

ADDA OR THE OLDEST EXTANT DISPUTE BETWEEN
JAINS AND HERETICS (SŪYAGADA 2, 6)
PART TWO¹

After shaking off² Gosāla, Adda on his way to Mahāvīra is met by some Buddhist monks³ who explain to him, in an exaggerated and ridiculed way, as is easily done in such cases, their view that the intention prevails over the act,⁴ with meat consumption as an example.⁵

2, 6, 26

piṇṇāga-piṇḍī-m-avi viddhā sūle
keī paejjā “purise ime” tti
alāuyam vāvi “kumārae” tti
sa lippaī pāṇi-vahēṇa amham

a: Cū: *viddhum*; J: *viddhu*; – b: T: *kei*, – c: Cū: *kumārao*; L: *kumāraga*;
– d: J: *pāṇa-vahēṇa*

IF SOMEONE PUTS A BALL OF OILCAKE ON A SPIT
AND ROASTS IT WITH THE IDEA: THIS IS A MAN, OR A
GOURD, THINKING IT TO BE A BABY, HE BECOMES FOR
US SOILED/SOILS HIMSELF FOR US WITH KILLING A LIVING
BEING.

d: cf. 27d

Pinṇāga-piṇḍī etc.: ‘If (a savage) thrusts a spit through the side of a granary, mistaking it for a man (...)’. Thus Jacobi who, conscious of the seemingly strange notion, dedicates to it a note⁶ in which he also paraphrases the commentators.⁷ One can object that if the granaries were made of (wattle and) mud it would be hardly possible for a part of it to be taken hold of with a spit. Jacobi here refers to 19th cent. granaries in Bihār of which, however, Grierson does not mention a beehive-shaped form. There have been found granaries dating from the Kuṣāṇa era, some of which are still in use in Surkh Kotal and

Ai Khanum. As in ancient Crete, they are $\pi\acute{\iota}\vartheta\omicron\varsigma$ -like storage vessels (pottery) in the shape of an egg 1.50 m high and 0.5 m in diameter.⁸ This type may show Hellenistic influence, but to spear a part of it would be even more difficult.⁹ Vessels of this kind are called *kusūla* in Sa. and Pkt. and one wonders why Jacobi did not give *piṇyāka* its normal meaning, all the more because *khala* is, besides an oil-cake, a threshing floor,¹⁰ not a storage vessel. Moreover, Grierson (l.c. §263) mentions a combination of both words in their modern form as denoting ‘oil-cake of poppy seeds’. One can imagine a part of an oil-cake on a spit, because it was edible, though Dalhaṇa ad Suśruta 46.382 describes its use as a dry vegetable (*piṇyāka-vikṛti*).¹¹ Schlingloff¹² rendered *piṇyāka* by ‘Kuchen’ (cake). – For the lengthening of the final syllable in – *piṇḍī* before *avi* see Pi §68 (end).

Alāuyam besides *alābuyam*: see Pi §201. Ṭ II 148a ll glosses as *tumbakam* which otherwise occurs only with lexicographers.

2, 6, 27

ahavâvi viddhūṇa milakkhu sūle
piṇṇāga-buddhīe naram paejjā
kumāragam vâvi alābuyam ti
na lippai pāṇi-vahēṇa amham

b: T: *buddhū*, V: *buddhīha*; – c: LJ: *alāue*; – d: T: *lippai*; J: *pāṇa*-^o

ON THE OTHER HAND, HOWEVER, IF A NON-ARYAN PUTS A MAN ON A SPIT AND ROASTS HIM, TAKING HIM FOR AN OIL-CAKE, OR DOES THE SAME TO A CHILD HE THINKS IS A GOURD, IN OUR OPINION HE IS NOT SOILED WITH KILLING A LIVING BEING.

2, 6, 28

purisam ca viddhūṇa kumāragam vā
sūlammi keī pae jāya-tee
piṇṇāga-piṇḍam sai-m-āruhetṭā
buddhāṇa tam kappai pāraṇāe

a: J: *veddhūṇa*; – c: L: *piṇḍim*; J: *piṇḍī*; TJ: *piṇṇāya*

IF (*ca*) SOMEONE PUTS A MAN OR A CHILD ON A SPIT AND ROASTS IT ON A FIRE TAKING IT FOR A LUMP OF OIL-CAKE, IT WOULD BE FIT FOR BUDDHISTS TO END THEIR VOW OF FASTING WITH.

Jāya-teye: also e.g. at Dasav 6, 33; Utt 12, 26 (see Charpentier) and Sam 50, but Sa. *jāta-vedas* and Pā. (Ja IV 383, 2*) *jāta-veda*. The entry *jāya-veya* in PSM for Utt 22 must be an error, but can *jāya-teya* be an ancient scribal error for *jāya-veya*?

Pinṇāga-piṇḍaṃ etc.: *jai koi a-jāṇanto purisaṃ (. . .) gilāṇa-bhikkhussa chinna-bhattassa dub-bhikkhâdisu jāya-tee paituṃ piṇḍīyaṃ iti “paolitaṃ”¹³ sugandhaṃ suhaṃ khāissaṃ*¹⁴ *ti satī buddhiḥ tasyāṃ kalpati* (Cū 429, 4ff.) – thus *satī* is probably equal to *smṛti*, whereas T II 148b 2 explains *satīm* as *śobhanām*.

Now the semantic group of *smṛti* centers on reminiscence, calling to mind (MW), also in Middle-Indo-aryan, but what is expected here is view, opinion which already induced Jambūvijaya to think of a slip of the pen for *matim*.¹⁵ The other difficulty in this line is *āruhetā*, which could barely be constructed with *maiṃ*, but not with *saiṃ*, for the meaning ‘to mount, get on’ given in PSM and AED (as in PED and CPD) is too narrow for Ardhamāgadhī as is also shown, e.g., at Viy 2, 1 sū. 50 etc., where the question is of the five great vows someone takes upon him.¹⁶ At Utt 17, 7 Jacobi translates *pāya-kambalam* (. . .) *āruhai* as ‘uses his duster.’ This meaning would approximately fit here: holding the belief/ conviction (*mai*) that it is a lump of oil-cake.

Buddhāṇa: ‘for Buddhas’ (Jac.); *nityam ātmani guruṣu ca bahu-vacanam, Buddhassa vi tāva kappati kim uta ye tac-chiṣyāḥ?* (Cū 429, 6). I have adopted Jīnadāsa’s alternative, Sa. *Bauddhānām*, because there was no longer a living Buddha.

Pāraṇāe: the author/redactor of Sūy 2, 6 here presupposes Buddhists to practice a similar fast scheme as the Jainas.

2, 6, 29

*siṇāyagāṇaṃ tu duve sahasse
je bhoyae niyae bhikkhuyāṇaṃ
te puṇṇa-khandhaṃ su-mahaṃ jīṇittā
bhavanti Āroppa mahanta sattā*

b: L: *nitie*; J: *nitie bhikkhugāṇaṃ*; – c: L: *sumah'-ajjanittā*; J: *sumah'-ajjinittā*

BUT THOSE WHO ALWAYS FEED TWO THOUSAND STAINLESS MONKS WILL GAIN A VERY GREAT DEAL OF MERIT AND BECOME GREAT BEINGS IN THE HEAVEN OF FORMLESSNESS

ab = 36 ab = 43 ab

Siṇāyaga corresponding to Sa. *snātaka*, Pā. *nahātaka* 'having washed off all evils' (Norman 1992: 57), cf. Sn 521:

ninhāyā sabba-pāpakāni
ajjhataṃ bahi[d]dhā ca sabba-loke
deva-manussesu kappiyesu
*kappaṃ n'eti, tam āhu: "n[h]ātako" ti*¹⁷

For Jains the *siṇāya*, 'absolved' is identical with *kevalin*,¹⁸ cf. T II 150b 11 *snātakānāṃ bodhisattva-kalpānāṃ bhiksūṇāṃ*.

Duve s.: 2000 is a rare number in Buddhist sources: Th 1024 mentions 2000 *dhammā* ('teachings') which the monk Ānanda obtained from other monks. At Pj I 133,8 four *mahā-dīpā* face 2000 minor islands, which may with PED (s.v. *dvi* A I b) just stand for a large number like the 4000 *sāmānika* gods in Rāy 15f. In this context Mbh 7, 87, 60c still speaks of a modest one thousand *snātakas* whom Sātyaki presented with gold *niṣkas*.

Je bhoyae: Cū 429,9 states as an example his (?) Ānanda who fed 2000 monks with their favourite meal of meat, molasses and pomegranates.¹⁹ The name Ānanda may be a reminiscence of Gotama's congenite and long-standing personal attendant and the food offered consists only of dishes forbidden to Jain monks – the last item no doubt because of the many seeds.

Niyae: perhaps we should read *niyayaṃ* ~ Sa. *nityam* for one cannot take it as ~ Sa. *niyato* because of the plural *je*.

Punṇa-khandhaṃ: cf. Pā *mahā-puṇṇa-kkhandha* at SN V 400,17 also in a watery context (*puṇṇābhisanda* etc.) and eulogy of open-handedness towards the Sangha but without the *snātaka*-image.

