

THE WORD 'OE' IN SOME CANONICAL JAINA TEXTS

Herman Tieken

§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*, Śīlāṅka gives the following paraphrases : "*ojaḥ*" *eko'seṣamalakalaṅkāṅkaraḥitaḥ*¹, "*ojaḥ*" *eko rāgaḍveṣaraḥitaḥ*² (for Śīlāṅka on *oe* in Āyāra I.8.3/209, see below §6), and, again, *rāgaḍveṣaraḥitaḥ*³. 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*⁴.

One of the problems with this interpretation is that, in the texts, beside the so-called adjective *oe*, also occurs a regular adjective *oyamīsī* (*ojasvin*), namely in the Āyāra II.1.4.2/534 : *se bhikkhū vā (...) jahā vegatīyāim rūvāim pāsejjā tahā vi tāim evam vadejja, tam jahā — oyamīsī oyamīsī ti vā teyamīsī teyamīsī ti vā ...*, and in the Samavāya (p. 471, lines 5 ff.) : *jam buddhīve ṇam dīve bhārahe vāse imīse osappiṇṇe nava dasāramamḍalā hotthā, tam jahā — uttamapurisā majjhimapurisā pahāṇapurisā oyamīsī teyamīsī vaccamīsī jasamīsī chāyamīsī kamītā*⁵

The lemma *o(y)a* in the Āgama Śabdakośa⁶, 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 Sūyagaḍa II.3/732, where *oa* denotes the nourishing substance with which the mother feeds the foetus while in her womb : *te jīvā mātuoṇam pitusukkam tam tadubhayam saṁsaṭṭham kalusam kibbisam tappadhamayāe āhāram āhāremī*⁷. Probably, however, we have to do here with a contracted form of *udaka* "water".⁸ See in this connection the Viyāhapaṇṇatti I, p. 53, lines 2 ff. : *jam se mātā nāṇāvīhāo rasavigatīo āhāram āhāreti tadekkadesenaṇam oyam āhāreti*. In the Nāyādhammakahā 1.10.2 we would indeed have to do with the substantive *ojas*, occurring in a description of the moon, which is *dittīe juttīe chāyāe pabhāe oyāe lesāe hīṇe* respectively *ahiye*⁹.

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 Sūyagaḍa I.4.1.11/275 :

*tamhā u vajjae itthī visalittam va kamṭagam ṇaccā
oe kulāṇi vasavattī āghāti ṇa 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 *kulāṇa*¹⁰. According to Alsdorf, this emendation, which is purely conjectural as no variant *kulāṇa* is found, is indeed unavoidable¹¹. 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 *kulāṇa*.

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”¹². 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 nirgrantha¹³.

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 Sūyagaḍa I.4.2.1/278 :

oje sadā ṇa rajjejjā bhogakāmī puṇo virajjejjā
bhoge samaṇāṇa suṇeha jaha bhumjaṃti bhikkhuṇo ege.

It is clear that, instead of *oje* we should, with Śīlāṅka¹⁴, 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 : *taṃ saccam saccavādī oe tiṇṇe chinṇakahamkahe ātitaṭṭhe anātīte*, in which *oe tiṇṇe*, 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 āgatiṃ gatiṃ pariṇṇāya acceti jātimaṇassa vaḍumagaṃ vakkhātarate*
- (2) *savve sarā niyaṭṭamti*
- (3) *takkā jattha ṇa vijjati matī tattha ṇa gāhiyā*
- (4) *oe appaṭiṭṭhāṇassa khettaṇṇe*
- (5) *se ṇa dīhe, ṇa hrasse etc.*

(1) may be translated as follows : “Having fully understood [the causes of] death and rebirth on this earth he leaves the path (? *vaḍumagaṃ*) 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 subjugated 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 *ṇa*, is found in the Sūyagaḍa II.1/649. There, a false doctrine is challenged, which maintains that the soul (*ātā*) 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 Sūyagaḍa I.5.6/176, in its negated form (*ṇa dīhe, ṇa hrasse ...*), it would describe a liberated soul¹⁵. 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 appaṭiṭṭhāṇassa khettaṇṇe* (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 *khettaṇṇe*. “He knows (-*ṇṇe*) the house (*oe*) as the place (*khetta*) of one who is without ground [for salvation] (*appaṭiṭṭhāṇassa*)”,¹⁶ 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 appaṭiṭṭhāṇassa khettaṇṇe*.

