THE WORD ‘OE’ IN SOME CANONICAL JAINA TEXTS
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§1

The word oe in the Āyāra I.5.6/176, I.6.5/196, I.8.3/209-210, and I.8.7/224, and in the Sūyagaḍa I.4.1.11/257, I.4.2.1/278, and I.14.21/600 is glossed with Skt ojas, which, as required by the respective contexts, would then function as an adjective describing a monk as “a strong person”. For oe, Śilāṅka gives the following paraphrases: “ojaḥ ekośeṣamalakalaṅkāṅkarahitaḥ”, “ojaḥ eko rāgadvēsarahitaḥ” (for Śilāṅka on oe in Āyāra I.8.3/209, see below §6), and, again, rāgadvēsarahitaḥ. With the gloss eka beside ojas, these paraphrases have retained somewhat of the embarrassment caused by the word oe, which suggests that we, on our part, accept the derivation from ojas only after our own independent and careful investigation. In this connection, Alsdorf, who follows the traditional interpretation, suggests that we infer an adjective ojas from the comparative ojīyas and the superlative ojīṣṭha.

One of the problems with this interpretation is that, in the texts, beside the so-called adjective oe, also occurs a regular adjective oyaṁśi (ajasvin), namely in the Āyāra II.1.4.2/534: se bhikkhū vā (….) jahā vegatīyāṁ rūvāṁ pāsejja tahā vi tāṁ evaṁ vadejjā, tāṁ jahā — oyaṁśi oyaṁśi ti vā teyamśi teyamśi ti vā …., and in the Samavāya (p. 471, lines 5 ff.): jambuddive ṇam dīve bhārahe vāse imise osappiṇie nava dāsāramāndalā hotthā, tāṁ jahā — uttamaṃpurisā mājhiṃmapurisā pahānāpurisā oyaṁśi teyamśi vacamśi jasaṁśi chayamśi karintā ... .

The lemma o(y)a in the Āgama Śabdakosā, which refers to the adjective o(y)a, contains, beside, a number of references to a noun o(y)a. One of these instances is the Sūyagada II.3/732, where oe denotes the nourishing substance with which the mother feeds the foetus while in her womb: te jīvā mātuoyāṁ pitusukkam tam tadbhayaṁ samṣattham kalusam kibbisam tappaḥdamayāṁ āhāram āhāreṇa. Probably, however, we have to do here with a contracted form of udaka “water”.5 See in this connection the Vīyāhapaṇṇatti I, p. 53, lines 2 ff.: jaṁ se māṭā nāṉāvēḥāo rasavigatī āhāram āhāreṇa tadekkadesamā𝑛 oyaṁ āhāreṇa. In the Nāyādhammakāhā I.10.2 we would indeed have to do with the substantive ojas, occurring in a description of the moon, which is dittē juttē chayāe pabhāe oye lesāe hine respectively ahiye.

This situation suggests that we have a closer look again at the instances of the so-called adjective oe and investigate the possibilities of another meaning and derivation for the word.

§2

The first instance to be considered is the Sūyagada I.4.1.11/275:

tamēhā u vajāe itthī visalittarī na kaṁṭagarī ṇaccā
se kulāṇi vasavattī āghāti na se vi ṇiggamthe.
The text and the meaning of the first line are clear and need no comment. As to the text of the second line, Schubring has suggested to emend the nominative-accusative kulāṇi into the genitive kulāna. According to Alsdorf, this emendation, which is purely conjectural as no variant kulāna is found, is indeed unavoidable. This, however, is only so as long as we follow the traditional interpretation of oe as an adjective. Moreover, given this interpretation of oe, one may wonder what may have caused the introduction of kulāṇi as a secondary reading and, subsequently, the complete disappearance from all manuscripts of the supposedly original and definitely more obvious reading kulāna.

In fact, the transmitted text suggests that we take oe kulāṇi as an independent phrase consisting of a chain, admittedly a short one, of two synonyms, or near-synonyms: “oe, kulāṇi”, one who has come under the influence of these...” For oe, occurring side by side with kula, this points to a derivation from Skt okas “house” or, figuratively, “worldliness”. The verse should then be translated as follows:

Therefore he should avoid women, knowing them to be like a thorn smeared with poison. “A house, families”, one who has come under the influence of these [situations], he is not called a nirgrantha.