Āroppa: not in PSM. Pā. *Āruppa* 'the highest heaven of the Buddhists' (Jac.).

(Ādraka speaks:)

2, 6, 30

*a-joga-rūvaṃ iha saṃjayāṇaṃ
pāvaṃ tu pāṇāṇa pasajjha kāuṃ
a-bohie doṇha vi taṃ a-sāhu
vayanti je vāvi paḍissuṇanti*

AS TO THIS (YOUR DENIAL OF GUILT, OUR) RECLUSES CONSIDER IT ABSOLUTELY IMPROPER TO USE FORCE ON LIVING BEINGS AND THUS HARM THEM. THOUGH THOSE WHO TEACH IT AS WELL AS THOSE WHO HEAR IT MAY NOT KNOW (doing harm) IS BAD FOR BOTH.

A-joga-rūvaṃ etc.: ‘well-controlled men cannot accept (your denial of) guilt incurred by (unintentional) doing harm to living beings’ (Jac.). *A-joga*^o is explained as *a-ghaṭamānakam* (T II 149a 9), *-rūva* ifc. is used after an adj. to emphasize its meaning or almost redundantly (MW). Because of the position of *pasajjha* in line b I have abstained from combining it with the negation of *a-joga*^o. In Sa. *na pasahya* signifies ‘by no means’. I have no translation for *tu*, nor did Jacobi apparently. *A-bohie*: ‘it will cause error’ (Jac.).

2, 6, 31

*uddham ahe yaṃ tiriyaṃ disāsu
vinnāya lingaṃ tasa-thāvarāṇaṃ
bhūyābhisankāḥ dugunchamāṇe
vae karejjā va; kuo v’ ih’/vih’ atthi*

a: L: *ya*; – c: TV – *saṃkāi*; – d: L: *vā*; omnes: *vih’ atthi*

ONE MAY SPEAK OR ACT (only) IF ONE KNOWS THE NATURE OF MOVABLE AND IMMOVABLE BEINGS ABOVE, BELOW AND HORIZONTALLY (i.e. on the earth) IN THE DIRECTIONS, AND ABHORS ENDANGERING LIVING BEINGS. (Only) IN THIS CASE IT IS POSSIBLE SOMEHOW (?) / (Otherwise,) WHY ARE THERE PRECEPTS?

a = 14a = 1, 5, 11c = 1, 10, 2a = 1, 14, 14a; – c: = 1, 14, 20a, cf. 2, 6, 14c = 1, 12, 17b

Bhūyâbhisankāē: cf. *bhūyâbhisankaṇa* at *Thā* 7 sū. 585 = *Viy* 25, 7 sū. 227 (ed. Doshi 1978).

Iha: *pravacane* (Cū 431, 10), *asminn evaṃ-bhūte 'nuṣṭhāne* (Ṭ II 149b 8).

Atthi: as a subject Cū (l.c.) supplies *aṇṇāṇeṇa doso n' atthi kuta etad brūmo māyā ca kucakucā (?) vā pravacane 'sti*, Ṭ (l.c.) *asmat-pakṣe yuṣmad-āpādito doṣaḥ*. Jacobi renders the second part of the *pāda* d as: “he will not be guilty of any (sin)”, which would rather fit as a translation of 1, 3, 4, 10 d. – My alternative version presupposes elision of the last -i of *vihi* which, however, is no problem.²⁰

2, 6, 32

purise tti vinnatti na evam atthi
aṇ-ārie se purise tahāhu
ko saṃbhavo piṇṇāga-piṇḍiyāe?
vāyāvi esā buiyā a-saccā

b: VTLJ: *tahā hu*; – J: *vāyā vi esā vuiyā*

THAT IS A MAN – SUCH AN IDEA IS NOT POSSIBLE. IF A MAN SPEAKS THUS HE IS WRONG (?). WHAT DOES A LUMP OF OIL-CAKE OUTWARDLY HAVE IN COMMON (with a man)? EVEN THE VERBAL EXPRESSION HEREOF IS WRONG.

Purise (...) *atthi*: cf. Jacobi 1886: 66,9 where Maṇḍiya cleft a *linga* of Śiva taking it for a man (Mūladeva).

Aṇ-ārie etc.: the second line “only an unworthy man can say it” (Jac.) presents some problems: the meaning of the first two words and the form of the latter two. *Aṇ-āriya* is not a synonym of *a-sacca*. *Se* can correspond, inter alia, to Sa. *sa*, *tad* and *saced*. The commentaries differ about the end of the line: *se puriso bhaṇṇati* (Cū 431,12), *tasmād ya evaṃ vakti*, so *'tyantaṃ tathābhyupagamena hu-śabdasyâiva-kārârthatvena an-ārya evâsau yaḥ puruṣam eva khalo 'yam iti matvā hate 'pi nâsti doṣaḥ* (...; Ṭ II 149b 10f.). I have followed Cū because otherwise the line has no verb, though this does occur now and then, e.g. here in vs. 42 and 55.

2, 6, 33

vāyābhi(y)ogeṇa jam āvahejjā
no tārisaṃ vāyaṃ udāharejjā
a-ṭṭhāṇaṃ eyaṃ vayaṇaṃ guṇāṇaṃ
no dikkhie būyā sūrālam eyaṃ

a: J: *jayā vahejjā*; – b: C: *ṇa*; T: *°harijjā*; – J: *je dikkhite*; omnes: *surālam*; Cū: *sūrālam*

IF ONE MIGHT BRING ABOUT SOMETHING (bad) BY MEANS OF WORDS, DO NOT UTTER SUCH WORDS. SPEECH OF THIS KIND IS INCOMPATIBLE WITH VIRTUES. AN ORDAINED RECLUSE SHOULD NOT USE SUCH IGNORANT LANGUAGE.

Guṇāṇaṃ: *a-himsakādīnāṃ* (Cū 432, 9).

Sūrālam: as the 7th syllable is anceps, it is surprising that no edition prints the contracted *ū* though both commentaries have recognized the cpd of *su* + *udāra*, which is paraphrased as *sthūlam* (Cū 432,11) or *suṣṭhu paristhūraṃ niḥsāraṃ nirupapattikaṃ* (*vacanam*, T II 150a 2). For this negative meaning of *udāra* cf. Āyār 1, 9, 1, 10 commented as *duṣpradhṛṣya duḥkha* by Śīlāṅka (T I 275b 2).

2, 6, 34

laddhe aṭṭhe aho eva tubbhe
jīvāṇubhāge su-vicintie va
puvvaṃ samuddaṃ avaraṃ ca puṭṭhe
oloie pāṇi-tale ṭhie vā

a: LJ: *laddhe ah' aṭṭhe*; – b: LJ: *ya*; – d: T: *uloie*; – L: *pāṇitalaṭṭhie*

YOU HAVE REALLY CAUGHT THE MEANING, THOUGHT OVER THE CONSEQUENCES FOR THE SOULS CAREFULLY (and) REACHED THE EASTERN AND WESTERN OCEAN, SEEN IT AS IF LYING ON THE PALM OF YOUR HAND.

a: is a śloka-pāda + *tubbhe*; therefore only ten syllables; – c: cf. Thī 500 *pubba-samudde aparato ca* and RV 10, 136, 5

2, 6, 35

*jivâṇubhāgaṃ su-vicintayantā
 āhāriyā anna-vihīṭe sohiṃ
 na viyāgare channa-paôvajīvī
 eso 'nudhammo iha saṃjayāṇaṃ*

a: C: *jivâṇubhāge*; – b: C: *odhāriyā*; T: *vihīya*; J: *sohī*; – c: *omnes: paopajīvi*

THINKING OVER CAREFULLY THE CONSEQUENCES OF ACTS FOR THE LIVING BEINGS ONE SHOULD PRESERVE PURITY REGARDING THE USE OF FOOD. NO ONE SHOULD GIVE EXPLANATIONS (of the Doctrine) WHO MAKES USE OF UNCLEAR WORDS (?). THIS IS THE RIGHT PRACTICE FOR OUR RECLUSES IN ACCORDANCE WITH OUR FAITH.

The Cūrṇi of 2, 6, 34f. has become mixed up it seems. Yet perhaps the canonical text had already been corrupted. Therefore I have dealt with the two stanzas together here and I have tried to get along without the additions Jacobi took from the *īkā* which make the text look more intelligible than it actually is.

(2, 6, 34) (*Ah'*): with this particle J fills the lacuna of one mora on the authority of the Cūrṇi reading *tadh'* which however, is not found in our C. *Aho dainya-vismayādisu. Dainyaṃ tāvat jahā koyi kaṃci dimūḍhaṃ (?) uppahena adantaṃ daṭṭhaṃ bhaṇati. Aho ayam evaṃ varāo kilīṭṭho kilissati. Evaṃ tubbhe ummagga-paḍivannā mohaṃ kilissaha. Sāsūyēti vismaye. Ayam śobhano aho siddhānto yatrācintitaṃ karma-cayaṃ na gacchati (...). Aho -śabdaḥ sarvatrānuvarttate aho vacas tena guruṇā kara-tala ivāmalakaṃ sarva-loko 'valo-kitah – jñāta ity arthaḥ. (Cū 432, 14ff.)*

Jivâṇubhāge: kaścāiṣāṃ anubhāgas tanu-sukha-priyatāḥ duḥkhôdvigītā, tat kim uktaṃ bhavati? Evaṃ jivâṇubhāgo suddhio bhavati; yad uta sarva-sattvānāṃ ātmôpamānena na kimci duḥkham udapaptad iti (Cū 433, 3f.), karma-vipāka (T II 150a 6).