§6

The next two instances of *oe* are found in the Āyāra I.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) *ñihāya daṇḍaṃ pāṇehi pāvaṃ kammaṃ akuvvamāṇe esa maham agamthe viyāhite*

(1b) *oe juimassa khet[sic]aṇṇe uvavāyam cayaṇaṃ ca ṇaccā “āhārovacayā dehā parīśahapabhaṃguṇo”*

(2) *pāsahege savvimdaehim parigilāyamāṇehim*

(3a) *oe dayam dayati*

(3b) *je samñidhānasatthassa khettaṇṇe*

(3c) *se bhikkhū kālaṇṇe bālaṇṇe (v.l. balaṇṇe) mātāṇṇe khaṇayaṇṇe vinayaṇṇe samayaṇṇe pariggaham amamāyamāṇe kāleṇuttāyī apaḍiṇṇe duhato chettā ñiyāti.*

(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 khettaṇṇe*, is, however, for various reasons problematic. Following the commentary of Śīlāṅka, who has : “*ojaḥ*” *advitīyo rāgadveśarahitaḥ*, “*dyutimān*” *saṃyamo moksā vā, tasya khedajño nipuṇaḥ*”¹⁷, the phrase may be rendered in the following way : “A strong monk, undaunted by the exhaustion involved in brilliant (selfcontrol, leading to moksā)”.

Regarding the text of this passage, and its interpretation, two points may be noted. The first one concerns the word *khettaṇṇe*. It is almost certain that here, as elsewhere, it is an alternative form of *khettaṇṇe* (*kṣetrajña*). The variation *khetta* - *khetā* is of the same type as *pekkhai* - *pehai* (Skt *prekṣati*). It is not clear if *khetā* beside *khetta* is not merely a matter of spelling. The word *kheyaṇṇe*, occasionally found, seems to be further development of this *khettaṇṇe*. The gloss *khedajña* must have its origin in this *kheyaṇṇe*. Śīlāṅka, however, seems to have been well aware of the various options, as appears from the Āyāra I.2.588 : for *kheyaṇṇe* he has : *khey(d)anne*, *khedaḥ* — *abhyāsaḥ*... *khedajño*, *athavā kṣetrajñaḥ*. Compare the Cūrṇi : *khittam jāṇati khettaṇṇo bhikkhāyariyākusale ... evamādī jāṇati khittanṇo*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 Śīlāṅka 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 *juīma*, means simply “brilliant” : in the

Uttarajjhayaṇa 5.26/155 it qualifies the *vimoha* regions, which are “full of light” (*uttarāim vimohāim juimant[i]*); and in the Sūyagada 1.6.8/359 it describes Indra : “like Śakra, the king of the gods, who is brilliant” (*Sakke va devāhipatī jutīmam*). It seems virtually impossible to make sense of the text with *juimassa* = *dyutimatas*.

In this situation, I venture to suggest an emendation, and to read, instead, *cuimassa*. In the present context *cuimassa*, from **cyutimat-* “one who will die (and be born again)”, would make perfect sense : *oe cuimassa khetanṇe* 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 agrantha, he knows that one who remains attached to the house will fall, knowing birth and dying (*cayaṇam* !), 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 dayam dayati* has a parallel in the Āyāra 1.6.5/196 *oe samitadamśaṇe dayam logassa jānittā*, for which, see below, §9.

