

THE RULES CONCERNING SPEECH (BHĀSĀ) IN THE ĀYĀRANGA-AND DASAVEYĀLIYA-SUTTAS

Collette Caillat

One of the major vows taken by the ascetics of ancient India, whether Brahmanic, Buddhist or Jaina, is “not to make any untrue statement¹.” In fact, this prescription applies to each and every individual, for (as is well known)², speech is assumed to exert extremely potent forces³. It is therefore quite natural that the *śāstras* lay down rules about what is or is not to be said, and where, when, how it should be uttered, not only on solemn occasions, but also in daily life. Such prescriptions are specified in the Scriptures of the Buddhists and the Jains

1. For a general survey and appraisal, H. JACOBI, SBE 22 (London, 1884, repr. Delhi, 1964), Introduction, p. XXII ff.
2. For general considerations on “oral rites”, M. MAUSS, *Theorie de la magie*, reprinted in *Sociologie et anthropologie*, Paris, 1950, p. 48 ff.—As far as India is concerned, L. RENOUE, *Etudes vediques et pāṇineennes*, 1, Paris 1955 (Institut de Civilisation Indienne de l'Université de Paris 1), p. 1-27; IDEM, *Etudes sur le vocabulaire du Rgveda*, Pondichery, 1958 (Institut Français d'Indologie 5), on *nāman*, p. 10-12 (“le nom n'est jamais” “pretexte, apparence” (oppose a “realite”); il est au contraire la realite meme, il touche a l'essence de l'etre...”, p. 11). Moreover, see, e.g., many of J. Gonda's books and articles, among others, Jan GONDA, *Die Religionen Indiens I, Veda und alterer Hinduismus* (Die Religionen der Menschheit. Herausgegeben von C. M. Schroder, 11), Stuttgart, 1960, p. 21 ff. (Das Wort”).
3. *Vāg ghy evaitat sarvam || vācā hyevaitat sarvam āptam*, “Everything here is speech |.| for by speech everything here is obtained”, Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa 10.5.1.3 (ed. A. Weber; Berlin-London, 1885 translation J. Eggeling SBE 43, Oxford, 1897, repr. Delhi, 1963); cf. ib, 14.3.2.20:

vācyarthāḥ niyatāḥ sarve, vān-mūlā vāg-nisritāḥ

“all things (have their nature) determined by speech; speech is their root, and from speech they proceed”, Mn 4.256 (trsl. G. Bühler);

vān-mayānīha śāstrāṇi vān-niṣṭhāni tathāiva ca

tasmād vācaḥ param nāsti vāg ghi sarvasya kāraṇam,

“the śāstras are made up of words, and words are the source of everything”, Nāṭyaśāstra, 9.3 (ed. M. Ghosh, Calcutta, 1967, trsl. Id, Calcutta, 1951, BI 272).

as well as in the Dharmaśāstras; but, whereas in the last mentioned books, the rules concern all social categories, in the Buddhist Pāli Tipiṭaka and in the Jaina Siddhānta, they are first and foremost meant for the members of the religious community.

The Śvetāmbara Jains have expressed their views on *bhāsā* (*bhāṣā*) in several passages of their canon¹. The topic is investigated from different angles in various parts of *Viyāhapannatti*, *Vyākhyā-prajñapti*, and systematically treated in the eleventh chapter, called "*bhāsā-pāya*", of the *Pannavaṇa*—a precious survey of which we owe to Pandit Dalsukh Malvania². Moreover, the first Aṅga and the second Mūlasūtra of the canon deal with *bhāsā* from the point of view of discipline, in their famous chapters which I propose to consider here; they are *Āyār* (aṅga-sutta) 2.4.1-2 (in prose), *Dasaveyāliya*—sutta 7 (in verses)³. I shall not examine the interconnexions between both, they have been studied by Dr. Ghatage in NIA 1.2 (may 1938, p. 130-137)⁴. I only wish to show that a comparison between these developments and their old Brahmanic counterparts⁵ help to realize how the Jains have succeeded in

- .1 References to canonical developments concerning *bhāsā* in W. SCHUBRING, *Die Lehre der Jainas*..., Berlin u. Leipzig, 1935 (GIAPhA 3.7) p. 103-104 = IDEM, *The Doctrine of the Jainas*, Delhi..., 1962 § 74.

For *Viyāhapannatti*, cf. J. DELEU, *Viyāhapannatti*..., Brugge 1970 (Rijksuniv. te Gent, Werken uitgegeven door de Fac. van Letteren en Wijsbegeerte 151), Index of terms and topics, p. 345.

2. Cf. *Paṇṇavaṇasuttam*, Ed. PUNYAVIJAYA-MĀLVANIĀ-BHOJAK, Bombay 1971 (Jaina-Āgama Series 9), Part 2, Introduction, p. 84-88 (translated into English by Dr. Nagin J. SHAH, p. 321-326, "on spoken language").

I had the good fortune to read this chapter with Pandit Dalsukh Malvania: I wish to seize this opportunity to express my affectionate gratitude to him, his family and circle of friends.

The Jaina (and Buddhist) statements concerning *addhamāgahā bhāsā* (*māgaha-bhāsā*, *mūla-bhāsā*), etc., will not be taken into consideration, as they would be irrelevant from the present point of view.