It should be noted that this interpretation of oe also removes the problem, not noted so far, of how we are to reconcile the qualification of the monk as strong (oe) with the fact that he comes under the influence of families. In this connection the question arises if, once the possibility that oe represents okas has been recognized, the latter meaning also fits into the text as emended by Schubring, assuming that the latter text is the original one after all. In that case, I think, we have to take oe as a locative: “One who has come under the influence of families (while staying) in a house”.

The next task is to see if and how the meaning “house, worldliness” arrived at just now also fits into the other contexts of the so-called adjective oe.

§3

One of these contexts is the Śūyagaḍā 1.4.2.1/278:

\[\text{oje sadā na rajjejja bhogakāmi pūno virajjejjā} \]
\[\text{bhoge samanāṇa suṇeha jaha bhūmijanti bhikkhuṇo ege.} \]

It is clear that, instead of oje we should, with Śīlāṅka, read oe, which, if representing Skt okas, would have to be taken as a locative with rajjejjā:

[A monk] should never show any attachment to the house (which is a source of worldliness); should he become attached to pleasures, he should free himself of passion again. Hear the pleasure of the śramanas, how some bhikkhus enjoy them.
§4

In the Āyāra I.8.6/224 and I.8.7/228 oe is found in the following enumeration: tam saccaṁ saccavādi oe tiṇṇaṁ chinnaṁ kaṁkahe ātītaṁ anātīte, in which oe tiṇṇaṁ, taken together, would mean: “having overcome worldliness”.

§5

The next instance to be discussed is the Āyāra I.5.6/176. The passage consists of several loosely integrated pieces of text, which, for easy reference, have been individually numbered below:

(1) iha āgatīṁ gatīṁ parinītāya acceti jātinaraṅgassa vaḍumagari vakkhātarate
(2) savve sarā nīvaṭṭamti
(3) takkā jattha na vijjati mati tattha na gāhiya
(4) oe appatiṭṭhānassa khettaṁne
(5) se na dihe, na hrasse etc.

(1) may be translated as follows: “Having fully understood [the causes of] death and rebirth on this earth he leaves the path (? vaḍumagari) of birth and death, delighting in the teaching”

(2) and (3) seem to describe a particular stage in the meditative practice attained by the monk mentioned just now, in which he has completely subdued the sense organs (the text mentions, by way of example, the organ of hearing): (2) “All sounds are retreating”; and in which speculation (takkā) has come to a complete standstill (3): “Where no speculation is found no (false) notions are formed (are caused to be made)”. This idea is, it seems, further elaborated in (5). The same enumeration, without na, is found in the Śūyaṅgada II.1/649. There, a false doctrine is challenged, which maintains that the soul (atā) has a form (long, short, etc.) and qualities (colour, taste, etc.) of its own, independently of the body. In his discussion of that passage Bollée notes that, in the Śūyaṅgada I.5.6/176, in its negated form (na dihe, na hrasse ...), it would describe a liberated soul. As far as I see, it would rather continue the argument set in in (3), and provide an example of a correct notion, namely: “[For such a monk] it (the soul) is not long, is not short ...”.

Syntactically, the phrase oe appatiṭṭhānassa khettaṁne (4) is to be linked with (1). It stands on the same level as vakkhātarate and qualifies the subject of acceti. Instead of first discussing the merits of the various available interpretations and translations of this phrase, I boldly present my own, in which oe “house” is taken as an apposition to khetta in khettaṁne. “He knows (-nne) the house (oe) as the place (khetta) of one who is without ground [for salvation] (appatiṭṭhānassa),” i.e. “He knows that one who remains attached to the house is without ground [for salvation].” In §7 I will return to this particular interpretation of the phrase oe appatiṭṭhānassa khettaṁne.
§6

The next two instances of oe are found in the Ayāra 1.8.3/209-210. The passage consists, again, of several distinct sections, showing abrupt transitions from the one to the other. The numbering has been added by me for the sake of easy reference.

(1a) nihāya daṁdaṁ pānehi pāvam kammaṁ akuvamāne esa maham agarthe viyāhte

(1b) oe juimassa khetṣa(jānne) uvacāyam cayanaṁ ca ṇaccā “ahārovacayā dehā parisaṁpaṁbabhamuṇo”

(2) pāsahege savimdaehirī pariṇīyāmānehehiṁ

(3a) oe dayam dayatī

(3b) je saṁnīdhanasatthassa khetanne

(3c) se bhikkhū kālaṁne balaṇne (v.l. balaṇne) mātanne khanayanne vinayanne samayanne pariggham anamāyanāne kālenūththāyi apadinne duhato chettā niyāti.

(1a) “Abstaining from harmful actions against living beings, not doing sinful deeds: he is called a great agrantha”.