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

I think, however, that we should start from the literal meaning of *saṃnidhāṇa*, 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 kālaṇṇe....* In this connection it is to be noted that the same enumeration, namely *kālaṇṇe bālaṇṇe mātaṇṇe* etc., is also found in the Āyāra 1.2.5/88. In the latter case, *kheyaṇṇe* has been included among the items enumerated, between *mātaṇṇe* and *khaṇayaṇṇe*, 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 *saṃñidhāṇasatthassa khettaṇṇe* given just now (§6), *saṃñidhāṇa* would specify *khetta* in *khettaṇṇe*. A similar function has been assigned to *oe* in the phrase *oe appatitthāṇassa/juimassa khet(t)taṇṇe* (§§5 and 6). This assumes that *khetta* in the compound *khettaṇṇe* has fully retained its own meaning, that is, that *khettaṇṇe* 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)taṇṇe* is found side by side with compounds like *kālaṇṇe*, *mātaṇṇe*, etc.²²

For the particular interpretation, with *saṃñidhāṇa* specifying *khetta*, or denoting the place from which the violence originates, I may refer to the phrase *pajjavasatthassa khettaṇṇe* in the Āyāra I.3.1/109, and to the compound *itthivedakhettaṇṇe* in the Sūyagada I.4.1.20/266. A closer look would show that *pajjavajāta* (the case of *itthiveda* is slightly different) denotes or specifies the “place” from which violence originates.

The sentence *je pajjavajātasatthassa khettaṇṇe se asatthassa khettaṇṇe* (Āyāra I.3.1/109) concludes a passage which starts with the exhortation of a monk to be indifferent towards *sadda*, *rūva*, *gaṃdha*, *rasa* and *phāsa*, features which are collectively known as the “accidental conditions” (*pajjava*, Skt *paryaya* 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 *kṣetra*” (*appamatto kāmehim uvarato pāvakammehim vīre ātagutte kheyanaṇṇe*). The last word, *kheyanaṇṇe*, is then further specified : *je pajjavajātasatthassa khettaṇṇe se asatthassa khettaṇṇe*.

For the interpretation of the compound *pajjavajāta* there seem to be basically two possibilities : (1) “the complete collection of the *pajjivas*” (cf. *jāta* in *bhoyanaṇṇa* and *pāṇagajāta* in the Āyāra II 1.1.11/409 (7 and 8 respectively), or (2) “one possessed with the *pajjivas*”, *pajjavajāta* 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., *puḍhavisattha* in the Āyāra I.1.2/17, which latter refers to violence against the earth : *taṃ pariṇṇāya mehāvī neva sayam puḍhavisattham samārambhejjā* “knowing this, a wise man should not himself commit violence against the element earth”. Therefore, *je pajjavajātasatthassa khettaṇṇe* should be translated as : “knowing the violence in one endowed with the *pajjivas* (or : in the whole collection of the *pajjivas*)”, “he who knows that violence is inherent in the possession of the *pajjivas*, also knows the absence of violence, which is in the absence of the *pajjivas*”²⁴.

The second example, *itthivedakhettaṇṇe* is found in the Sūyagada I.4.1.20/266 :

*usiyā vi itthiposesu purisā itthivedakhettaṇṇe
paṇṇāsamanitā vege narīṇa vasam uvakasanti.*