Puvvaṃ (...) puṭṭhe: not commented upon in Cū. Bhavatāṃ yaśaḥ pūra-samudram aparaṃ ca spaṣṭaṃ (sprṣṭaṃ ?),²¹ gatim ity arthaḥ (T II 150a 6). Did Śīlāṅka read puṭṭhaṃ?

(2, 6, 35) *Āhāriyā*: m.c. for *āhārīya*, polyvalent indeclinable optative form (Pi § 466), T II 150a 11 *āhṛtavantaḥ*.

Anna-vihē: syāt-karoty anyo vidhir benāryā śodhim icchanti. Tata ucyate jahā chaṇaṇaṃ, nāpi samcintitaṃ karma badhyata iti Siddhāntaḥ (Cū 433, 6f.), *anna-vidhau śuddhim āhrtavantaḥ svīkṛtavanto dvi-catvāriṃśad-doṣa-rahitena śuddhenāhāreṇāhāraṃ kṛtavanto, na tu yathā bhavatāṃ piśitādy api pātra patitaṃ na doṣāyēti* (Ṭ II 150a 10f.). Further, *anna-vihi* occurs at Samav 72, 7 and Nāyā 1, 1, 85 as the 16th of 42 *kalā* meaning *pāka-kalā* (Aup 107). This rules out Jinadāsa's interpretation.

Channa-°: channam a-prakāśam a-darśanam an-upalabdhir ity an-arthāntaram, padaṃ ceṣṭitaṃ, channa-padena upajīvana-dharmā (Cū 433, 9), *mātr-sthānôpajīvī (!)*²² *san* (Ṭ, 1.c.). In accordance with the present reference my rendering at Sūy 1, 4, 1, 2 should be changed. *Aṇudhammo: anu paścād-bhāve 'nudharmas tīrthakarâcīrṇo 'yam upacaryate iti anudharmas tīrthakarânudharmināḥ sādhaveḥ* (Cū 434, 1), *paścād-dharmo 'nudharmas tīrthakarânusṭhānād an-antaram bhavati* (Ṭ II 150a 13). Jacobi: 'maxim'.

Iha: asmin jagati pravacane vā (Ṭ 1.c.).

2, 6, 36

*siṇāyagāṇaṃ tu duve sahasse
je bhoyae niyae bhikkhuyāṇaṃ
a-saṃjae lohiya-pāṇi se ū
niyacchatī gariha-m-ih' eva loe*

b: LJ: nitie; – c: C: *asaṃjatā*; – d: J: *ṇigacchatī garahaṃ*; T: *ṇiyacchati*

BUT HE WHO ALWAYS FEEDS TWO THOUSAND STAINLESS MONKS LACKS CONTROL AND HAS BLOOD ON HIS HANDS; HE WILL INCUR BLAME ALREADY IN THIS WORLD.

ab = 29 ab

Lohiya-pāṇi: mosttimes found in an enumeration of invectives, e.g. 2, 2, 58 (§ 713), Nāyā 1, 18, 19 (cf. Dasā 6, 4); Vivāga 1, 3, 7. Cū 434, 4 comments as *sadya-ghāti*, Ṭ II 150b 12 as *an-ārya*. Jacobi translates "will be blamed like a man with bloody hands." Did he take *u* for *(i)va*? I would prefer to relate *lohiya-°* to stanza 37. – *U* at the end of a *pāda* occurs also, e.g., SūyN 32 and 61.

2, 6, 37

*thūlaṃ urabbhaṃ iha māriyāṇaṃ
uddiṭṭha-bhattaṃ ca pagappaettā
taṃ loṇa-telleṇa uvakkhaḍettā
sa-pippalīyaṃ pagaranti maṃsaṃ*

b: J: *pakappaittā*; – d: CūJ: *pakarenti*

HERE (among Buddhists) THEY KILL A FAT SHEEP AND PREPARE A MEAL FROM IT FOR A PARTICULAR PERSON, DRESS IT WITH SALT AND OIL AND SEASON THE MEAT WITH PEPPER.

Māriyāṇaṃ: T II 151a 10 not sanskritized, but at once replaced by *vyāpādyā* which in its turn is explained as *ghātayitvā*.

Uddiṭṭha°: SD., § 163; Dasā 6, 9f. (thus read for 6, 2 in AED). For this Jain argument against Buddhists cf. the *atītavattthu* of Jātaka no. 246.

2, 6, 38

*taṃ bhunjamāṇā pisiyaṃ pabhūyaṃ
no ūvalippāmō vayaṃ raṇaṃ
icc-evam āhaṃsu aṇ-ajja-dhammā
aṇ-āriyā bālā rasesu giddhā*

b: C: *ṇeva lippāmo*; J: *na uva-*; TJ: *uva*°; V: *ovalippāmu*

“(Even) WHEN EATING THIS MEAT IN ABUNDANCE WE ARE NOT AT ALL STAINED BY EVIL” – THUS THE UNBELIEVERS SPEAK; UNWORTHY PEOPLE; FOOLS; DESIROUS OF SENSUAL ENJOYMENTS.

Bāla: Jacobi connected *bāla* with *rasesu* and translated ‘devoted to foolish pleasures’.

2, 6, 39

*je yāvi bhunjanti taha-ppagāraṃ
sevanti te pāvaṃ a-jāṇamāṇā
maṇaṃ na eyaṃ kusalā karenti
vāyāvi esā buiyā u micchā*

a: V: *te yâvi*; – c: T: *karentī*; – d: J: *tu*

WHOSOEVER EATS FOOD OF THIS KIND UNKNOWINGLY DOES WRONG. VIRTUOUS PEOPLE DO NOT THINK OF DOING THAT. EVEN MENTIONING IT IS WRONG.

Beside the often found quotation of Manu 5, 55²³ Śīlāṅka (T II 151b 3ff.) mentions two others here for which see at the end of this paper (*himsā-mūlam* etc. and *yo 'tti yasya* etc.).

2, 6, 40

savvesi jīvāṇa day'-atṭhayāe
sāvajja-dosaṃ parivajjayantā
tas-sankiṇo isiṇo Nāya-puttā
uddiṭṭha-bhattaṃ parivajjayanti

OUT OF PITY ON ALL LIVING BEINGS THE SAGES, THE DISCIPLES OF VADDHAMĀNA MAHĀVĪRA, AVOID BLAMEFUL FAULTS, ARE AFRAID OF THEM AND AVOID FOOD ESPECIALLY PREPARED FOR THEM.

2, 6, 41

bhūyābhisankāḍḍha dugunchamāṇā
savvesi pāṇāṇa nihāya daṇḍaṃ
tamhā na bhunjanti taha-ppagāraṃ
eso 'nudhammo iha saṃjayāṇaṃ

b: C: *savvesu pāṇesu*; J: *pāṇāṇaṃ ihāya-daṇḍaṃ*

THEY DO NOT LIKE TO TERRIFY LIVING BEINGS, LAYING ASIDE VIOLENCE AGAINST ALL BEINGS; THEREFORE THEY DO NOT EAT FOOD OF THIS KIND. THIS IS THE RIGHT PRACTICE IN ACCORDANCE WITH OUR FAITH FOR OUR RECLUSES.

b: cf. Sn 35a: *sabbesu bhūtesu nidhāya daṇḍaṃ*; – c: cf. 39a; – d = 35d

Nihāya: daṇḍaḥ – samupatāpas ('pain'; not in MW), *taṃ nidhāya – parityajya* (T II 152a 5). For the *pāda* b, which has a parallel at the beginning of the Rhinoceros sutta of the Suttanipāta pāli; see Norman's comment and further parallels in his translation (The Group of Discourses, p. 144f.). Note the genitive in our *pāda* against the locative in Pāli. – The occurrence of this parallel shows the patchwork of the present stanza, which is not surprising, as the content is pan-Indian. *Aṇudhammo: jahā loe aṇurāiṇo dhammo (...)*²⁴ *evam ihāpi; anu paścād-bhāvēti kṛtvā tīrthakara-gaṇadharehiṃ varjitam uddēṣitam, tad-anu tac-chiṣyāḥ api pariharanti, athavā aṇuḥ sūkṣma ity arthaḥ* (Cū 436, 1 f.). – For *anudhamma* the CPD gives the meaning 'right method'; see also BHSD.