3. As noted by Schubring, the odd chapters of *Dasav* are concerned with special subjects (*Dasav*, Introduction, p. VI); in particular, different aspects of (right) conduct are examined therein.
4. "Parallel passages in the *Daśavaikālika* and the *Ācārāṅga*"; A. M. Ghatage's conclusion is that *Dasav* 7 is older than *Āyār* 2.4. Schubring's opinion, on the contrary, is that "*Dasav* is later than *Āyār*. If in its ślokas it contains such pādas as scattered in the prose of *Āyār*./ the latter represent an ancient stock....", *Doctrine* § 74 n. 2.
5. On the comparative antiquity of *Gaut DhS*, etc., and of Buddhist-Jaina canonical scriptures, JACOBI, loc. cit., p. XXX ff,

binding into an organic unity prescriptions which are also found, but more or less scattered, in different sections of the DhS, and which have been somewhat differently elaborated in the Pāli scriptures. In fact, as is natural, the Jainas' ethical teachings in this field are linked with their metaphysical tenets.

Let me first sketch how the DhS approach the subject.

Sometimes—exceptionally—the approach is a general one; e. g., when ĀpDhS introduces the chapters on penance, it explains that “A wise man who has eradicated the (faults) which destroy creatures, obtains salvation”¹. “(These are) anger exultation, grumbling, covetousness, perplexity, doing injury, hypocrisy, lying, gluttony, calumny, envy, lust, secret hatred, neglect to keep the senses in subjection, neglect to concentrate the mind...”, *krodho harṣo roṣo lobho moho dambho droho mṛṣodya-mātyāṣa-parivādāvāsūyā kāma-manyū anātmyam ayogas, teṣāṃ yoga-mūlo nirghātaḥ* (ĀpDhS 1.8.23.5) On the contrary, “freedom from anger (*akrodha*)...., truthfulness (*satya-vacana*)...., silencing slander (*a-paifuna*) uprightiness, affability (*ārjava-mārdava*)...., peace with all created beings, concentration (of the mind on the contemplation of the Ātman), regulation of one's conduct according to that of the Āryas (*āryava*)—these (good qualities) have been settled by the agreement (of the wise) for all (the four) orders....”² Similar precepts are also ordained by Manu, who applies them to the snātaka :

satyadharmāryavratteṣu saucē caivāramatsadā
..... *vāg-bāhūdara-saṃyataḥ,*

“Let him always delight in truthfulness,...; let him keep his speech, his arms and his belly under control” (Mn 4.175)³. As a matter of fact, Manu is in accordance with Gautama who, among the duties of the Snātaka (ch. 9), prescribes :

“He shall keep his organ, his stomach, his hands, his feet, his tongue, and his eyes under due restraint”⁴, further :

satya-dharmā (68), *ārya-vṛttaḥ* (69).... *syāt* (72),

“He shall always speak the truth.”

“He shall conduct himself (as becomes) an Āryan.”

1. *nirhṛtya bhūta-dāhīyān kṣemaṃ gacchati paṇḍitaḥ,*
(trsl. Bühler).

2. Ib 6. Cf. also 1.11.31.25 (trsl., SBE 1.11.31.23) :
krodhādīṃśca bhūta-dāhīyān doṣān varjayet,

“and let him (the snātaka) avoid the faults that destroy the creatures, such as anger and the like.”

3. Bühler translates : “in truthfulness, (obedience to) the sacred law”; but cf. Gaut DhS, 9.68, infra.

4. *na śīṣnodara-pāṇi-pada-vāk-cakṣuś cāpalāni kuryāt.*

Thus, rules regarding speech are, in fact, but the application to a particular case of general injunctions to keep one's organs (organs of sense, organs of action and *manas*) under complete control (cf. Mn 2.88) the organ of speech being the tenth in the list¹.

Therefore, it would seem normal that, in the DhS, general instructions should be given about the proper use of Vāc. Nevertheless, most of the time, in the texts, the rules are laid down for specific categories of individuals : the householder, or, more often, the brahmacārin, the student who has returned home, the *snātaka*....

Now, what are these rules ? Two sets can be distinguished :

(1) the rules connected with salutation; (2) the rules which might be termed apotropaic, whether the danger is visible or occult.

(1) It is well known that "reverential salutation" is looked upon as strengthening *vardhana*.² Conversely, as stressed in a floating stanza, "he who habitually salutes and constantly pays..... reverence to the aged obtains an increase of four (things), (namely) glory, length of life, fame, (and) strength".³

abhivāda-śīlasya nityaṃ vṛddhopasevināḥ

catvāri saṃpravardhante, kīrtir āyur yaśo balaṃ (Mbh. 5.39.60).

The same view is expressed among the Buddhists.⁴

With minor variants, Mn (2.121) applies the maxim to the brahmacārin :

catvāri tasya vardhante, āyur prajñā yaśo balaṃ.

As a matter of fact, in the DhS, much importance is attached to terms of address and to saluting⁵—a topic to which the sixth chapter of the Gaut DhS is

1. *vāk caiva daśamī smṛtā*, Mn 2. 90 d.—

Compare Aśoka, Rock Edict XII (C), recommending *vaca-* (*vaci-*) *gutti* and, *infra*, Uttarajjhayāṇa 24. 22-23.