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*²⁵. Bollée, who seems to be the most recent scholar to discuss the term, follows the commentaries, which gloss it with Skt *strī-veda*. Unfortunately, Bollée does not specify which word *veda* is actually intended here. He does quote a passage from the *Cūrṇi* according to which *veda* would mean “knowledge” : *striyo yena vā vedyante sa strīvedo bhavati*²⁶, but this interpretation has been presented as an alternative. According to Bollée *itthiveya/-veda* in the present verse means “the female sex”,²⁷ as it would elsewhere in the canon. In this connection he refers to *Viyāhapaṇṇatti* 2.5.1 : *ege (...) jīve (...) egaṃ veyam veei taṃ jahā itthiveyam vā purisaveyam*²⁸ (the JĀS-edition reads throughout *veda*)²⁹, to *Viyāhapaṇṇatti* 19.9.8, in which is found the expression *itthiveyakaraṇa* : “having sex with a woman”³⁰, and to the expression *avagayaveya*, quoted from Schubring, meaning “free from thoughts about sex”³¹. 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 *veya* would represent *vega* “excitement”, which word actually occurs in the second line of the verse under consideration. *Viyāhapaṇṇatti* 2.5.1 should accordingly be translated with : “A being normally feels but one kind of excitement (*veyam veei*), 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 *Uttarajjhayaṇa* 32.102, in which *pum-*, *itthi-* and *napuṃsaveya* are found side by side with the emotions (*thāvas*) *koha*, *māṇa*, *māyā*, *lobha*, *dugumchā*, *araī*, *raī*, *hāsa*, *bhaya*, and *soga*³².

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

Itthiveyakhetanṇe, thus, seems to follow the pattern of *pajjavajātasatthassa khetanṇe*, in that the women (*itthi*) 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 *itthiposesu*. *Posa* has been generally equated with Skt *poṣa* “nourishing”, which, however, has led to all kinds of *ad hoc* translations for *usiyā*. To quote Alsdorf : “Even men who have had experience of supporting women”.³³ This is indeed a strange translation for *usiyā*, the past participle of *vas-* “to live with”. As far as I see, *itthiposa* corresponds to Skt *strī-puṃs(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 *khettaṇṇe* are, for different reasons, problematic. The first is the Āyāra I.1.4/32 : *je logaṃ abbhāikkhati se attāṇaṃ abbhāikkhati* (...) *je dīhalogasatthassa khettaṇṇe se asatthassa khettaṇṇe*, “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” (*dīhaloga*) here.

As to *khettaṇṇe* in the Āyāra I.2.6/104, the problem is linked to that of the meaning of the otherwise rare word *aṇugghātana* : *se medhāvī je aṇugghātanaṃ khettaṇṇe je ya baṃdhapamokkham aṇṇesī*. The context suggests that we mentally supply a word for “bondage” to *aṇugghātanaṃ khettaṇṇe*. “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 instance 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 :

hāsaṃ pi ṇo saṃdhaye pāvadhamme oe tahiyaṃ pharusāṃ viyāṇe
ṇo tucchae ṇo va vikaṃthatijjā aṇāile yā akasāyi 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 *kaṣāyas*³⁴.

§9

The final instance to be discussed is the Āyāra I.6.5/196 : ... *jaṇavayaṃtaresu vā saṃt’egatiyā jaṇā lūsagā bhavaṃti aduvā phāsā phusaṃti. te phāse puṭṭho dhīro adhiyāsae. oe samitadamśaṇe dayam logassa jāṇittā* (...) *āikkhe vibhae kiṭṭe vedavī*. In the JĀS-edition the phrase *oe samitadamśaṇe* 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 samitadamśaṇe* is instead to be taken with the sentence that follows. The phrase *oe samitadamśaṇe* is to be compared with *phāse phāse samitadamśaṇe*, “endowed with complete knowledge of the various afflictions”, occurring in the Āyāra I.6.2/185. Conformingly, *oe samitadamśaṇe* 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]”.

As already indicated, the phrase *oe samitadamśane dayam logassa jāṇittā* may be compared with *oe dayam 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 *ojas* "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 kulāṇi* 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 Jaina 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 *aṇukkasāin* "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 *kulāṇi* in the Sūyagaḍa I.4.1.11/257 into *kulāṇa*, may after all 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 *itthiveda*, 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 :

savvappagam viukkassam savvam nūmam vihuṇiyā
appattiyam akammamse eyam attham mige cue.