2, 6, 42

*niggantha-dhammammi imaṃ samāhiṃ
assim su-ṭhiccā aṇ-ihe carejjā
buddhe muṇi sīla-guṇōvavee
accatthayaṃ pāuṇai silogaṃ*

a: C: -*dhammāṇa* (corrected as: *dhammammi*) *imo*; LJ: *imā samāhī*; –
d: T: -*attham* corrected as -*atthato*; L: *ihaccaṇaṃ*; J: *iccatthatam*

(Having reached) THAT DEEP MEDITATION ON THE DOCTRINE OF THE JAINAS (as aspired to/necessary) AND HAVING ESTABLISHED ONESELF FIRMLY IN IT, ONE SHOULD PRACTISE WITH EQUANIMITY. THE ENLIGHTENED MONK WHO OBSERVES MORAL CONDUCT AS WELL AS THE FIVE MAJOR VOWS AND THE TEN RENUNCIATIONS COMES TO VERY GREAT FAME.

ab: cf. 55 ab; b: cf. 1, 14, 16

Niggantha-°: the words in brackets correspond to Śīlāṅka's *anuprāptaḥ* (T II 152a 10), without which the lines cannot be construed. The fact that *imaṃ (...)* *su-ṭhiccā* occurs at 1, 14, 15f. to which the explanation of *imaṃ* as *pūrvōktaṃ* refers (T, 1.c.) may also point to our stanza being patchwork. At any rate it seems that the words *imaṃ* etc. were taken from another context.

Aṇihe: a-māyo 'ihavā nihanyata iti niho; na niho 'nihah – pariṣahair a-pīdīto (T II 152a 11), cf. Pā *anigha* (see CPD).

Muṇī: kāla-traya-vedī (T II 152a 12).

Sīla^o: taken as a *dvandva* as done by Śīlāṅka for whom *sīla* is *krodhâdy-upaśama-rūpa*; for the *guṇas* see SD., § 172.

Accatthayam: *atyarthatām* corrected as *-taḥ* – *sarva-guṇâtisāyinīm sarva-dvandvôparama-rūpām* (T II 152a 13).

(A brahmin speaks:)

2, 6, 43

*siṇāyagāṇam tu duve sahasse
je bhoyae niyae māhaṇāṇam
te punṇa-khandhe su-mah' ajjaṇittā
bhavanti devā ii veyā-vāo*

b: LJ: *ni(t)ie*; – c: LJ: *khandham su-mah'-ajjiṇittā* (L: *ajjaṇittā*)

BUT THOSE WHO ALWAYS FEED TWO THOUSAND STAIN-
LESS BRAHMINS WILL EARN A GREAT DEAL OF MERIT AND
BECOME GODS. THAT IS THE TEACHING OF THE VEDAS.

ab: cf. 29 ab = 36 ab

Ajjaṇittā: also Sūy 1, 5, 2, 35.

Veyā-vāo: *dāna-ṣṭutis* are as old as the RV (e.g. X 117) and the donors of a *dakṣiṇā* are said to stand high in heaven (RV X 107, 2), but in this context I have no place referring to *snātakas*, to whom gifts must be made in proportion to their learning (Manu XI 2f.).²⁵ Beside *vedāḥ pramāṇam* (*lokānām*, Mbh 2, 262, 1a), Cū 438 quotes many Sanskrit *pādas* that cannot be identified and one Pkt. *pāda* (*jaittā viule jaṇṇe*); see the list of quotations below.

2, 6, 44

(Ārdraka speaks:)

*siṇāyagāṇam tu duve sahasse
je bhoyae niyae *kulālayāṇam*
se gacchaī loluva-saṃpagāḍha
tivvābhītāvī naragābhisevī*

b: LJ: *nitie*; – c: T: *gacchati sampañāḍhe*

BUT HE WHO ALWAYS FEEDS TWO THOUSAND STAINLESS MEN OF GOOD FAMILY (?) WILL AFTER HIS DEATH BECOME A DENIZEN OF HELL, FULL OF DESTRUCTIVE BEINGS, AND WILL SUFFER SHARP PAINS

Kulālayāṇaṃ: this reading is unmetrical and therefore can not be correct. The word must begin with a trochee and have four syllables. The commentaries think of *kulāta* which they take to mean ‘cat’ and ‘brahmin’. Perhaps we have to do here with **koliya*, an equivalent of Sa. *kaulya* ‘sprung from a noble family’ (MW).

Gacchai: *gacchati* can mean ‘to die’ (MW), *gati* ‘reincarnation’.

Loluva-°: *sa-pāpo lolupaḥ svābhāvikaiḥ śītōṣṇāhiḥ parasparôḍīritaiḥ samkṣiṣṭasurôḍīritais ca duḥkhair bhūmi-gatā abhigatā lolupyante lolavijjante vā bhr̥ṣaṃ gāḍhaṃ tīvraṃ; evaṃ śītādyāḥ svābhāvikāḥ parakṛtā vā tīvrānubhāvā yeṣu anu paścād-bhāve jehiṃ aṇṇe sattā duḥkhehiṃ tāvitā, te pacchā duḥkham anubhavantīty anubhāvaḥ narakāḥ uktaḥ* (Cū 438, 13ff.), *lolupaiḥ – āmiṣa-gr̥ddhai rasa-sātā gauravādy-upapannaiḥ jihvëndriya-vaśagaiḥ sampragāḍho – vyāpto yadivā kimbhūte narake yāti? Lolupaiḥ – āmiṣa-gr̥dhnuvahir asumadbhir vyāpto yo narakas, tasminn iti* (T II 153a 5ff.).

“We will have to endure great pains in hell, being surrounded by hungry (beasts”); Jacobi). I take – *sampagāḍhe* as a locative and compare 1, 5, 1, 17 *tahiṃ ca te lolāṇa-sampagāḍhe gāḍhaṃ su-tattam aḡaṇiṃ vayanti* “and there in the place where there is constant shivering, they resort to a large burning fire” (Jacobi). Here there is a v.l. *loluya*. At 1, 5, 2, 6, too, we find *sampagāḍha* ‘intolerable’ (hell; Jacobi), though without *loluya*, used as an epitheton of hell, not of its inhabitants.

2, 6, 45

dayā-varaṃ dhammā dugunchamāṇo
vahāvahaṃ dhammā paṣaṃsamāṇo
egaṃ pi je bhoyayai a-sīlaṃ
 niho *nisaṃ jāi kuo surehiṃ?*

a: *pāṭha* in Cū 439, 11: *dugunchamāṇo*; CTV: *-māṇā* (but Śīl.: *-māṇo*); LJ: *dugunchamāṇe*; – CTV: *paṣaṃsamāṇā*, Śīl.: *praśaṃsan*; LJ: *paṣaṃsamāṇe*; – c: Cū: *ku-sīlaṃ?*; – d: TV: *nivo*; L: *niho nisaṃ*

gacchai anta-kāle; – J corrects *ṇivo* as *ṇidho* (...) *kato* [*’*] *surehiṃ* (cf. T II 153a 13), V: *’surehiṃ*

WHO SLIGHTS THE RELIGION OF COMPASSION AND HONOURS
A RELIGION OF VIOLENCE; WHO FEEDS EVEN ONE MAN
WITHOUT MORAL PRACTICE WILL GO DOWN (?) IN THE
DARK; WHY WITH/ TO THE GODS?

d: cf. 1, 5, 1, 5 *niho nisaṃ gacchati anta-kāle*

Dayā-varam: against Śīlāṅka’s *dayā-vara* (T II 153a 9f.), PSM and ĀŚK prefer *dayā-para* as the etymology.

Niho: At our place there seems to be a lacuna in Cū including the *pratīka* of 2, 6, 46 and T explains *nivo* – *nṛpaḥ*. Fortunately, we have a near parallel in 1, 5, 1, 5, where this word is commented *nidhau gatiṛ adhogatiḥ* (...) *nyag* (Cū 158, 8), *nyag adhastāt* (T I 128a 12). It is perhaps an ad hoc formation of *ni* + *a(d)ho* favoured by alliteration.

(A Vedāntin [?] speaks:)²⁶

2, 6, 46

ḍuhao vi dhammammi samuṭṭhiyāmo
assim su-ṭṭhiccā taha esa-kālaṃ
āyāra-sīle buie ’ha nāṇī
na saṃparāyammi visesa-m-atthi

a: L: *samuṭṭhiyāmo*; – c: Cū: *ācāra-śīlaṃ*; J: [*’*] *ha*; LJ: *nāṇe*; – J: *saṃparāyaṃsi*

BOTH OF US ADHERE ORIGINALLY TO ONE DOCTRINE, ARE
FIRMLY ESTABLISHED IN IT AND WILL BE SO ALSO IN THE
FUTURE. WHO IS PRACTISING THE RIGHT CONDUCT IS SAID
TO BE WISE IN THIS WORLD: AS TO THE NEXT WORLD THERE
IS NO DIFFERENCE (between us).

b: cf. 42b and 1, 14, 16

Āyāre-sīle: *ācāra-śīlaṃ* 2 *tatrâcāraḥ yathā bhavatām yuga-mātrântara-*
drṣṭitvam evaṃ asmākaṃ api (...) *jñānam upadeśa ācāraḥ śīlaṃ yasya*
jñānasya tad idam ācāra-śīlaṃ athavā jñānam iti bhavatām api caitanyāt

an-anya ātmā (Cū 440, 10ff.), *ācāra-pradhānam śīlam uktam yama-niyama-lakṣaṇam, na phalgu-kalka-kuhakā-jīvana-rūpam athānantaram jñānam ca mokṣāṅgatayābhīhitam* (T II 154a 13f.). This interpretation does not seem reconcilable with the text in hand, even if one reads *nāṇam* instead of *nāṇī* as was apparently done by Śīlāṅka. Beside, *āyāra-sīle* could express a contrast to *a-sīlam* in vs. 45. – Jacobi's translation runs as follows: "(we believe that) virtue consists in good conduct and that knowledge (is necessary for liberation)."