2. J. Gonda, IJ 8 (1964), p. 14, quoting RV 6.51.8.

3. For concordances, L. Sternbach, Mahā-subhāṣita-saṃgraha 2, Hoshiarpur 1976 (Vishveshvaranand Vedic Research Institute, V. Indological Series—69, no 2336, compare 2337-8). Trsl. following Bühler, Mn 2.121.

4. *abhivādana-śīlissa niccaṃ vaddhapacāyino*

cattāro dhammā vadḍhanti : āyu vaṇṇo sukhaṃ balaṃ, DhP 109, of which the Gāndhārī Dharmapada rendering is :

ahivadaṇa-śīlisa

nica vridhavayariṇo

catvari tasya vardhadi

ayo kirta suha bala (ed. J. Brough, London, 1962, London Oriental Series, 7), 172.

5. Cf. Kane, History of Dharmaśāstra, 2.1, p. 333 ff., specially 336 ff., ubi alia.

wholly devoted. Actually, most DhS give details on proper behaviour in this connexion, whether regarding the time and circumstances, the gestures, the words, intonation syntax.....¹. Generally, though, saluting is not treated as an independent subject; Mn, for instance, includes the topic in the chapter dealing with studentship, where it is specified which words the young man must use according to the age, sex, learning, social status.... of the person whom he addresses (2.121-129), and according to circumstances (2.49). Similarly, ĀpDhS inserts this special subject in one of the chapters about the general obligations of the Vedic student (1.2.5.15 ff.), his behaviour while begging (1.1.3.28.30, cf; Gaut DhS 2.36), or, again, the conduct of the student who has returned home (1.4.14.7 ff., particularly 1.4.14. 26-31).... Thus, the matter is considered separately in several developments, where it is discussed with more or less detail :

(2) The same remark would apply to the second set of rules, those which I proposed to term apotropaic. They seem to be given mainly for the snātaka; and to remain comparatively unchanged.

Before stressing that the snātaka should abide by truth, *satyadharmāsyāt* (9.61, supra), Gautama considers several utterances which are to be avoided. The same warnings recur in other DhS, especially in ĀpDhS, the sūtras of which can be conveniently examined (1.11.31. 5-16) :

5. And he shall not speak evil of the gods or of the king,

(*paraṣaṃ cobhayordevatānāṃ rājñaśca varjayet*),

.....

8. He shall not mention the blemishes of a cow, of sacrificial presents, or of a girl.

9. And he shall not announce it ... if a cow does damage (by eating corn or grain in a field).

10. (Nor shall he call attention to it) if a cow is together with her calf....

11-12. And of a cow which is not a milch-cow he shall not say 'She is not a milch-cow'. He must say 'This is a cow which will become a milch-cow'.

(*nādhenum adhenur iti brūyāt,*

dhenu-bhanyetyeva brūyāt),

.....

16. If he sees a rainbow, he must not say to others, 'Here is Indra's bow'.²

1. For proper words, ĀpDhS 1.4.14.26-29; pluti of final vowel, ib 1.2.5.17, Vas 13.46, Mn 2.125, Pāṇ 8.2.83, quoted in Kane, ib, p. 340; syntax, GautDhS 2.36, ĀpDhS 1.1.3 28-30, Mn 2.69.

2. *gor dakṣiṇānāṃ kumāryāś ca parivādān varjayet* (8)

strīhantiṃ ca gām nācakṣīta (9)

saṃsṛṣṭāṃ ca vatsenānimitte (10)

nendradhanur iti parasmai prabrūyāt (18)

Similarly, GautDhS 9.22 remarks : “(...in speaking of) a rainbow (he shall use the word) *mañi-dhanus* (the jewelled bow) instead of *Indra-dhanus*”¹—a prescription which is in agreement with BaudhDhS 2.3.6. 11-12, and VasDhS 12.32.²

The prohibitions and injunctions detailed above are likewise given in the other DhS. The implied justification can be deduced from the following observation, by ĀpDhS :

nāsau ‘me sapatna’ iti brūyāt; yady ‘asau me sapatna’ iti brūyād dviṣantaṃ bhrātṛvyaṃ janayet,

“(In company) he shall not say, ‘This person is my enemy’. If he says ‘This person is my enemy’, he will raise for himself an enemy, who will show his hatred” ĀpDhS 1.11.31.15).³

Now, these remarks are made in a *khaṇḍa* which warns against dangerous words and acts, and points to those which are conducive to welfare (1.11.31.6; 14, etc.); similarly, *khaṇḍa* 32 dissuades from visits to countries inhabited by inferior men, from mixing in assemblies and crowds (1.11.32. 18-19); it also advises the *snātaka* not “to cross a river swimming”⁴ and not to use “ships of doubtful (solidity)” (2.6.27).⁵ To revert to speech : we can include in this review a rule laid down for both the *snātaka* and the householder, who are advised not to “talk of a doubtful matter as if it were clear” (2.5.12.21, cf. 1.11.32.22).⁶ This last recommendation leads us back to the observance of truthfulness, which should not be interpreted as an encouragement to use cruel words. On the contrary, Manu stresses :

*hīnāṅgānatiriktāṅgānvidyā-hīnānvayo-’dhikān
rūpa-draviṇa-hīnānsca jāti-hīnānsca nākṣipet,*

1. *mañidhanur itīndradhanuḥ.*
2. Compare, a little differently, Mn 4.59.

