what he did at the outset of his reply.

Thus these three verses appear to the present writer to form a homogeneous unit, quite constructible and intelligible, imbibing one and the same ideal.