2, 6, 47

*a-vvatta-rūvaṃ purisaṃ mahantaṃ
saṇāyaṇaṃ a-kkhaṃ a-vvayaṃ ca
savvesu bhūesu vi savvao se
cando va tārahī samatta-rūve*

c: J: *so*; – d: J: *cando vva* (...) – *rūvo*

(We believe in) AN UNMANIFEST, GREAT, ETERNAL, IMPERISHABLE AND UNCHANGING *PURUṢA*. HE APPEARS WITH RESPECT TO/COMPARED WITH ALL (other) BEINGS WITHOUT EXCEPTION (*vi*) AS IN EVERY WAY PERFECT LIKE THE MOON COMPARED TO THE STARS.

Cando etc.: cf. Mbh cr. ed. 8, 32, 6 and esp. Anguttara Nikāya Pāli III 34, 20* *Yathā pi cando* (...) *tāra-gaṇe* (...) *atirocati*; III 365, 10 ff. etc.

(Ārdraka speaks:)

2, 6, 48

*evaṃ na mijjanti na saṃsaranti
na māhaṇā khattiya-vesa-pesā
kīḍā ya pakkhī ya sarīsivā ya
narā ya savve taha deva-logā*

a: T: *saṃsarantī*; – b: J: *pessā*

IF THAT WOULD BE THE CASE (beings) COULD NOT BE PERCEIVED (i.e., distinguished) NOR WANDER IN *SAMŚĀRA*. THERE WOULD BE NEITHER BRAHMIN NOR *KṢĀTRIYAS*,

VAIŚYAS OR SERVANTS, INSECTS, BIRDS OR SNAKES AND ALL WOULD BE MEN OR GODS.

Mijjanti: mriyanti (Cū 442, 1), *mīyeran – paricchidyeran* (Ṭ II 155b 3). For the *ātmādvaita-vāda* – the doctrine of the non-difference of the soul of the Universe and the individual souls – which Śīlāṅka mentions here (Ṭ 155b 6) see Bollée 1977: 82 note 9.

Māhaṇā: as an example of the equality of mankind, Cū 442,6 compares the *Malla-dāsī sarveṣāṃ Mallānāṃ sāmānyā: evaṃ brāhmaṇa-sarīram api sarveṣāṃ kṣatriya-ṣiṭ-chūdrāṇāṃ sāmānyam*.

Deva-logā: this seems to be an early instance of *-loga* as a plural formant in NIA languages.

2, 6, 49

*loyaṃ a-yāṇitt' iha kevalenaṃ
kahanti je dhammaṃ a-jāṇamaṇā
nāsanti appāṇā paraṃ ca naṭṭhā
saṃsāra ghorammi aṇ-ora-pāre*

a: VL: *logaṃ*; J: *ajāṇittiha*; – b: L: *kahinti*; J: *kahenti*; – c: LJ: *nāsenti*

THOSE WHO TEACH A DOCTRINE WITHOUT KNOWING THE WORLD HERE BY UNLIMITED VISION (*kevala-nāṇa*) AND THUS ARE IGNORANT RUIN THEMSELVES AND WHEN LOST (also) OTHERS IN THIS HORRIBLE, BOUNDLESS SAṂSĀRA.

Loyaṃ: *caturdaśa-rajiv-ātmakaṃ carācaram vā lokam* (Ṭ II 155b 13), on which see Caillat/Kumar 1981: 20 and 54.

Paraṃ: *dparāṇ* (Ṭ II 156a 1). For the acc. Pl. – *aṃ* in Pāli see Norman 1997: 77 (Dhp 64f.).

Aṇ-ora-pāre: cf. *Dhyāna-śataka* 56 in AvNH 601b 1 and, in Pāli, *Milinda-pañha* 319, 20. The dvandva *ora-pāra* occurs in *Suttanipāta* 1ff. and was discussed by Brough 1962: 202.

2, 6, 50

*loyaṃ vijāṇant' iha kevalenaṃ
punṇeṇa nāṇeṇa samāhi-juttā
dhammaṃ samattaṃ ca kahanti je u
tāranti appāṇa paraṃ ca tiṇṇā*

a: VL: *logaṃ*; – c: L: *kahinti*; J: *kahenti*; – d: LJ: *tārenti*

BUT THOSE WHO TEACH THE RIGHT DOCTRINE BECAUSE THEY KNOW THE WORLD HERE BY UNLIMITED VISION AND COMBINE MEDITATION WITH (this) FULL KNOWLEDGE SAVE THEMSELVES AND WHEN SAVED, (also) OTHERS

Probably due to the similarity of the *pratīkas* of vss. 49 and 50, the beginning of the latter stanza is missing in Cū.

Vijānanti: both commentators take this form to be a present indicative, whereas Jacobi seems to take it as a participle ('those who know') in conformity with the absolutive *a-yānīti* of the previous stanza.

Punneṇa: to be taken, with Jacobi, but against both commentators, from *pūrṇa*. At least Śīlāṅka seems to have had a reading *panneṇa*: *prakarṣeṇa jānāti prajñāḥ puṇya-hetutvād vā puṇyaṃ, tena* (T II 156a 4).

Nāṇeṇa: *Bauddha-matôcchedena jñānâdhâra ātma asti* 'with the exception of Buddhism the soul is the possessor of knowledge' (T II 156a 7).

Param: cf. note on vs. 49.

2, 6, 51

je garahiyam thāṇam ihāvasanti
je yāvi loe caraṇôvaveyā
udāhaḍaṃ taṃ tu samaṃ maṭṭe
ahāuso vippariyāsa-m-eva

c: T omits: *tu*; – d: C: *āuse*

BUT THOSE WHO ASSUME HERE A PART INCURRING BLAME AND THOSE WHO IN THIS WORLD PRACTISE RIGHT CONDUCT – THAT IS CALLED THE SAME IN (your) VIEW. THEN, SIR, THIS CAN ONLY BE AN ERROR

Garahiyam th: the *svarabhakti* vowel between *r* and *h* should be ignored. On the other three *thāṇā garahiyā* see Thā (Lāḍnūn 1975) 3, 315. *Sa. sthāna* can mean 'part of an actor' (MW) and the combination with *āvasati* in this sense is unusual the normal meaning being 'to inhabit a place' (Vimānavatthu 653), but no doubt Jacobi is right with his rendering.

Caraṇôvaveyā: for the renewal of the preposition see Leumann 1883: 106 and Bollée 1998 Glossary, s.v. *uvaveya*.

Vippariyāsa-m-eva: viparyayam evôdāhared (...) yadivā viparyāsa iti madônmmatta-pralāpavad ity uktam bhavati (T II 156b 4f.). The indeclinable *viparyāsam* in Sa. means ‘alternately’ (MW) which does not fit here and thus excludes *udāhaḍam* as a supplement. Therefore I have taken the word as a nominative.

(An elephant ascetic speaks)

2, 6, 52

*saṃvaccharenāvi ya egam egam
bāṇeṇa māreu mahā-gayam tu
sesāṇa jīvāṇa day’-atṭhayāe
vāsam vayam vittī pakappayāmo*

d: L: *vittim*

ONCE ANNUALLY WE KILL ONE BIG ELEPHANT WITH AN ARROW OUT OF PITY FOR THE OTHER LIVING BEINGS AND LIVE FOR A YEAR ON IT

Avi: api-śabdāt ṣaṇ-māsena (T II 156b 10). the ascription of this stanza to the *hatthi-tāvasā* is based – apart from the contents – on N 190 and is not canonical. In the Siddhānta this class of “ascetics” is mentioned in a standard list at Aup § 74 etc. In his CIP I (1990: 80f.) Norman discussed their identity in connection with *ibbha*. His cautious facit was that *hatthi-tāvasas* were perhaps identical with the latter and possibly Buddhists, but more likely Ājīvikas (loc. cit., p. 81). I cannot see very well a reason for either of these to worship elephants,²⁷ which recluses would not do anyway, let alone eat them.²⁸ Yet before actually eating an elephant they could first have sacrificed the animal. Handiqui 1949: 377 states that at the Vedic *punḍarīka* sacrifice an elephant was killed, but gave no reference.²⁹ “It is evident that much of the information of Jain writers in regard to Vedic rites was based on hearsay (...). Their statements are no doubt mala fide”.³⁰ The *punḍarīka* of which Jones³¹ says: “there is no clue as to their³² nature” in fact is a Soma sacrifice as attested by the Pañcaviṃśa-brāhmaṇa 22, 18, 7 and Āpastamba ŚS 22.24.8.³³ Perhaps, however, the sect in question here can be identical with the *hatthivattika*³⁴ and the *hasti-vratas* mentioned in another Buddhist text, viz. Lalit 248, 21, in the cpd. *Go-vrata-mrga-*

śva-varāha-vānara-hasti-vrata. The Niddesa-atthakathā 271,34ff. gives us details on the elephant vow: “from today on I will follow the way of the elephants.” People with this intention walk, stand, sit, lie and evacuate the way elephants do. Others when seeing elephants lift up a trunk and utterly imitate their way of going. These are the people who are under a vow regarding elephants.”³⁵ We would not call these men *tāpasas* or even religious at all. The *hatthi-vattikas* are the only elephantomaniacs we have found a serious description of so far. What is said about the *hatthi-tāvasas* in our text is a clear case of odium theologicum, I believe, especially, because it concerns killing of an animal whose flesh is not kosher for Hindus or for Buddhists. Perhaps the text author/redactor has thought up this kind of “ascetic” as the climax of a series of abominable unbelievers.