(1b) Would further qualify this great agrantha. The transmitted text, oe jutimassa khetanne, is, however, for various reasons problematic. Following the commentary of Śilāṅka, who has: “ajah” adwityo rāgavēṣahārhitaḥ, “dyutimān” saṁyamo mokṣā vā, tasya khetajñō nipunah”, the phrase may be rendered in the following way: “A strong monk, undaunted by the exhaustion involved in brilliant (selfcontrol, leading to mokṣā)”.

Regarding the text of this passage, and its interpretation, two points may be noted. The first one concerns the word khetanne. It is almost certain that here, as elsewhere, it is an alternative form of khetanne (kṣetrajña). The variation khetta - khet is of the same type as pēkkhī - pēhai (Skt prekṣati). It is not clear if khetta beside khetta is not merely a matter of spelling. The word kheyānne, occasionally found, seems to be further development of this khetanne. The gloss khetajñā must have its origin in this khetanne. Śilāṅka, however, seems to have been well aware of the various options, as appears from the Ayāra 1.2.588 : for kheyānne he has : kheya(d)anne, khedāh — abhyāṣāḥ... khetajñō, athavā kṣetrajñāḥ. Compare the Cūṇā : khuttam jāṇati khetanṇo bhikkhāyāryakusale ... evamādi jāṇati khitannā.18.

The question why in the instance under investigation the “alternative” kṣetrajña was not considered may have to do with the context and with the way this context was perceived. This brings us to the second point to be discussed, namely the meaning of the word juima- (Skt dyutimat-). The technical meaning “selfcontrol, liberation” assigned to it by Śilāṅka would merely show his embarrassment with the word in the present context. The meaning seems to have been invented for the occasion. In the two other instances of the word juima, or juima, means simply “brilliant” : in the
Uttarajñāyaṇa 5.26/155 it qualifies the vimohā regions, which are “full of light” (uttaraiṁ vimohāṁ juṁmant[ij]; and in the Śūyagaḍa 1.6.8/359 it describes Īndra: “like Śakṛē, the king of the gods, who is brilliant” (Sakke va devahipati jutiṁtam). It seems virtually impossible to make sense of the text with juṁmassa = dyutimatas.

In this situation, I venture to suggest an emendation, and to read, instead, cuṁmassa. In the present context cuṁmassa, from “cyutimata- “one who will die (and be born again)”, would make perfect sense: oe cuṁmassa khetanqe should be translated as “he knows the house as the place of one who dies (to be born again)”, i.e. “he knows that one who remains attached to the house will die (and be born again)”. In §7 I will return to this interpretation of the phrase.

(1b) is a continuation of (1a). Thus: “This man is called a great agrahtha, he knows that one who remains attached to the house will fall, knowing birth and dying (cayamai !), and [that] bodies are heaps of food, liable to break under afflictions”. The last line, with the nominative dehā, seems to be part of a free-floating Śloka verse, added here without any adaptation of the grammar.

In (2) the teacher points to some people (or to some monks ?) who do not guard their sense organs: “Look, there are some, (however), who (live) with all their sense organs weakening (i.e. unchecked).”

In (3a) the point of view shifts back to the true monk: “He has pity (on them) for their worldliness.” The sentence oe dayaṁ dayati has a parallel in the Āyāra 1.6.5/196 oe samitadamsane dayaṁ logassa jāṁiti, for which, see below, §9.

According to Schubring, the interpretation of the compound saminidhānasatthassa (3b) is a problem19. He suggests the possibility that we have a compound with the order of its members reversed: sattha-saminidhāna (sāstra[sic]-saminidhāna). His translation appears to be a conflation of the various possibilities: “who knows the teachings (sāstra) concerning the putting down (saminidhāna) [of weapons (śastra)].”

I think, however, that we should start from the literal meaning of saminidhāna, which is “vicinity, proximity” (3b): “For he knows the violence which arises from staying in the vicinity (of a house)”. Translated in this way (“For he knows...”) the sentence continues the preceding one (3a). It is not unlikely, however, that it has to be taken with the one which follows (3c): se bhikkhū kālanqe... In this connection it is to be noted that the same enumeration, namely kālanqe bālanqe mātanqe etc., is also found in the Āyāra 1.2.5/88. In the latter case, kheyonaṁ has been included among the items enumerated, between mātanqe and khanayananbh, while in the passage under consideration it has been singled out, elaborated, and placed in front (3b and 3c) : “The monk who knows the violence which arises from staying in the vicinity (of the house), who knows the time, etc. ..... goes out of this world”.20
§7