On beliefs connected with rainbow, M. Mauss, “Theorie de la magie”, reprinted in *Sociologie et anthropologie*, Paris, 1950, p. 32; S. H. Webster, *Le tabou*, (French translation), Paris, 1952, p. 227 and n. 1.—For the same warning, Prof. Gonda kindly refers me to several other texts : PārG 2.7.13, VaikhDh 3.2.12, AthPārS 72.1.6, and to the old saying in The Netherlands, that it is a bridge for the deceased to go to heaven, (cf. H. Bachtold-Staubli, *Handwörterbuch des deutschen Aberglaubens*. Berlin, 1927–1942, 6 vol., s. v. Regenbogen).

3. 1.11.31.17 in the text, but 15 in the translation.
4. *bāhūbhyāṇ ca nadī-taraṇam* (scil. *varjayet*), (26); cf. 1.2.5.9; 1.5.15.11 (and the note SBE 2, p. 55): 1.11.32.26; also Mn 4.77.
5. *nāvāṃ ca saṃśayikīm* (scil. *varjayet*), (27).
6. *na saṃśaye pratyakṣavad brūyāt.*

“Let him (the *snātaka*) not insult those who have redundant limbs or are deficient in limbs, nor those destitute of knowledge, nor very aged men, nor those who have no beauty or wealth, nor those who are of low birth.”¹ As a matter of fact, avoiding lies and avoiding harshness are both combined in the fourfold prescription emphasized by Mn (4.138) :

*satyaṃ brūyāt, priyaṃ brūyānna brūyātsatyamaṃpriyaṃ,
priyaṃ ca nānṛtaṃ brūyād eṣa dharmāḥ sanātanaḥ,*

“Let him (the *snātaka*) say what is true, let him say what is pleasing, let him utter no disagreeable truth, and let him utter no pleasant falsehood; that is the eternal law”.²

Parallels for this aphorism are quoted from Viṣṇu- and Yājñavalkya—DhS, from the epics³.... More could be adduced from Buddhist and Jaina scriptures.

Let us now turn to the Jainas.

First of all, one fact is remarkable: that two old canonical texts each devote one whole chapter completely to the examination of the different species of *bhāṣā* (“*bhāṣā-jāyā*”), and to right conduct with regard to speech. This proves the very great importance attached to the subject by the Jaina teachers, and by the Jaina tradition. No less remarkable is the endeavour of Āyār and Dasav to explain what their guiding principles are; they can be summarized as follows: on the one hand, it is imperative to respect truth—an effort which involves the constant observance of self-control, *saṃyama*- (Amg *saṃjama*); on the other hand, it is necessary to combine respect for truth with respect for *ahiṃsā*. Such is the complex behaviour advo-

1. Mn 4.141.

2. *ṣukṭā rūkṣāḥ paraṣā vāco na brūyāt*, BaudhDhS 2.3,20, “let him (the *snātaka*) not make empty, ill-sounding, or harsh speeches” (Bühler’s trsl.)

3. *nāksmād apriyaṃ vadet,*
nāhitaṃ nānṛtaṃ caiva, Yājñavalkya DhS (ed. Stenzl Berlin-London, 1849), 1.132, “on no account should he say (anything) disagreeable, noxious, or, again, untrue”;

nāślīlaṃ kīrtayet (72) *nānṛtaṃ* (73) *nāpriyaṃ* (74),
Viṣṇusmṛti, ch. 71 (ed. J. Jolly, Calcutta 1881, repr. 1962);

satyaṃ vaded vyāhṛtaṃ tad dvitīyaṃ,
dharmāṃ vaded vyāhṛtaṃ tat tṛtīyaṃ,
priyaṃ vaded vyāhṛtaṃ tac caturtham. MBh (Bh) 12.288.38,
(similar to Mn, loc. cit.; compare, infra, the Buddhist definition of *subhāṣita*).

Of Rāma, it is said that, even if spoken to harshly, he never gave a harsh answer, Rām 2.1.10 (on which Gonda, Selected Studies, Leiden, 1975, p. 514).

cated in the introduction and conclusion of Āyār 2.4¹, where it is recommended (1) to “vomit” the four passions involving [violence (*vantā kohaṃ ca māṇaṃ ca māyaṃ ca lohaṃ ca*), (2) to speak only after due reflection and with constant circumspection². To help attain this ideal aim, bhāsā is analysed into four species (with subdivisions): two of them are absolutely condemned and prohibited, because they are either totally or partly wrong and false; as for the other two, the monk should be educated to use them with discrimination: Dasav 7.1 proclaims:

*cauṇhaṃ khalu bhāsāṇaṃ parisamkhāya paṇṇavaṃ
doṇhaṃ tu piṇḍaṃ sikkhe, do na bhāsejja savvaso*³.