In accordance with their vow they should in fact have been vegetarians and the author of Sūy 2, 6 will have chosen this strange sect to make Jain monks abhorrent to meat-eating unbelievers.³⁶

(Ārdraka speaks:)

2, 6, 53

*saṃvaccharenāvi ya egam egam
pāṇaṃ haṇantā a-niyatta-dosā
sesāṇa jīvāṇa vahe na laggā
siyā ya thovaṃ gihiṇo vi tamhā*

c: thus J; TLV: *vahēṇa*

IF ONE ONLY ONCE ANNUALLY KILLS A LIVING BEING AND
THUS DOES NOT STOP DOING WRONG ONE IS OF COURSE NOT
BURDENED WITH THE DEATH OF/GUILTY OF KILLING OTHER
BEINGS, BUT (ya) THERE MAY BE LITTLE (distance/difference)
FOR A MERE HOUSEHOLDER FROM SUCH A ONE/THAT
(recluse)

Siyā etc.: both commentaries seem to take *gihiṇo* as a plural (Cū 445,3; T II 157a 8). Jacobi does not translate *tamhā* which seems superfluous in the sense of *tasmāt kāraṇāt* (T II 157a 10).

2, 6, 54

*saṃvacchareṇāvi ya egam egam
pāṇaṃ haṇantā samaṇa-vvaesu
āyā-hie se purise aṇ-ajje
na tārise kevaliṇo bhavanti*

b: LJ: *haṇante*; L: *-vvate ū*; – d: J: *tārisā*; L: *tārisaṃ (...) bhaṇanti*
(cf. Cū 445, 8 *ṇa tārisaṃ dhammaṃ hiṃsakaṃ kevaliṇo bhaṇanti*)

THOSE WHO ONLY ONCE ANNUALLY KILL A LIVING BEING
(but otherwise remain) WITHIN THE BOUNDS OF THEIR VOWS
AS RECLUSES ACT AGAINST THEIR OWN INTEREST AND ARE
UNBELIEVERS. SUCH PEOPLE WILL NOT OBTAIN UNLIMITED
VISION/BECOME KEVALINS

2, 6, 55

*buddhassa āṇāḍe imaṃ samāhiṃ
assim su-thiccā ti-viheṇa tāt
tariyaṃ samuddaṃ va mahā-bhavôghaṃ
āyāṇavaṃ dhammaṃ udāharejjā*

tti bemi

c: V: *°bhavovam*; – d: CLJ: *udāharejjāsi*; AED: *āyāṇavantam
samudāharejjā*

(Having reached) THAT DEEP MEDITATION (as aspired/necessary)
UNDER THE DIRECTION OF A BUDDHA AND HAVING ESTAB-
LISHED ONESELF FIRMLY IN IT IN THE THREEFOLD WAY
(with thoughts, in words, by acts), SUCH A ONE AS IS ABLE TO
CROSS THE GREAT OCEAN OF EXISTENCE MAY TEACH THE
DOCTRINE

THUS I SAY

ab: cf. 1, 14, 16 ab; – c = 1, 6, 25c

(Having reached) translates *avāpya* (T II 158a 5). For the faulty construc-
tion of the first half of the stanza see my remark on vs. 42.

Buddhassa āṇāḍe: this probably means that they were *pacceya-buddhas*
and had not reached enlightenment on their own initiative.

Samāhiṃ: sad-dharmānvāpti-lakṣaṇaṃ (T II 158a 5). On Jain *samāhi* see Bronk-horst 1986: 29–38.

Tāi: see Bollée 1988: 61.

Āyāṇavaṃ: ādānaṃ – samyag-darsana-jñāna-cāritra-rūpaṃ tad vidyate yasyāsāv ādānavān – sādhuḥ (T II 158a 8f.).

Udāharejjā(si): see my remark at Sūy 1, 1, 4, 13 (Bollée 1977: 130).

QUOTATIONS IN THE COMMENTARIES

a-cchedyo 'yam a-bhedyo 'yam (Cū 441, 6 ad Sūy 2, 6, 47)

ajo – nityaḥ śāśvato yo na kṣīyate ghaṭavat (Cū 441, 4f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 47)

aṭṭha-kamma-pagaḍḍo siḍḍhila-bandhaṇa-baddhāo dhaṇita° (Cū 435, 8 ad Sūy 2, 6, 40)

a-ṭṭhite na ṭhaveti paraṃ (Cū 447, 14f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 55)

aṇ-āgato bhāsiyāṇi (Cū 447, 3 ad Sūy 2, 6, 55)

a-tuṣyāṇy a-trirātrāṇi tīrthāṇy an-abhiḡamya ca / a-datvā kāñcanaṃ gās ca daridras tena jāyate // (Cū 437, 5f. and Sūy 2, 6, 42)

an-asthi-jantūnāṃ śakata-bharaṃ mārayitvā brāhmaṇaṃ bhojayet (T II 154a 1 ad Sūy 2, 6, 45)

an-asthikānāṃ śakata-bhāraṃ mārayitvā brāhmaṇaṃ bhojayet (Cū 439, 6 ad Sūy 2, 6, 44)

api tasya kule jāyā-saddo (Cū 439, 10 ad Sūy 2, 6, 45)

a-vijñānōpacitaṃ parijñānōpacitaṃ īryā-pathikaṃ svapnāntikaṃ cēti karmōpacayaṃ na yāti (T II 148b 4f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 28)

ātatāyinaṃ āyātaṃ api vedāntagaṃ raṇe / a-hatvā brahma-hato vā hatvā pāpāt pramucyate // (Cū 439, 5 ad Sūy 2, 6, 44)

ātatāyinaṃ āyāntaṃ api vedāntagaṃ raṇe / jighāṃsantaṃ jighāṃsīyān na tena brahmaḥ bhavet (T II 153b 13f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 44)

āhā-kamm'-aṇṇaṃ, bhante, bhunjamāṇe kiṃ pagarenti (Cū 435, 8 ad Sūy 2, 6, 40)

kāyikaiḥ karmaṇāṃ doṣair yāti sthāvaratāṃ naraḥ / vācikaiḥ pakṣi-mṛgatāṃ mānasair antya-jātitaṃ // (T II 153b 10f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 45)

kīdā (ya) pakkhī (ya) sarīsivā (ya) (Cū 442, 7f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 48)

kecit-śūnyaṃ naṣṭaḥ (Cū 431, 1f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 30)

guṇasu-ṭṭhitassa vayaṇaṃ (Cū 448, 1 ad Sūy 2, 6, 55)

grāma-kṣetra-grhādīnaṃ (Cū 436, 11 ad Sūy 2, 6, 43)

jaittā viule jaṇṇe (Cū 438, 3 ad Sūy 2, 6, 43)

jīvo jātis tathā dehaḥ (Cū 438, 8 ad Sūy 2, 6, 43)

jo khalu jīvaṃ uddaveti esa khalu para-bhave tehiṃ vā aṇṇehiṃ vā jīvehiṃ uddavijjati (Cū 435, 12 ad Sūy 2, 6, 41)