In the interpretation of the phrase *samānidhānasatthassa khettanne* given just now (§6), *samānidhāna* would specify *khetta* in *khettanne*. A similar function has been assigned to *oe* in the phrase *oe appatūṭhānassā/jui massa khet(t)tanne* (§§5 and 6). This assumes that *khetta* in the compound *khettanne* has fully retained its own meaning, that is, that *khettanne* means what it says, namely “who knows the field or place”. In this connection one may note the passage found in the Āyāra I.8.3/210 (see above §6)\(^{21}\), in which *khet(t)an ne* is found side by side with compounds like *kālanne, mātanne*, etc.\(^{22}\)

For the particular interpretation, with *samānidhāna* specifying *khetta*, or denoting the place from which the violence originates, I may refer to the phrase *pajjavasatthassa khettanne* in the Āyāra I.3.1/109, and to the compound *ithivedakhetan ne* in the Sūyagaḍā I.4.1.20/266. A closer look would show that *pajjavājāta* (the case of *ithiveda* is slightly different) denotes or specifies the “place” from which violence originates.

The sentence *je pajjavājātasatthassa khetan ne se asatthassa khetan ne* (Āyāra I.3.1/109) concludes a passage which starts with the exhortation of a monk to be indifferent towards *sadda, riṣa, gamādhā, rasa* and *phāsa*, features which are collectively known as the "accidental conditions" (*pajjava*, Skt *paryāya* or *paryāya*). The true monk is next said to be "not careless towards desires, abstaining from sins, a hero, having his senses checked, and knowing the *kṣeta*" (appamatto kāmehiṁ uvarato pāvakammehim vire ātugutta kheyānne). The last word, *kheyānne*, is then further specified : *je pajjavajātasatthassa khetan ne se asatthassa khetan ne*.

For the interpretation of the compound *pajjavājāta* there seem to be basically two possibilities : (1) "the complete collection of the *pajjavas*" (cf. *jāta* in bhoyanjāya and pānagajāta in the Āyāra II 1.1.11/409 (7 and 8 respectively), or (2) "one possessed with the *pajjavas*", *pajjavājāta* being a compound like *dantajāta*\(^{23}\). Whichever of these two meanings is intended here, it would seem clear that the relationship between the members of the compound *pajjavajātasattha* is not the same as the one in, e.g., *pudhavisattha* in the Āyāra I.1.2/17, which latter refers to violence against the earth : *taṁ parinnāya mehāvī neva sayam pudhavisattheraṁ samārāmbhejjaṁ* “knowing this, a wise man should not himself commit violence against the element earth”. Therefore, *je pajjavajātasatthassa khetan ne* should be translated as : “knowing the violence in one endowed with the *pajjavas* (or : in the whole collection of the *pajjavas*), “he who knows that violence is inherent in the possession of the *pajjavas*, also knows the absence of violence, which is in the absence of the *pajjavas*”\(^{24}\)

The second example, *ithivedakhetan ne* is found in the Sūyagaḍā I.4.1.20/266 :

\[
\text{usiyā vi itthiposesu purisā itthivedakhetan ne} \\
\text{pannāsamanntā vege nariṇā vasāṁ uvakasarñi.}
\]

The current interpretation of this verse is fraught with a cumulation of
misunderstandings and ad hoc solutions. A case in point is the interpretation of itthiveda, or as some editions have, itthiveya. Bolleé, who seems to be the most recent scholar to discuss the term, follows the commentaries, which gloss it with Skt stri-veda. Unfortunately, Bolleé does not specify which word veda is actually intended here. He does quote a passage from the Cûrû according to which veda would mean "knowledge" : striyo yena và vedyante sa strivedo bhavati, but this interpretation has been presented as an alternative. According to Bolleé itthiveya-veda in the present verse means "the female sex", as it would elsewhere in the canon. In this connection he refers to Vîyâhapanottti 2.5.1 : ege (...) jîve (...) egari veyam veeti tam jahâ itthiveyam và purisaveyam (the JAS-edition reads throughout veda), to Vîyâhapanottti 19.9.8, in which is found the expression itthiveyakarana : "having sex with a woman", and to the expression avagayaveyam, quoted from Schubring, meaning "free from thoughts about sex". However, if these latter instances show anything, it is that itthiveya-veda does not mean "the female sex". For a proper appreciation of the meaning of the compound, I think we have to start from itthiveya, in which veyam would represent veda "excitement", which word actually occurs in the second line of the verse under consideration. Vîyâhapanottti 2.5.1 should accordingly be translated with : "A being normally feels but one kind of excitement (veyam veeti), namely either excitement caused by women or excitement caused by men". That the meaning is "excitement caused by/directed towards", rather than "sexual activity with" or its equivalents, is shown by Uttarajâhâyâya 32.102, in which pum., itthi- and râpunisaveyam are found side by side with the emotions (thâvas) kohâ, mâna, mâyâ, lobha, dughûnîchâ, arai, rai, hâsa, bhaya, and soga.