Āyār also distinguishes four *bhāsā-jāyā*, somewhat emphatically: *bhikkhū jāṇejjā cattāri bhāsā-jāyāni, taṃ-jahā : saccaṃ egaṃ padhamaṃ bhāsā-jāyaṃ bīyaṃ mosam taiyaṃ, seccā-mosam, jaṃ n’eva saccaṃ n’eva mosam n’eva saccāmosam asaccāmosam taṃ cauttamaṃ bhāsā-jāyaṃ, se bemi....* (2.4.1.4). Thus the bhikkhu is invited, trained to recognize: (1) truth, (2) untruth, (3) truth mixed with untruth, (4) “what is neither truth, nor untruth, nor truth mixed with untruth ...”⁴. Consequently, Dasav 7 immediately

1. *se bhikkhū vā bhikkhunī vā vantā kohaṃ ca māṇaṃ ca māyaṃ ca lohaṃ ca, aṇuvī nīṭhābhāsī nisamma-bhāsī aturiya-bhāsī vivega-bhāsī samiyāe samjāe bhāsāṃ bhāsejjā.*

“a monk or a nun, putting aside wrath, pride, deceit, and greed, considering well, speaking with precision, what one has heard, not too quick, with discrimination, should employ language in moderation and restraint”, (Āyār 2.4.2.19 trsl, Jacobi).

2. Compare Dasav 7. 54-57 :

*chasu samjāe, sāmaṇie sayā jae,
vaejja buddhe hiyaṃ aṇulomiyaṃ,*

“controlled (in his conduct) towards the six (groups of souls), (and) always restrained in monkhood the wise one shall speak good (and) kind (words)” (56 c-d, trsl. W. Schubring).

3. “Of the four kinds of speech, the thoughtful (monk) should, after consideration, learn the training in two, (but) should not use the other two ones at any occasion.”
4. Cf. Viyāhapannatti, ch. 13, Ed Suttāgame, Gurgaon, 1953. vol. 1, 692, 15; Pannavaṇā, ed. Puṇyavijaya, etc. (Jaina-Āgama-Series 9.1), p. 215, §§ 870-876; Tṭhāṇga ch. 4.1, ed. Suttāgame, 223,8 (*cattāri bhāsā-jāyā....*).

See the same fourfold division “truth, untruth, ...” in relation with the first and second *guttis* (*gupṭi*— : *maṇa-gupṭi*, *vai-g.*), in Uttarajjhāyā 24. 20-23 (ed. J. Charpentier, Upsala, 1921, Archives d’Etudes orientales, 18), i.e. in the chapter concerning the eight *paṇḍita-māyā* (“matrices of the Doctrine”). Here, the analysis of the three *guttis* follows that of the five *sāmitis*: the second of these is the *bhāsā-samiti*, “care in speaking”

proclaims an interdiction “the thoughtful (monk) should not use” “that (form of speech) which is true (but) not to be uttered, that which is half-true, that which is (quite) untrue, none (of which is) practised by the Jinās”¹. The positive recommendation is formulated in the next śloka :

“(But) he should, after deliberation (*samuppeham*), use a speech not exposed to doubt (*asaṃdiddhaṃ giram bhāsejja*), that is (a speech) which is neither true nor untrue and (a speech) which is true, provided that it is not to be blamed or rough”

asaccamosaṃ, saccaṃ ca aṇavajjam akakkasaṃ (Dasav 7.2-3)².

Thus, the conceptual frame is firmly set for a discussion on bhāsā to take place. The adduced definitions aim at being both clear and exact (in agreement with the complexity of reality); moreover, they expressly recognize the heterogeneity of charity and truth : further whereas, as we have just seen, Manu merely combined both virtues in, so to say, a formal fourfold pattern, the Jainas strive for complete integration and try to reconcile these sometimes contradictory requirements in a higher synthesis. Their effort can also be evaluated if compared with the

(ib 9-10), which stresses the necessity to expel all passions (compare, supra, ĀpDhS 1.8.23.5) :

*kohe māṇe ya māyāe lo(b)he ya uvanttay ā
hāse bhae moharie vikaḥāsu taḥ'eva ca
eyāim atṭha thāṇāim parivajjitu sṃjjae
asāvajjam miyaṃ kāle bhāsaṃ bhāsejja pannaṃ*

“To give way to anger, pride, deceit and greed, laughter, fear, loquacity and slander; these eight faults should a well-disciplined monk avoid; he should use blameless and concise speech at the proper time” (transl. H. Jacobi, SBE 45, Oxford, 1895, repr. Delhi, 1964, p. 131, and n. 2).

For other references, cf. W. Schubring, *Doctrine* § 173; P. S. Jaini, *The Jaina Path of Purification*, Berkeley . . . , 1979, 247-8); etc.

1. Dasav 7.2 :

jā ya saccā avattavvā, saccāmosā ya jā, musā

jā ya, buddhehi 'nāiṇṇā, na taṃ bhāsejja pannaṃ,

2. Cp. Āyār 2.4.1.6 : *se bhikkhū va jā ya bhāsā saccā, jā ya bhāsā mosā, jā ya, bh. saccā-mosā, taḥ-ppagāraṃ bhāsaṃ sāvajjam sa-kiriyaṃ kakkasaṃ sa-kaḍu-yaṃ niṭṭhuraṃ pharusam aṇhaya-kariṃ cheda-kariṃ bheda-kariṃ pariāvāṇa-kariṃ uddavaṇa-kariṃ bhūovaghāiṃ abhikaṃkha no bhāsaṃ bhāsejjā,*

“a monk or a nun, having well considered, should not use speech—truth, or untruth, or truth mixed with untruth—that is blamable, (speech which is) sinful, rough, stinging, coarse, hard, leading to sins, to discord and factions, to grief and outrage, to destruction of living beings” (trsl. partly following Jacobi).