This verse is generally taken to refer to the four *kaṣāyas* : *savvappagam* would stand for *lobha*, *viukkassam* for *māna*, *nūmam* for *māyā* and *appattiyam* for *krodha*. This identification of these words with the four *kaṣāyas* stands completely on its own, and

clearly represents an *ad hoc* solution. As earlier argued by me, the original text must have read *savvappagam̃ pi ukkassam̃* (*sarvālpakam̃ api utkarṣan*) and *akammāse* (*akalmāsaḥ*) :

Pulling out a thing (*ukkassam̃*), however small it is (*savvappagam̃ pi*), one should remove (*viḥuṇiyā*) everything which is lying deep (or : is hidden; *ñūmam̃*). Not believing (this to be necessary; *appattiyam̃*, 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 *Sūyagaḍa* I.1.1.5/5. I quote the passage together with the second line of the preceding verse :

mamātī luppatī bāle annamannehim̃ mucchie (4cd)
vittam̃ soyariyā ceva savvam̃ etam̃ na tāṇae
sam̃khāe jīviyam̃ ceva kammunā u tiuṭṭai (5).

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. *Sūyagaḍa* I.9.5/441 : *mātā pitā ṇhusā bhāyā bhajjā puttā ya orasā/ṇālam̃ te tava tāṇae luppatissa sakammunā //*, *ibidem* I.2.3.16/158 : *vittam̃ pasavo ya ṇātayo tam̃ bāle saraṇam̃ ti maṇṇatī Vete mama tesu vī aham̃ no tāṇam̃ saraṇam̃ ca vijjai //*, and *ibidem* I.13.11/567a : *ṇa tassa jātī va kulam̃ va tāṇam̃*. 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 strījano nṛpatī tathā/ete vittam̃ na jānanti jāmātā caiva pañcamah̃ //*³⁸. On the basis of this parallel it is tempting to “emend” the phrase *ṇa tāṇae* into *ṇa 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 (*soyariyā*), all this he does not acknowledge. But only by (acting with) deliberation (*sam̃khāe*) (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 *Sūyagaḍa* 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 manuscripts³⁹. 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 (LSJĀ), p. 154.
2. Āyāra (LSJĀ), p. 183.
3. Sūyagada (LSJĀ), p. 166.
4. Alsdorf, "Itthiparinnā", p. 263.
5. See also Samavāya, p. 478, lines 2 ff. and Viyāhapaṇṇatti I, p. 101, line 6.
6. Āgama Śabdakośa, p. 289.
7. Also in Thāṇa 3.3.185 and 4.4.377, and in Viyāhapaṇṇatti I, p. 52, line 19.
8. For Pāli *oka* from *udaka*, see CPD II, p. 681 s.v. *oka*
9. Paṇhāvagaraṇa (Ladnun-edition), p. 221 and p. 222 respectively.
10. Schubring, *Worte Mahāvīras*, p. 146, note 1.
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 CPD 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.l. *āghāte*) from *ākhyā-* and its translation with "he is called".
14. As quoted in the JĀS-edition : *oe ityādi*.
15. Bollée, *Studien zum Sūyagada I*, p. 145.
16. Or : "he knows the house/worldliness as the reason for the being without ground [for salvation]". For *appatitthāna* "the being without ground [for salvation]", beside "one being without ground [for salvation]", *AiGr.* II,1, pp. 304-305.
17. Āyāra (LSJĀ), p. 183.
18. As quoted in the Āyāra (JĀS-edition).
19. Schubring, *Worte Mahāvīras*, p. 108, note 3.
20. See also the sentence *je pajjivasatthassa khetanṇe se asatthassa khetanṇe*, discussed below in §7.
21. The same enumeration is found in the Āyāra 1.2.5/88.
22. For *khe(t)tanṇe* in a different enumeration, see Sūyagada II.1/639 : *aham amsi purise khettanṇe kusale paṇḍite viyatte medhāvī abāle maggatthe maggavid maggassa*