As far as I see, itthiveda has been introduced only secondarily for itthiveya, which editorial intervention may have been triggered by the juxtaposition of veyam to ved(jei) (vedayati). If so, veda would have nothing to do with veda "knowledge", but would have to be taken as meaning something like "feelings".

Itthiveyakhetanne, thus, seems to follow the pattern of pâjjavâtâsatthassa khetanne, in that the women (ittí) are the causes (khetta) for the excitement (veya). In this connection it would not matter that the compound itthiveya is also found by itself.

A second point concerns the meaning of ittiposesu. Posa has been generally equated with Skt pûsa "nourishing", which, however, has led to all kinds of ad hoc translations for usiyâ. To quote Alsdorf : "Even men who have had experience of supporting women". This is indeed a strange translation for usiyâ, the past participle of vâs- "to live with". As far as I see, ittiposa corresponds to Skt stri-pûnis(a) "a masculine type of woman, a hermaphrodite". The verse should accordingly be translated as :

Men, even those who have lived with hermaphrodites, know the excitement caused by women. Endowed with insight concerning [the source of] excitement, men (are able to) remove the power women have over them.
The two remaining instances of khettan̄ne are, for different reasons, problematic. The first is the Āyāra I.1.4/32: *je loğaṁ abbhāikkhati se attan̄am abbhāikkhati (…) je dihalogasatthassa khettan̄ne se asatthassa khettan̄ne*, “He who has a wrong conception of the world, has a wrong conception of himself. … [But] he who knows that the long (?) world is a source of violence, he knows how to avoid violence”. Admittedly, I fail to see what is meant with “the long world” (dihaloga) here.

As to khettan̄ne in the Āyāra I.2.6/104, the problem is linked to that of the meaning of the otherwise rare word anugghātana: *se medhāvi je anugghātanassa khettan̄ne je ya bahdhapamokkham aṇṇesī*. The context suggests that we mentally supply a word for “bondage” to anugghātanassa khettan̄ne. “He is wise who knows that the place (i.e. the cause) of not breaking open [is bondage], and who strives after the liberation of bondage.”

§8

The remaining two instances of the word oe are the Sūyagaḍa I.14.21 (a verse) and the Āyāra I.6.5/196 (prose). The Sūyagaḍa I.12.21 reads:

*hāsaṁ pi no saṁdhaye pāvadhamme oe tahiyam pharusam viyāne no tucchae no va vikaṁthatijjā anāile yā akasāyī bhikkhū.*

The verse is found in a passage which describes, among other things, how a monk should behave in his contacts with “ordinary” people. For the verse I suggest the following translation:

He should not laugh at their wickedness (pāvadhamme). He should realize that simply to be told the truth with regard to their worldliness is already hard for them to bear. He should not belittle (them?) nor brag about his (own) accomplishments, he, an untroubled monk, free from kaśāyas.

§9

The final instance to be discussed is the Āyāra I.6.5/196: … *jaṉavayamitaresu vā saṁtegaṭiyā jaṅā lūsagā bhavaṁti āduvā phāsa phusamti. te phāse puṭṭho dhīro adhiyaśac. oe samitadamsaṇe dayaṁ logassa jaṅittā (…) āikkhe vibhace kīṭhe vedavi.* In the JĀS-edition the phrase *oe samitadamsaṇe* is taken with the preceding sentence: “…or in the janapadas, there are some people who will inflict pain on him, or painful experience will touch him. Touched but steadfast, he will bear these painful experiences, he, strong (oe) and endowed with right views”. In my view, however, *oe samitadamsaṇe* is instead to be taken with the sentence that follows. The phrase *oe samitadamsaṇe* is to be compared with *phāse phāse samitadamsaṇe*, “endowed with complete knowledge of the various afflictions”, occurring in the Āyāra I.6.2/185. Conformingly, *oe samitadamsaṇe* may be translated “endowed with complete knowledge of worldliness”. The sentence as a whole runs as follows: “Endowed with complete knowledge of worldliness, having pity on those people, (…) he, the wise one, should teach, impart, praise [the doctrine, which teaches houselessness]”.