Buddhist fourfold definition of *subhāsita vācā*¹, and fourfold analysis of *anariya-vohāra*².

Now, though the Jaina analysis of *bhāsā* can be said to be comparatively clear-cut, the attached developments are not always plain to understand. Two points, nevertheless, are manifest: (1) all the prohibitions and injunctions included in the two relevant lessons of Āyār and Dasav can be shown to proceed from the above two fundamental principles, observance of truth based on *saṃjama*, and observance of *ahiṃsā*; (2) the various particular prescriptions are, in many cases, akin or similar to those which are laid down in the DhS; but, precisely because the Jaina chapters concentrate on *bhāsā* exclusively, all the minute rules can easily be recognized as special applications of an underlying theoretical scheme (applied examples of which are evidently liable to be multiplied); moreover, though they start from a multiplicity of particular consideration (most of which are formulated in all Indian *śāstras*), the Jainas obviously connect them with their own metaphysical system (and their doctrine of *jīva-nikāyas*, *infra*), therefore promote a more consistent and general outlook; finally, they tend to include in the *bhāsā*-chapter remarks which, in the DhS (also : in the Jaina suttas) mainly concern behaviour³ : Just as bad behaviour should be shunned, words also must clearly, though not aggressively, help discriminate between good and reprehensible conduct; in all possible ways, speech shall conform to the correct norm⁴. Thus, from the Dasav and Āyār point of view, the scope of *bhāsā* seems almost unlimited⁵.

1. *Idha bhikkhave bhikku subhāsitaṃ yeva bhāsati no dubbhāsitaṃ; dhammaṃ yeva bh. no addommaṃ; piyaṃ yeva bh. no appiyaṃ; saccaṃ yeva bh. no alikaṃ. Imehi kho |. | catūhi angehi samannāgatā vācā subhāsita hoti no dubbhāsita; anavajjā ca ananuvajjā ca viññānaṃ, if a bh. "speak well and not badly, speak righteously and not unrighteously, speak affectionately and not unkindly speak truth and not falsehood, his speech having these four qualities, is well spoken, faultless, and not blamable by the wise", S 1.188.33-189.4 (C. Rhys Davids trsl.). With the "subhāsita-sutta" in S, compare the "subhāsita-sutta" in Sn. 78,5 ff., stanzas 450-454 (cf. *infra*).*
2. *Cattāro anariya-vohārā. Musā-vādo, pisunā vācā, pharusā vācā, saṃphappalāpo*, "four are the ignoble modes of speech : lying speech, slandering speech, rough speech, frivolous speech", D 3.232. 5-6, etc., cp. M 1.42.10 ff.
3. Cf. ĀpDhS 1.11.32, *supra*.
4. Including the grammatical norm. *infra*.
5. Cf. the conclusion of Dasav 7 stanza 57 :
parikkha-bhāsī susamāh' indie
cauk-kasāyāvagae aṇissie
sa ṇiddhune dhutta-malaṃ pure-kaḍaṃ
arāhae logam imantaḥā paraṃ-tti bemi,

Let us consider some of the examples adduced by the texts.

In Pannavaṇā, all speech inspired by the four *kaṣāyas*, *koha māṇa*..., is assimilated to lie, *mosā*¹. On the other hand, according to Āyār, anger etc. are conducive to harsh words (2.4.1.1) that hurt (ib 6). As such, they are prohibited. For its part, Dasav explains, so to say, the śloka 7.11-35 by emphasizing twice, at the beginning, and towards the end of the development, that a wise monk must (even if it is true) avoid all “rough speech which does harm to living beings :

....*pharusā bhāsā guru-bhūovaghāṇī*
saccā vi sā na vattavvā..... (7.11, cf. 29 c-d).

Without going into all the details and possible digressions, it is interesting to review what is prescribed and what is prohibited in the aforesaid passage. Various recommendations are met with which have been seen to be addressed either to the brahmacārin or the snātaka in the DhS. In Dasav 7.12, it is stressed that defect and mutilations should not be pointed to²; that various personal remarks are unacceptable (though they might be true literally speaking) for they might lead to faults of feeling and of conduct.³ In this connexion, prescribed and recommended terms of address are specified, and detailed in six ślokas (14-19)⁴. But it is not enough to observe circumspection when addressing mankind : circumspection is necessary also when speaking of all other five sense creatures, *pancediya-pāṇa*, and, in particular, no *himsā* should be suggested against them, whatever their species⁵. Cows, especially, should not be referred to foolishly :

“(he who) speaks after consideration, controls his senses well, has overthrown the four passions, (and) is without (worldly) support purges (his soul) of the dirt resulting from previous evil deeds (and) is sanctified in this world and the next. Thus I say “(trsl. Schubring). Compare Pannav chap. 11 § 830-1, the fourfold *ohāraṇī-bhāsā* : the *saccā* form is *ārāhaṇī*.