taṇa-katṭha-gomaya-māhaṇassiyā saṃsedasidā maṭṭissitā c'eva Cū 445,
 1f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 53)
 deva-lokôpamānāni bhuñjanty apsaraḥ striyaḥ / vinyastāni hi puṇyāni
 yeṣāṃ tapaḥ phalaṃ tataḥ // (Cū 446, 10f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 54)
 na jātir duṣyate rājan (Cū 438,9 ad Sūy 2, 6, 43)
 na dukkaraṃ vā nara-pāsa-moyaṇaṃ gayassa mattassa vaṇammi rāyaṃ
 / jahā u cattāvalieṇa(m) tantunā su-dukkaraṃ³⁷ me paḍihāi moyanaṃ
 // (Cū 446, 13 ad Sūy 2, 6, 13f.; T II 158a 1f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 54)
 na vi atthi māṇusāṇaṃ (ĀvN 980; Cū 436, 9f.)
 nimittaṃ hetur apadeśaḥ (Cū 431, 5f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 31)
 nāinaṃ chindanti śāstrāṇi (Cū 441,5 ad Sūy 2, 6, 47)
 nāivāsti rāja-rājasya tat-su° (Cū 436, 12 ad Sūy 2, 6, 43)
 prakṛter mahāms tato 'haṃkāras tasmād gaṇas ca ṣoḍaśakaḥ / tasmād
 api ṣoḍaśakāt pañcabhyaḥ pañca bhūtāni // (Cū 440, 3f. ad Sūy 2, 6,
 45)
 brāhmaṇa eva jāyate (Cū 437,2 ad Sūy 2, 6, 42)
 bhakṣaṇīyaṃ bhaven māṃsaṃ prāṇy-aṅgatvena hetunā / odanādivad
 ity evaṃ kaścid āhātītārkikaḥ // (T II 150b 3f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 35)
 māṃ sa bhakṣayitāmutra yasya māṃsaṃ ihādmy aham / etam-māṃsasya
 māṃsatvaṃ pravādanti maṇiṣiṇaḥ // (Manu 5, 55; T II 151b 5f. ad
 Sūy 2, 6, 39)
 yathāpare saṃkathikāḥ (? Cū 436, 11f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 42)
 yad yad ācarate śreṣṭhaḥ (Mbh 6, 25, 21a; Cū 436, 1 ad Sūy 2, 6, 41)
 yasmāt paraṃ nāparaṃ asti kiṃcit (Cū 441, 10 ad Sūy 2, 6, 47; Cū
 442, 11 ad Sūy 2, 6, 48)
 yān yān kāmān brāhmaṇebhyo dadāti tān kāmān prajānôpabhukte (Mbh
 apocr.; Cū 438, 2f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 43)
 yo 'tti yasya ca tan-māṃsaṃ ubhayoḥ paśyatāntaram / ekasya kṣaṇikā
 trptir anyāḥ prāṇair viyuḥyate // (T II 151b 6 ad Sūy 2, 6, 39)
 rājānaṃ tṛṇa-tulyaṃ eva manute Śakre 'pi nāivādaro / vittôpārjana-
 rakṣaṇa-vyaya-kṛtāḥ prāpnoti no vedanāḥ / saṃsārāntara-varty apīha
 labhate saṃ muktavan nirbhayaḥ saṃtoṣāt puruṣo 'mṛtatvaṃ a-cirād
 yāyāt surēndrārcitaḥ (T II 152b 1f.)
 rutṭhassa kharā diṭṭhī (Cū 430, 4 ad Sūy 2, 6, 30)
 vayaṃ sa-karmaṇo 'rthasya (Cū 430, 5 ad Sūy 2, 6, 30)
 varṇa-pramāṇake (Cū 438,8 ad Sūy 2, 6, 43)
 vedāḥ pramāṇaṃ (Mbh 12, 262, 1a; Cū 438, 1 ad Sūy 2, 6, 43)
 śakyaṃ kartuṃ jīvatā karma pāpaṃ (statement of Viśvamitra in Cū
 444,9 ad Sūy 2, 6, 52)
 sūdraṃ hatvā prāṇāyāmaṃ japet apahasitaṃ vā kuryāt yat-kiṃcid vā
 dadyāt (T II 153b 14f.)

śrgālo vai eṣa jāyate yaḥ sa-purīṣo dahyata (Ṭ II 153b 8 ad Sūy 2, 6, 45)

śrutvā duḥkha-paramparām atighṛṇām māṃsāsīnām dur-gatiṃ ye
kurvanti śubhōdayena viratiṃ māṃsādanasyādarāt / sad-dīrghāyur
a-dūṣitaṃ gada-rujā sambhāvya yāsyanti te martyeṣūdbhaṭa-bhoga-
dharma-matiṣu svargāpavargeṣu ca (Ṭ II 151b 11 ad Sūy 2, 6, 39)
ṣaṭ śatāni niyujyante paśūnām madhyame 'hani / aśvamedhasya vacanān
nyūnāni paśubhis tribhiḥ // (Cū 438, 10 ad Sūy 2, 6, 43; Ṭ II 153b
11f.)

sadyaḥ patati māṃsena lākṣayā lavaṇena ca / try-ahena śūdrī-bhāvati
brāhmaṇaḥ kṣīra-vikrayī // (Cū 438, 7 ad Sūy 2, 6, 43; Ṭ II 153b 8.f)

sapta vyādhā daśārṇeṣu (Cū 438, 7 ad Sūy 2, 6, 43)

samaṃ na brāhmaṇe dānaṃ (Cū 437, 9 ad Sūy 2, 6, 43)

sarvaṃ sarvatra sarva-kālaṃ ca (Cū 441, 7f. ad Sūy 2, 6, 47)

snānādyā deha-saṃskārāḥ (Cū 436, 7 ad Sūy 2, 6, 42)

hatvā svarge mahīyati (Cū 439, 10 ad Sūy 2, 6, 45)

himsā-mūlam a-medhyam āspada-malaṃ dhyānasya raudrasya yad,
bībhatsaṃ rudhirāvilam kṛmi-grhaṃ durgandhi-pūyādim / Śukrāsṛk-
prabhavaṃ nitānta-malinaṃ sadbhiḥ sadā ninditaṃ; ko bhuṅkte narakāya
rākṣasa-samo māṃsaṃ tad ātma-druhaḥ? // (Ṭ II 151b 3ff. ad Sūy 2,
6, 39)

NOTES

¹ The first part of this article will be published in the Felicitation Volume for Munivara Shri Jambuvijayaji. Ahmedabad, 1998. For the convenience of the reader, the abbreviations used here are those adopted for my *Studien zum Sūyagada I*. Wiesbaden, 1977: C = pratikas in the Cūrṇi (1950); Ṭ = Sūy(agaḍa) text in Śīlāṅka's commentary II (1953); V = Vaidya's ed. (1928); L = text ed. by Tulsī and Nathmal. in: Angasuttāni I (Lāḍnūm 1975); J = Jambuvijaya's ed. (1978).

² *Apahastita*, Ṭ II 147b 12.

³ Śākya-putrīyā bhikṣavaḥ (Cū 428, 1; Ṭ I.c. 13).

⁴ Schlingloff 1962: 31.

⁵ I regret I could not use the Pāda Index and Reverse Pāda Index to Early Jain Canons (1995) by Yamazaki and Ousaka as for the present lecture the *pādas* have not been listed there.

⁶ "The commentators explain *pinṇāga* (= *piṇyāka*) by *khala*, and *pinḍi* by *bhinnaka* or *śakala*. Śīlāṅka gives the following explanation. During a struggle with savage men (*mleccha*) someone runs away and throws his cloak off on a granary. An enemy in pursuit of that man mistakes it for him and takes hold of it, together with the part of the granary. – This interpretation looks absurd; but it will appear not so if we remember that granaries are beehive-shaped reservoirs made of sun-baked mud or wattle and mud; compare Grierson 1885: 17."

⁷ Cf. also Cū 428, 7ff.: *jai koi āsanna-vero verio jo bāla-rūvāi soyati, so te vi mārei, māretum "ce-ḍa-rūvāim pi māremi" tti vavasito, suvanti ya kei veriyā je gabbhe vi vigintinti mahilāṇaṃ, mā ete baddhamāṇā sattuno hohinti, tattha samāvattīe*

khala-piṇḍī pallankae pottenā ohāditā manda-prakāśe gṛhāika-dese vā so teṇa tivva-verābhibhūteṇa “*esa dārao tti kāūṇaṃ satti kunto vā satti vā ti-sūlaṃ vā* (...).

⁸ Gardin 1984: 111.

⁹ Id., p. 125 note 13.

¹⁰ PWB: ‘Tenne’; pwb: ‘Scheuer, Scheune zum Aufbewahren und Dreschen des Getraides’ (Barn, shed for storing and threshing grain).

¹¹ Om Prakash 1961: 290 sub 94.

¹² Schlingloff 1962: 31.

¹³ Probably belongs with *paulei* (429, 1) to *pra* √*JVAL* and should be added in PSM.

¹⁴ *Ad Pi* § 525.

¹⁵ Jambūvijaya 1978 in the app. Crit. of Sūy 2, 6, 28. Slips of the *s/m* kind are frequent, e.g. *komala/kosala* (Harivamśa, Vāyupur < MW), *Timisa/Tisīsa* (Alsdorf 1974: 95), *mālam/sālam* (Balbir 1985: 129), *mukham/sukham* (Mvu III 311, 2).

¹⁶ Weber 1867: 293 *sayam eva panca mahavvayāiṃ ārohetā* ‘die fünf großen Satzungen ersteigend’ (lit.: ascending the five great precepts) is obscure.

¹⁷ Metre adjusted after Norman 1992: 247.

¹⁸ Schubring, *Doctrine*, § 184.

¹⁹ *Catasro tāsū ta (?) dvādaśasu dhūta-guṇesu yuktā (?) etesiṃ evaṃ-guṇa-jāyiyāṇaṃ abhigata° yathā tasyānando donṇi sahasse bhikkhuyāṇaṃ bhojāveti sa-māmsa-guḍa-dāḍimenēṣṭena bhattena* (...).

²⁰ See, e.g., Jacobi 1970: 90.

²¹ Thus Sūy-ṭ 1917.

²² Read: *māyā-sthān°* and cf. Sūy 2, 5, 31 *micchōvajīvi*.

²³ See Bollée 1993: 25.

²⁴ Quotations of Mbh 6, 25, 21a (*ācarati* against here in Cū: *ācarate*) and another which I could not spot: *deṣe deṣe dāruṇo* (...); see the quotation list at the end of this paper.

²⁵ Kane 1974: 110ff.