Jain Education International
For Private & Personal Use Only
www.jainelibrary.org
As already indicated, the phrase *oe samitadarśane dayamī logassa jāṇitā* may be compared with *oe dayamī dayati* in the Āyāra I.8.3/209-210, discussed above in §6.

§10

Above, it has been suggested that *oe* in the canonical texts is not derived from *oajas* “strength” but from *okas* “house”, or, figuratively, “worldliness”. The starting-point for the present investigation was formed by the occurrence of *oe* in the enumeration *oe kulāni* in the Sūyagaḍa I.4.1.11/257. Next, the new meaning arrived at in that instance has been checked in the other ones. If my interpretation of *oe* is correct, it must be noted that the fate of the Skt word *okas* in the Jain canon is particularly unfortunate: it has been misunderstood not only in its form *oe*, but also, as shown by Norman, in its form *ukka*, namely in *anukkatasātī* “not sleeping in the house”35.

§11

In the course of the above investigation of the passages in which the word *oe* was found I have, in §6, suggested to emend the text against the unanimous evidence of the transmission. I refer to the emendation of *juimassa* (*dyuti-matas*) in the Āyāra I.8.3/209-210 into *cuimassa* (*cyuti-matas*). In §2 I have argued that a similar, conjectural, emendation introduced by Schubring, and accepted by Alsdorf and Bollée, namely of *kulāni* in the Sūyagaḍa I.4.1.11/257 into *kulāna*, may afterall be unnecessary. The latter example would show that it is, as a rule, unwise to tamper with the text in this way. To arrive at the conclusion that a given text makes no sense, is one thing, therefore to change it, is another. With the latter step we have left the path of sound scholarly practice. There are, however, at least two reasons to be less scrupulous.

In the first place, the commentaries and the variant readings bear ample witness of the fact that in the course of its transmission the text of the canon has been constantly edited in the light of new interpretations. The instance *ittiiveda*, discussed above (§7) may now be added to those noted by Caillat in the commentary of the Dasaveyāliya36. Moreover, this process of editing can be traced back to the very beginning of the present textual transmission, in which case every trace of the original text has been lost. Below I will briefly discuss two such instances dealt with by me earlier in a more elaborate way37.

Another reason is that in some cases the alternative to emendation may even be worse, as it involves accepting all kinds of *ad hoc* interpretations. As an example I may refer to the Sūyagaḍa I.1.2.12/39:

```
savvappagani viukkasaṁ savvanī nīmanī vihuntyā
appattiyam akammavāse eyam aṭṭhamāṁ mige cue.
```

This verse is generally taken to refer to the four kāśyās: *savvappagani* would stand for *lobha*, *viukkasaṁ* for *māna*, *nīmanī* for *māyā* and *appattiyam* for *krodha*. This identification of these words with the four kāśyās stands completely on its own, and
clearly represents an ad hoc solution. As earlier argued by me, the original text must have read savvappagarñ pi ukkassanñ (sarvālpakam api utkarṣan) and akammāse (akalmāsaḥ) :

Pulling out a thing (ukkassanñ), however small it is (savvappagarñ pi), one should remove (vihumīyā) everything which is lying deep (or : is hidden; nūmaṁ). Not believing (this to be necessary; appattiyām, negated present participle of pattiya-)(being innocent; ‘akalmāsa), therefore the spotless [deer] has died.

The only room for argument seems to be whether the text had been corrupt first or whether the corruption is the result of editing.

A more complicated instance is furnished by the word tāṇae in Sūyagaṇa I.1.1.5/5. I quote the passage together with the second line of the preceding verse :

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mamāṭī luppāṭī bāle annamanneḥim mucchie} & \ (4cd) \\
vittāṁ sovāriyaeva savvām etām na tāṇae \ & \\
saṁkhāe jiviyaeva ca kammunā u tiṣṭtai & \ (5).
\end{align*}
\]

In the commentaries tāṇae is translated with trāyate. Conformingly, tāṇa- has been explained as a denominative verb of t(r)āṇa. It should be noted, however, that this seems to be the only instance of this verb.