1. Cf. chap. 11 § 963.
2. *tah' eva kāṇaṇ'kāṇe' tti no vae,*
“.... a monk should not call a one-eyed man” by this ~~wante~~; cf. Āyār 2.4.2.1.
3. *eeṇ' anneṇa attheṇa paro jeṇ' uvahammaṭ,*
āyāra-bhāva-dosa-nnū, na taṇṇ bhāsejja pannavaṇ,
“because the person concerned would be hurt by this or similar statement, a thoughtful (monk) should not utter such speech, as he knows (that) faults of conduct and of feeling (would result from it), trsl. cf. Schubring. cf. Āyār 2.4.2.1-2.
4. *tah' eva “hole” “gole” tti na taṇṇ bhāsejja pannavaṇ,* 7.14. etc. Cf. Āyār 2.4.1. 8-11 (on how to address or not to address a man, a woman). Compare Chāndogya Upaniṣad 7.15.2.
5. Dasav 7.22.

tah' eva gāo dujjhāo dammā
*... .. n'evaṃ bhāsejja pannavaṃ*¹

So, "a thoughtful (monk) should not say : '(these) cows should be milked, tamed ...' . He should say : 'this is a young bull', 'this is a milk cow',

*juvaṃ-gave tti naṃ būyā, dheṇuṃ rasa-daya tti va*².

There can be little doubt that all these rules more or less echo what is to be found in the different sections of the DhS. But the Jainas adapt them and expatiate further. After they have mentioned the highest beings, the *pañcendriya-pāṇas*, they jump to the other extremity of the animate world of the *chajjīva-nikāyas*—to the immobile *jīvas*, viz, trees (and their fruit), plants, etc.³, which naturally must also be respected, as prescribed in ten ślokas (7,26-35) : in fact, all the *jīvas* come to be protected thanks to the warnings against and condemnation of *bhūovaghāiṇī bhāsā*.

Thus, following the thread offered by the first part of Dasav 7 and (though perhaps not so clearly) by Āyār 2.4, we have encountered many of the prescriptions found in the DhS; it is obvious, nevertheless, that, in the Jaina suttas, they are integrated in a comparatively well-defined general structure.

The second part of Dasav 7 warns against colloquial expressions which, in fact, are misleading, as they confuse right and wrong.⁴ Some concern, for instance, festive entertainments, (crossing, etc., of) rivers (36-39), in short, precisely those actions which are criticised in the above quoted khaṇḍas of ĀpDhS (1.11.31-32) and connected brahmanic texts : the Jainas retain most of the circumstances detailed in the DhS chapter(s), but, in the present development, they focus the attention on what is commonly—lightly said about them. Caution is also required if the monk should mention actions or preparations which are usually said to be "well done", "well cooked",

su-kaḍe tti su-pakke tti,

though they actually imply injury to living beings ! further, he should not issue orders and assertions which might be inconsiderate.⁵ Thus, in all the above circumstances, the monk is warned against rashness and lack of self-control⁶ :

tah' evasaṃjayaṃ
*... .. n' evaṃ bhāsejja pannavaṃ*⁷

1. Cf. Āyār 2.4.2.9.

2. Dasav 7.24-25, cf. Āyār 2.4.2.7-10.
Compare supra, ĀpDhS, etc.

3. Cf. Āyār 2.4.11-16. Cf. the "lesson" on the six *jīva-nikāyas*, at the beginning of Dasav 4, ed. Leumann, p. 614-5.

4. Cf. Dasav 7. 48-49.

5. Dasav 7.41-42., cf. Āyār 2.4.2.3-6.

6. Dasav 7. 43-47.

7. Dasav 7.47; (= 29 d; on the contrary *evaṃ bh. p.*, 39d=44d).

Self-control is further required when speaking of atmospheric phenomena. It will be remembered, in this connection, that Gaut DhS, etc. specify, in particular, how to mention the rain-bow (supra).¹ But, whereas the DhS seem to express some form of taboo, the Jainas aim at being accurate and consistent; the words chosen by the religious person should not contradict with the objective truths attained by the (Jaina) scientists; therefore, “he should not say that a cloud, the sky, or a man is a god, (but) he should (simply) state (the fact) that a cloud has formed itself or has risen high, or that a thunder-cloud has sent down rain” :

tah' eva mehaṃ va nahaṃ va māṇavaṃ
na deva deva tti giraṃ vaejjā;
‘sammucchie unnae vā paoe’
vaejja vā ‘vuṭṭhe balāhae’ tti (Dasav 7.52).²

Moreover, the monk will naturally accept seasons and events with due equanimity.³

Self-control, *saṃjaya*, is all the more advocated as it often happens that false appearances are confused with truth, and hence, are conducive to lies and to sin.⁴ Therefore, one should be careful when speaking of doubtful matters—an advice which is also given by ĀpDhS, as we have seen.⁵ Dasav and Āyār apply this consideration to trivial remarks, especially to those concerning future events, which, by nature, are uncertain;⁶ and, also, to those that concern the sex of various animals.⁷

Consequently, attention must also be paid to grammar and grammatical correction, of which Āyār recalls the fundamental constituents (2.4.1.3).⁸ Thus,

1. Cf. ĀpDhS 1.11.31.16, etc. supra.

2. Cf. ib 53; Āyār 2.4.1.12-13.

3. Dasav 7.50-51; Āyār 2.4.1.12-13.

4. Dasav 7.5 :

vitahaṃ pi tahā-mottiṃ jaṃ giraṃ bhāsae naro
tamhā so puṭṭho pāveṇaṃ

“by a speech which has the appearance of truth though it is untrue, a man is touched by sin” (trsl. Schubring).