gatiparakkamaṇṇū (Cūrṇi, as quoted in the JĀS-edition : *aham asmi puruṣaḥ deśakālaññaḥ kṣetrajñāḥ, deśo yena yathā'vatīryate, kālo divaso, kuśalo dakṣaḥ (...) paṇḍitaḥ upāyajñāḥ...*, as if the text read *desakālaṇṇe khettaṇṇe*) (see also *ibidem* 640, 641 and 643); and *Sūyagaḍa* II.1/680 : *esa dhamme dhuve ṇitīe sāsate samecca logaṃ khettaṇṇehiṃ pavedite*. In this last instances the compound seems to have been used as a general term. However, note that in the *Āyāra* I.3.2/109 *kheyaṇṇe* in *appamatto kāmehiṃ uvarato pāvakammehiṃ vīre ātagutte kheyaṇṇe*, is further specified in the sentence which follows : *je pajjavajātasatthassa khettaṇṇe* (see furtheron). Furthermore, *Sūyagaḍa* I.15.13/619 : *aṇelisassa khettaṇṇe ṇa virujjhejja 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.”

23. *AiGr* II, 1, pp. 302-303.

24. The compound *pajjavajāta* is found in several other places, but the meaning “accidental conditions” for *pajjava* in this compound seems to be restricted to the instance discussed just now. Of all the other instances the one in the *Ṭhāṇa* I.3/399 comes closest to this one in that *jāta* seems to mean “the whole collection of” there as well : *āyāriya-uvajjhāyassa ṇaṃ gaṇaṃsi paṃca vuggahaṭṭhāṇā pannattā, taṃ jahā (...) āyāriya-uvajjhāye ṇaṃ gaṇaṃsi je suttapajjavajāte dhāreti te kāle kāle no sammam aṇuppavātettā bhavati* (also in the *Ṭhāṇa* I.3/400, V.2/439 and VII 544). “There are five situations in which one may discontinue the teachings of the *āyāriya-uvajjhāya* in the *gaṇa*, 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 *Ṭhāṇa* III.4/222, however, *jāta* in *pajjavajāta* seems to have its full participial meaning : *bālamaraṇe tīvhe pannatte, taṃ jahā ṭhitalessa saṃkiliṭṭhalessa pajjavajātalessa* “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 *Ṭhāṇa* V.3/467, in which are enumerated five reasons for reciting the sutta : *saṃgahaṭṭhayāte, uvaggahaṭṭhatāte, nijjaratṭhayāte, sute vā me pajjavajāte bhavissati, suttaṃ vā avvocchittinayattṭhayāte* “In order to subject it to [the *naya* “reflection”] *saṃgaha*, to subject it to *uvaggaha* (?), to subject it to *nijjara* (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 *avvocchitti-naya*.”

Ṭhāṇa I 3/399 (*suttapajjavajāte*) and III 4/222 (*sutte... pajjavajāte bhavissati*) may be compared with the following passages from the Leumann's *Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen* : 43.3 : *evaṃ tassa thovaṃ avadhāriyaṃ bhavai aṇisuddhaṃ ca pajjavehiṃ*, “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 : *evaṃ tassa aṇunnāyaṃ pariyattiyam ca bahuṃ thiraṃ pajjava-suddhaṃ 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 *pajjava* 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 atthaṃ gāheṃ savva-pajjavehiṃ*

tassa pāse soyavvaṃ, "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 : Thāṇa I/30 : *egā dhammapaḍḍimā jaṃ se āyā pajjavajāte* (cp. Thāṇa I/29 : *egā ahammapaḍḍimā jaṃ se āyā parikilesati*); Paṇhāvagaṇa 10.7, in a description of food one is to avoid : *jaṃ pi uddiṭṭha-ṭhaviya-racitaga-pajjavajāta-pakiṇṇa-pāukaraṇa-pāmiccam*; and Āyāra II.1.1.11/409 (4), which lays down rules for accepting food : *assim khalu paḍiggāhiyaṃsi appe pacchākamme appe pajjavajāte* (the same passage is found in 409 (8), but without *appe pacchākamme*, cf. Mette, *Piṇḍ'esaṇā*, p. 208 (sūtra 521) : *purakamma-pacchakamme appe asuddhe ya* and, for the translation, p. 115.