In support of this derivation several supposedly parallel passages have been advanced. E.g. Sūyagaṇa I.9.5/441 : mātā pitā nhusā bhāyā bhajā putā ya orasa/nālam te tava tāṇae luppāntassā sakamunaḥ //, ibidem I.2.3.16/158 : vittāṁ pasavo ya nātayo tam bāle saranam ti māṇṇatī Vete mama tesu vi aham no tāṇam saraṇam ca vijjai //, and ibidem I.13.11/567a : na tassa jāti va kulam va tāṇam. The verbal agreement of these passages with the verse under consideration should not close our eyes for the fact of the isolated existence of the verb tāṇa-, which remains striking, especially as it does not concern a technical or special term. Moreover, these so-called parallels are counterbalanced by another, a well-known Sanskrit saying : athitir bālakaś caiva strijano nrpatis tathā/ete vittāṁ na jānantī jāmatā caiva pañcamāḥ //39. On the basis of this parallel it is tempting to “emend” the phrase na tāṇae into na āṇae, which would lead to the following translation :

He is greedy; infatuated then by this then by that, he, a fool, is broken. Possessions, even (or : and [ceva]) sisters born from the same mother (sovāriya), all this he does not acknowledge. But only by (acting with) deliberation (saṁkhāe) (one’s whole) life long one escapes from karma.

It is not difficult to see how the rare word tāṇae would have been introduced for original āṇae as a result of a reinterpretation of the verse in the light of the supposed parallels such as the Sūyagaṇa I.9.5/441. In this connection it should be noted that this latter verse is also found in Uttarajjhayaṇa 6.3/164, which would indicate that we have to do with a well-known, free-floating, verse.
Apart from these traces pointing to a process of editing in the very period of the textual fixation of the texts, we also have to reckon, as shown by Alsdorf, with the clerical errors going back to the same stage and therefore transmitted in all presently available manuscripts. This state of affairs provides an excuse for conjectural emendations, the outcome of which, however, is inevitably arbitrary and by definition open to discussion. These emendations are therefore to be considered as markers of, given our present knowledge, otherwise unsolvable textual problems.

Annotations:

1. Āyāra (LSJ), p. 154.
2. Āyāra (LSJ), p. 183.
5. See also Samavāya, p. 478, lines 2 ff. and Viyāhapanṇatti I, p. 101, line 6.
6. Āgama Śabdakośa, p. 289.
7. Also in Ṭhāna 3.3.185 and 4.4.377, and in Viyāhapanṇatti I, p. 52, line 19.
8. For Pāli oka from uđaka, see GPD II, p. 681 s.v. oka.
11. Alsdorf, “Itthiparinnā”, p. 263. This “emendation” has been accepted without comment by Bollée, Studien zum Sūyagada II, p. 21 and p. 151.
12. For oka in Pāli, see GPD II, pp. 680-681, s.v. oka.
13. In the present context I do not wish to go into the merits of the derivation of āghāti (v.lāghāte) from ākhāyā- and its translation with “he is called”.
16. Or: “he knows the house/worldliness as the reason for the being without ground [for salvation]”. For appatiṭṭhāna “the being without ground [for salvation]”, beside “one being without ground [for salvation]”, AiGr. II,1, pp. 304-305.
17. Āyāra (LSJ), p. 183.
18. As quoted in the Āyāra (JĀS-edition).
20. See also the sentence je pajavasatthassa khetaṇṇe se asatthassa khetaṇṇe, discussed below in §7.
21. The same enumeration is found in the Āyāra I.2.5/88.
22. For khetattante in a different enumeration, see Sūyagada II.1/639: aham anisi putte khetattante kusale paṇḍite viyatte medhāvi abāle maggattthe maggavid maggassa
gatiparakkamanna (Cūrṇi, as quoted in the JĀS-edition: aham asmi purusaḥ deśakālaṁ kṣetrajñaḥ, deśo yena yathāvādyate, kālo divaso, kuśalo daksāḥ (...) pānditaḥ upāyajñīḥ..., as if the text read desakalante khetanne) (see also ibidem 640, 641 and 643); and Śūyagaḍa II.1/680: esa dhamme dhuve nitte sāsane sānecca ṭagāṁ khetannehiṁ pavedite. In this last instance the compound seems to have been used as a general term. However, note that in the Āyāra 1.3.2/109 khetanne in appamatto kāmeṁhi uvarato pāvakammeṁhi viṁ ateṣu khetanne, is further specified in the sentence which follows: je pajjavajītasatthassa khetanne (see furtheron). Furthermore, Śūyagaḍa I.15.13/619: anelisassa khetanne na virūḍhejja keṇai, may well be translated as “He who knows the place of the incomparable will be hindered by nothing in his attempt to reach it.”