5. Cf. Āyār 2.4.1.2.

6. Dasav 7.6-10 (compare Āyār 2.4.1.2) :

jaṃ aṭṭhaṃ tu na jāṇejjā “evam eyaṃ” ti no vae,
jaṭṭha sankā bhava jaṃ tu “evam eyaṃ” ti no vae,

“if (a monk) does not know (or) has some doubt he should not say “it is thus” (Dasav 7. 8-9 (trsl. Schubring).

7. Dasav 7.21.

8. Cf. Paṇṇav § 896 (for a discussion on empirical truths, ib § 862).

the Jainas seem to advocate purism, at least as far as possible, and their attitude is noteworthy, as the Buddhists apparently deny that any fundamental connection exists between chaste speech and spiritual achievement.¹ In this case, then, as in several others,² the Jainas probably follow the Brahmanic trend more closely than the Buddhists do.

Be that as it may, it is obvious that the Jainas were well aware of the prescriptions concerning speech which are registered in the Dharmasāstras; moreover, in the above quoted Dasav and Āyār chapters, they appear to have added several new bhāsā rules which almost certainly stem from the same common sources, though they seem to have been suggested not so much by the actual wording (in the DhS they concern deeds) as by their location, (in the DhS, they are in the immediate context of the rules about speech).

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that the Jainas unweariedly strive to be explicit about the conceptual basis of, and reasons for, the rules they ordain. This, possibly, helped them to consider floating precepts with fresh eyes, to group them and integrate them in an organic unity. In this respect, whatever their actual sources, the Jainas can be said to have achieved a perfectly original work. Nowhere, in the Āyār and Dasav chapters, is there any mention of retaliation, or any trace of obscure fear of occult forces; on the contrary, all the percepts are well-grounded on objective considerations—whether scientific, metaphysical and/or ethical. To a certain extent, thanks to these lessons on bhāsā, we can witness how the Jainas have reconsidered generally accepted rules of conduct and recast them to build a really new, and comparatively systematic, code.

1. Cf. the commentary on the (Sn) Subhāsita-sutta, in Paramatthajotikā 2.2 (ed. Helmer Smith, London, Pali Text Society, 1917), 397.7–398.7 : *yad aññe| . | nāmādīhi padehi, lingavacana-vibhatti-kālakārādīhi sampattihi ca camannāgataṃ vācam 'subhāsita' ti maññanti, taṃ dhammato patisedheti*, “what some believe, that ‘subhāsita’ means speech composed with words—names, etc.—possessed of gender, inflection, tense marker..., — One lawfully rightly, rejects this view—To avoid *dubbhāsita* means avoiding *pesuñña*, etc. (supra).
Cf. the whole discussion, Pj 2.2.3966 14—398.12, and Sāratthapakāsinī (ed. F. L. Woodward, London 19... PTS) 1.272.8–274.22.
2. Cf. JACOBI, SBE 22, Introduction, p. xxix.

Abbreviations

Amg = Ardhamāgadhi;

ĀpDhS = Āpastambīya Dharma Sūtra (ed. G. Bühler, Bombay, 1968; translation G. Bühler, SBE 2, Oxford, 1879; repr. Delhi, 1965);

Āyār = Āyāranga-sutta (ed. H. Jacobi, London PTS 2) 1882; (Āgamodaya Samiti), samvat 1936 = A.D. 1880, repr. Delhi 1978; ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, Bombay, 1976 (Jaina-Āgama-Series 2. I); transl. H. Jacobi, SBE 22, Oxford, 1884);

Baudh (*DhS*) = Baudhāyana Dharma Śāstra (ed. E. Hultzsch, Leipzig 1884 + Id, Leipzig 1922 (Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes 8.4 and 16.2); transl. G. Bühler, SBE 14, Oxford, 1882, repr. Delhi 1965).

BI = Bibliotheca Indica;

D = Dīgha Nikāya (ed. T. W. Rhys Davids, London (PTS));

Dasav = Dasaveyāliya-sutta (ed. Ernst Leumann, ZDMG 46 (1982), 581-663; Puṇyavijaya and A. m. Bhojak, Bombay, 1977 (Jaina-Āgama-Series 15); transl., cf. Dasaveyāliya Sutta, ed by Ernst Leumann and translated by Walther Schubring, Ahmedabad, 1932; repr. in Walther Schubring, Kleine Schriften, herausgegeben von Klaus Bruhn, Wiesbaden, 1977 (Glasenapp-Stiftung, 13), p. 111-248);

DhS = Dharma Sūtra/Śāstra;

Gaut (*DhS*) = Gautama DhS (ed. F. Stenzler, London, 1876 (Sanskrit Text Society); transl. G. Bühler, SBE 2, Oxford, 1879; repr. Delhi, 1965);

M = Majjhima Nikāya (ed. V. Trenckner; R. Chalmers, London (PTS));

MBh = Mahābhārata (ed. Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona)

Mn = Mānava DhS (ed. J. Jolly, London 1887 (Trübner's Oriental Series; transl. G. Bühler, SBE 25, Oxford, 1886);

PTS = Pali Text Society, London;

RV = Ṛgveda;

S = Saṃyutta Nikāya (ed. L. Feer, London (PTS));

Sn = Suttanipāta (ed. D. Andersen-H. Smith, London (PTS));

Vas = Vāsiṣṭha DhS (ed. A. A. Führer, 1883; transl. G. Bühler, SBE 14, Oxford, 1882).