25. See Alsdorf, "Itthiparinna", p. 254, and Bollée, *Studien zum Sūyagada II*, p. 22.
26. Bollée, *Studien zum Sūyagada II*, p. 159.
27. Bollée, *Studien zum Sūyagada II*, p. 159.
28. Bollée, *Studien zum Sūyagada II*, p. 159, note 53.
29. *Viyāhapaṇṇatti I*, p. 97 : *ege vi ya ṇaṃ jīve egeṇaṃ samaeṇaṃ egaṃ vede vedei, taṃ jahā — itthivedaṃ vā purisavedaṃ vā*. For the gods : *egeṇaṃ samaeṇaṃ do vede vedei*, see p.96.
30. *Viyāhapaṇṇatti II*, p. 851 : *vedakaraṇe tivihe pannatte, taṃ jahā — itthivedakaraṇe purisaveyakaraṇe napuṃsagaveyakaraṇe*.
31. Bollée, *Studien zum Sūyagada II*, p. 159, note 53, where he refers to Schubring, *Die Lehre der Jainas*, p. 114.
32. *Uttarajjhayaṇa 32*, 102/1336 : *kohaṃ ca māṇaṃ ca taheva māyaṃ lobhaṃ dugumchaṃ araṇiṃ raṇiṃ ca/hāsaṃ bhayaṃ sogapumitthiveyaṃ napuṃsaveyaṃ vivihe ya bhāve //*
33. Alsdorf, "Itthiparinna", p. 259.
34. For *aṇāile yā akasāyī bhikkhū*, cf. *Sūyagada I.6/359* : *aṇāile vā akasāyī mukke*, and *I.13/578* : *aṇāule yā akasāyī bhikkhū*.
35. Norman, "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies III", pp. 322-327.
36. Caillat, "Notes sur les variantes dans la tradition du Dasaveyāliya-Sutta", pp. 71-83.
37. Tieken, "Textual Problems in an Early Canonical Jaina Text", pp. 5-25.
38. Sternbach, *Mahā-Subhāṣita-Saṃgrahaḥ*, p. 95, no.555.
39. Alsdorf, "Uttarajjhāyā Studies", pp. 133-134.

Abbreviations and Bibliography

AiGr.II,1

J. Wackernagel and A. Debrunner, *Altindische Grammatik II, 1, Einleitung zur Wortlehre. Nominalkomposita. Nachträge*, Göttingen 1957.

Āgama Śabdakośa

Eds. Ācārya Tulasī and Yuvācārya Mahāprajña, *Āgama Śabdakośa (Word-index of Aṅgasuttāṇi)* Vol. I, Jain Viśwa Bhāratī, Ladnun 1980.

Alsdorf (1958)

L. Alsdorf, "Itthiparinā. A Chapter of Jaina Monastic Poetry, edited as a Contribution to Indian Prosody", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 2, 249-270 (= *Kleine Schriften*, ed. A. Wezler, Wiesbaden 1974, 193-214).

Alsdorf (1962)

L. Alsdorf, "Uttarajjhāyā Studies", *Indo-Iranian Journal* 6, 110-136 (= *Kleine Schriften*, 225-251).

Āyāra

Ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, *Āyāraṅga-suttam [Ācārāṅgasūtram]*, Jaina Āgama-Series No.2 (1), Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay 1976.

Āyāra (LSJĀ)

Eds. Ācārya Sāgarānandasūrijī Mahārāja and Muni Jambūvijayajī, *Ācārāṅgasūtram and Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtram with the Nirukti of Ācārya Bhadrabāhu Svāmī and the commentary of Śīlāṅkācārya*, Lālā Sundarlāl Jaina Āgamagranthamālā Vol. I. Delhi 1978.

Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen

Ed. E. Leumann, *Die Āvaśyaka-Erzählungen*, Abhandlungen für die Kunde des Morgenlandes X 2, Leipzig 1897.

Balbir (1993)

N. Balbir, *Āvaśyaka-Studien. Introduction générale et Traductions*, Alte- und Neu-Indische Studien 45, 1, Stuttgart.

Bollée(1977)

W.B. Bollée, *Studien zum Sūyagaḍa I. Die Jainas und die anderen Weltanschauungen vor der Zeitwende. Textteile, Nijjutti, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Schriftenreihe der Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg 24, Wiesbaden.

Bollée (1988)

W.B. Bollée, *Studien zum Sūyagaḍa II. Textteile, Nijjutti, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen*, Schriftenreihe der Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg 31, Wiesbaden.

Caillat (1981)

C. Caillat, "Notes sur les variantes dans la tradition du Dasaveyāliya-Sutta", *Dr. Ludwig Sternbach Commemoration Volume, Indologica Taurinensia* VII-IX, 71-83.

CPD —

Eds. V. Trenckner et al., *A Critical Pāli Dictionary*, Copenhagen 1924ff.

Mette (1974)

A. Mette, *Piṇḍ'esaṇā. Das Kapitell der Oha-nijjuttī über den Bettelgang übersetzt und kommentiert*, Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur, Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse 1973, nr. 11, Wiesbaden.

Nāyādhammakahā

Eds. Ācārya Tulasī and Muni Nathamal, *Aṃga Suttāni III*, Jain Viśva Bhārati, Ladnun 1973.

Norman (1962)

K. R. Norman, "Middle Indo-Aryan Studies III", *Journal of the Oriental Institute Baroda* XI, 322-27 (*Collected Papers* Vol. I, Oxford 1990, 30-35).

Paṇhāvagarāṇa

see Nāyādhammakahā.

Samavāya

Ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, *Thāṇaṃgasuttam* and *Samavāyaṃgasuttam* [*Sthānāṃgasūtram* and *Samavāyāṃgasūtram*], *Jaina-Āgama-Series* No.3, Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay 1985.

Schubring (1927)

W. Schubring, *Worte Mahāvīras. Kritische Übersetzungen aus dem Kanon der Jaina, Quellen der Religionsgeschichte*, Göttingen.

Schubring (1935)

W. Schubring, *Die Lehre der Jainas nach den alten Quellen dargestellt*, Grundriss der Indo-Arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde III 7, Berlin.

Sternbach (1974)

L. Sternbach, *Mahā-Subhāṣita-saṃgrahaḥ* (*Anthology of delightful verses*). *Sanskrit Text with English Translation, Critical Notes, Introduction and Index*. Vol.I, Delhi

Sūyagaḍa

Ed. Muni Jambūvijaya, *Sūyagaḍaṃgasuttam* [*Sūtrakṛtāṃgasūtram*], *Jaina-Āgama-Series* No.2 (2I), Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay 1978.

Sūyagaḍa (LSJĀ)

see Āyāra (LSJĀ).

Ṭhāṇa

see Samavāya.

Tieken (1986)

H. Tieken, "Textual Problems in an Early Canonical Jain Text", *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde Südasiens* XXX, 5-25.

Uttarajjhayaṇa

Eds. Muni Shri Puṇyavijayaji and Amritālāl Mohanlāl Bhojak, *Dasaveyāliyasuttam, Uttarajjhayaṇam and Āvassayasuttam*, Jaina-Āgama-Series No. 15, Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay 1977.

Viyāhapannatti

Eds. Pt. Bechardas J. Doshi [and Pt. Amritlāl Mohanlāl Bhojak], *Viyāhapannattisuttam I-III*, Jaina-Āgama-Series No.4 (1-3), Shri Mahāvīra Jaina Vidyālaya, Bombay 1974-1982.