24. The compound pajjavājāta is found in several other places, but the meaning “accidental conditions” for pajja in this compound seems to be restricted to the instance discussed just now. Of all the other instances the one in the Thāna I.3/399 comes closest to this one in that jāta seems to mean “the whole collection of” there as well: āyārya-avajhāyassa naṁ gānāṁsi paṁcena vuggahaṭṭhāṁ pannattā, tam jahā (...) āyārya-avajhāye naṁ gānāṁsi je sutta-pajjavajāte dhāreti te kāle kāle no samānaṁ anuppavātāṁ bhavati (also in the Thāna I.3/400, V.2/439 and VII 544). “There are five situations in which one may discontinue the teachings of the āyārya-avajhāya in the gana, namely (...) when he presents the whole collection of textual variants (or: of alternative interpretations) of the sutta, but is unable in time to provide valid refutations.”

In, for instance, the Thāna III.4/222, however, jāta in pajjavajāta seems to have its full participial meaning: balamāraṁ tīvhe pannattā, tam jahā thitalesse sankalitelesse pajjavajātelasse “The death of a fool is known as threefold, namely: the leśyās remain (the same), they have lost their brightness, or they have changed (their colour) altogether”. The same may be the case in the Thāna V.3/467, in which are enumerated five reasons for reciting the sutta: sāngahaṭṭhatāye, uvaṅgaḥhatthetāye, nijaraṭṭhatāye, sute vā me pajjavajāte bhavissati, suttassa vā avocchittinayatṭhatāye “In order to subject it to [the naya “reflection”] sāngaha, to subject it to uvaṅga (?), to subject it to nijara (expurgation ?), or [because (otherwise)] the sutta will be produced by me with textual variants (or: in order that the sutta will be considered for alternative interpretations), or in order to subject the sutta to the avocchittinaya.”

Thāna I 3/399 (suttapajjavajāte) and III 4/222 (sutta... pajjavajāte bhavissati) may be compared with the following passages from the Leumann’s Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen: 43.3: evam tassa thovāṁ avadhāriyaṁ bhavai avisuddham ca pajjavahīn, “In this way he will remember very little, and (only) things which are not pure due to alterations” (see Balbir, Āvaśyaka-Studien, p. 425) and 43.8: evam tassa aṁnunnoyaṁ pariyaṭṭhāyaṁ ca bahunā thīravī pajjavasuddham ca bhavai, “In this way that which has been studied and memorized will be much, will stay and be free from alterations” (see Balbir, op.cit., p. 427). In these instances pajja has been taken to refer to alterations of the text. In the Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen 33.48 it has been taken to refer to possible alternative interpretations: jo attaṁ gāheī savvapajjavahīn
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tassa pāse soyavām, “It is with a teacher who explains the sense with all its nuances that one should study” (see Balbir, op.cit., p. 371).

I am unfortunately unable to make sense of the following passages: Śāna I/30: egā dharmapadindā janī se āyā pājjavajāte (cp. Śāna I/29: egā ahampadindā janī se āyā parikilesati); Paññāvagāraṇa 10.7, in a description of food one is to avoid: janī pi uddīṭṭha-thāvīya-rasītage-pājjavajāt-pātikīn-pāukaḷaṇa-pātimiccaṁ; and Ayāra I.1.1.11/409 (4), which lays down rules for accepting food: asaṁ khaḷu padiggaḥyaṁṣi appe paṭcākamme appe pājjavajāte (the same passage is found in 409 (8), but without appe paṭcākamme, cf. Mette, Pīṇḍesāraṇa, p. 208 (sūtra 521): purakamma-paṭcākamme appe asuddhe ya and, for the translation, p. 115.


27. Bollée, Studien zum Śiyagada II, p. 159.


29. Viṭṭhāpanṇatti I, p. 97: ege vi ya ṯām jīve egeṇaṁ samaṇenaṁ egan vede vedei, taṁ jahā — itthivedanā vā purisavedanā vā. For the gods: egeṇaṁ samaṇenaṁ do vede vedei, see p.96.


32. Uttarajjhāyaṇa 32, 102/1336: kohāṁ ca mānam ca taheva māyan lobbam dugumčham arain raṁ ca/hāsam bhayaṁ soga-pumīthiveyam napatīsagaveyam vivihe ya bhāve //


34. For anāile yā akasaṁ bhikkhū, cf. Śiyagada 1.6/359: anāile vā akasaṁ mukke, and I.13/578: anāule yā akasaṁ bhikkhū.


38. Sternbach, Mahā-Subhāṣita-Saṅgrahaḥ, p. 95, no.555.
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