²⁶ At Ṭ II 154a 3 and 154b 4, vs. 46f. are spoken by Ekadaṇḍins, i.e. either Daṇḍins or Ājīvikas according to Hoernle as quoted in Basham 1951: 170. The Daṇḍins invoked not only Śiva, but also Viṣṇu-Nārāyaṇa. Thus at 154a 13 they are said to perform the *vratēśvarayāga* ‘offering to Śiva’, but at 155a 11 they practise *pancarātrōpadiṣṭa-yama-niyama* as a Vaiṣṇava sect with Sāṃkhya tenets (Schrader 1973: 126f.; Basham 1951: 169f.), as is confirmed by Śīlāṅka at 154a 5f. The Sāṃkhyas, however, carried three staves (Glasenapp 1925: 269), but by the word *caitanya-lakṣaṇātma* (Ṭ II 154b 10) Śīlāṅka identifies the speaker of vs. 47 as a Vedāntin. Earlier, Jinadāsa had wavered between Sāṃkhyas and Vaidikas (Cū 441, 9) *etac ca sūtraṃ Sāṃkhya-Vaidikayos tulyaṃ vyākhyāyate* (441, 14).

As to this, we should be reminded of the origin of the Sāṃkhya in the *yonī* of the old Vedānta (Strauss 1925: 84). The mention of *a-vyakta puruṣa* may have favoured the ascription of vs. 47 to the Sāṃkhya. Ṭ II 154b 8 explains *purisa* as *jīva*. As the various ascriptions of the doctrine meant here by the commentators, for which cp. also 2, 1, 25 – a passage Jacobi thinks could also belong to the Yoga school – it should be borne in mind that various scholasticisms of Sāṃkhya, Yoga and Vedānta existed side by side until a particular direction could establish itself. This direction now is for us the representative of the system in question (Strauss 1925: 127). Moreover, our commentators are Jains who might have known hardly more of these old and vague views of religious opponents than we. Thus the subject matter of vs. 46 alone does not enable us to ascribe it to a particular denomination. This vagueness and its possible grounds were already discussed by Thibaut (1890: xiv) and Strauss (1925: 228).

²⁷ Laymen will often worship Gaṇeśa, but I found no evidence in Hopkins' 1915: 17f. that G. is the god of the Śūdras according to Manu as stated by Gokhale 1951: 176 note 12.

²⁸ On inedible animals see e.g. Vinaya Pāli II 219; Rasvāhinī 2, 9, 18 vii and Saletore 1943: 118 note 2 with the testimony of Chinese visitors.

²⁹ The only relation between *pundarīka* and elephants I would know of is that P. is the name of the elephant guardian of the South East.

³⁰ Handiqui 1949: 386.

³¹ 1952: 224 note 8.

³² "Their" implies also a *padma* sacrifice, inter alia, at Mahāvastu II 237, 20.

³³ For these references I am indebted to the kindness of Dr P. Aithal, of Heidelberg.

³⁴ Mahāniddeśa Pāli 89, 17.

³⁵ "Ajjato paṭṭhāya hatthīhi kātabbam karissāmi" ti evaṃ uppanna-cittā hatthīnaṃ gamanākāraṃ, tiṭṭhanākāraṃ, nisīdanākāraṃ, sayanākāraṃ, uccāra-passāva-karaṇākāraṃ, aññe hatthī disvā soṇḍam ussāpetvā gamanākāraṃ ca sabbam karonti ti hatthi-vatikā. Before aññe a sentence containing *eke* ('some') seems to be missing. As with the cynomaniacs at Majjhima-Nikāya I 388, 7, the aim of religious endeavour of these people was to become a *deva*. Daniel Ingalls considers cynomaniacs etc. to be shamans manqués (Cynics and Pāsupatas: the seeking of dishonour. In: *Harvard Theological Review*, LV (1962), p. 296).

³⁶ Dr Paul Dundas has discussed the elephant ascetics at the conference on Jainism and the Environment held at Harvard Divinity School in July 1998 in a paper with the title "The Limits of a Jain Environment Ethic" which will appear in the Proceedings of this conference in due time.

³⁷ T: *sadukkaram*.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alsdorf, Ludwig (1974) *Kleine Schriften*. – Wiesbaden.
- Balbir, Nalīn (1985) The monkey and the weaver-bird: Jaina versions of a pan-Indian tale, *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 105(1): 119–134.
- Basham, Arthur L. (1951) *History and Doctrines of the Ājīvikas*. – London.
- Bollée, Willem B. (1977) *Studien zum Sūyagada I*. – Wiesbaden. – (Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts; 24).
- Bollée, Willem B. (1988) *Studien zum Sūyagada II*. – Stuttgart. – (Schriftenreihe des Südasien-Instituts; 31).
- Bollée, Willem B. (1993) Le Végétarisme défendu par Haribhadrasūri contre un bouddhiste et un brahmane. *Wagle and Watanabe*: 22–28.
- Bollée, Willem B. (1998) *Bhadrabāhu, Brhatkalpaniryukti and Sanghadāsa, Brhatkalpabhāṣya*. – Stuttgart. – (Beiträge zur Südasienforschung. Südasien-Institut Universität Heidelberg; 181, 1–3).
- Bronkhorst, Johannes (1986) *The two traditions of meditation in ancient India*. – Stuttgart. – Alt-und Neu-Indische Studien 28.
- Brough, John (1962) *The Gāndhārī Dharmapada*. – London. (London Oriental Series 7).
- Caillat, Colette and Kumar, Ravi (1981) *La Cosmologie Jaina*. – Paris.
- Deleu, Jozef (ed.) (1978) *Nāyādhammakahāo*, see Schubring 1978.
- Dundas, Paul (1997) The Meat at the Wedding Feasts: Kṛṣṇa, Vegetarianism and a Jain Dispute. – Toronto. – (The 1997 Roop Lal Jain Lecture). The Limits of a Jain Environmental Ethic (in press).
- Gardin, Jean-Claude (1984) Die Ursprünge der Kuṣāṇa-Keramik, *Ozols und Thewalt*: 110–126.

- Glasenapp, Helmuth von (1925) *Der Jainismus*. – Berlin.
- Gokhale, B. G. (1951) Some obscure cults, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* Bombay. New Series 26(2): 174–179.
- Grierson, George (1885) *Bihar Peasant Life*. – Calcutta.
- Handiqui, Krishna K. (1949) *Yasastilaka and Indian Culture*. – Sholapur.
- Handiqui, Krishna K. (1965) *Naiṣadhacarita*. – Poona.
- Hopkins, Edward (1915) *Epic Mythology*. – Straßburg.
- Jacobi, Hermann (1886) *Ausgewählte Erzählungen in Māhārāṣṭrī*. – Leipzig.
- Jacobi, Hermann (1895) *Jaina Sūtras II*. – Oxford. – (Sacred Books of the East xlv).
- Jacobi, Hermann (1970) *Kleine Schriften*. – Wiesbaden.
- Jones, J. J. (1952) *The Mahāvastu II*. – London.
- Kane, Pandurang Vaman (1974) *History of Dharmaśāstra II*, 1. – Poona.
- Linke, Elfrun (1998) Glossary of Schubring's *Doctrine of the Jainas*. in: *Bollée I*: 374–411.
- Norman, Kenneth R. (1990–1996) *Collected Papers I–VI*. – Oxford.
- Norman, Kenneth R. (1996) *The Group of Discourses II*. Oxford. – (Pali Text Society Translation Series; 45).
- Norman, Kenneth R. (1997) *The Word of the Doctrine*. – Oxford. – (Pali Text Society Translation Series; 46).
- Ozols, Jakob und Thewalt, Volker (eds.) (1984) *Aus dem Osten des Alexanderreiches*. – Köln.
- Prakash, Om (1961) *Food and Drinks in ancient India*. – Delhi.
- Saletore, Rajaram N. (1943) *Life in the Gupta Age*. – London.
- Schlingloff, Dieter (1962) *Die Religion des Buddhismus I*. – Berlin. – (Sammlung Götschen; 174).
- Schrader, Friedrich Otto (1902) *Über den Stand der indischen Philosophie zur Zeit Mahāvīras und Buddhas*. – Leipzig.
- Schrader, Friedrich Otto (1973) *Introduction to the Pāñcarātra and the Ahirbudhnya Samhitā*. – Adyar.
- Schubring, Walther (1962) *The Doctrine of the Jainas*. – Delhi.
- Schubring, Walther (1978) *Nāyādhammakahāo* ed. by J. Deleu. – Mainz. – AdWL. 6.
- Strauss, Otto (1925) *Indische Philosophie*. – München.
- Thibaut, George (1890) *The Vedānta Sūtras of Bādarāyaṇa* – Oxford. – (Sacred Books of the East xiv).
- Yamazaki, Moriichi and Ousaka, Yumi (eds.) (1995) *A Pāda Index and Reverse Pāda Index to Early Jain Canons*. – Tokyo.
- Wagle, Narendra K. and Watanabe, Fumimaro (eds.) (1993) *Studies on Buddhism in Honour of Professor A. K. Warder*. – Toronto. – (South Asian Studies Papers 5).
- Weber, Albrecht (1867) *Über ein Fragment der Bhagavatī II*. – Berlin. – (Abhandlungen der königl. Akademie der Wissenschaften 1866).

Heidelberg
Germany