Words for violence in the “Seniors” of the Jaina Canon*

Colette Caillat

In the opening sloka of the Dasaveyāliya (one of the “seniors” of the Jaina canon), homage is auspiciously paid to the Law — which is said to be the best word to begin with — and to three of the fundamental elements of the right conduct, viz. non-violence, self-control, austerity:

*dhammo mangalam ukkatham, ahimsa samjamo tavo.*

As a matter of fact, while tracing the way to Perfection or total emancipation, Jainism strives to free the individual souls and the world from misery and from cruelty. Violence, therefore, is condemned, and all the more so as it is prone to pervade almost all human activities. It is referred to by means of several recurring expressions or words, some of which, though quasi-synonyms, can be shown to be used with slightly different shades of meaning, or to be preferred in specific contexts or phrases.

It is proposed, here, to review some of these expressions, verbs and verbal nouns, especially *daṇḍa* (āya-daṇḍa, daṇḍam (sam)ārambhai, etc.), and *pāṇāvāya* (pāṇe aivāei, aivāya); moreover the verbal and some nominal forms from the roots *HAN* and *HIMS*. Concerning the two latter, it will be seen that the two verbs are sometimes exchanged, and that *hiṃsai, hiṃsā* never have a desiderative meaning.²

It will appear that any (violent) enterprise can more or less be summarized as starting with *daṇḍam* (sam)ārambhai and ending with *hiṃsā*; a chronological order which will be followed here.

The present survey will be limited to the “seniors” of the Śvetāmbara canon, i.e. to the Āyāranga, Sūyagaḍa, Uttarajhāya, Dasaveyāliya. It is submitted as a tribute to a scholar who made himself known thanks to his “Lexical addenda from Rājaśekhara’s Prabandhakoṣa”, and who, in his study
of the Viyāhapannatti inserted many remarks which add much to our knowledge of the Jaina vocabulary.

1. dāṇḍa

_Dāṇḍa_, the compounds _dāṇḍa-samāyāṇa_ and _āya-dāṇḍa_, and the expression _dāṇḍam_ (sam)ārambhai will be considered first.

1.1. As far as _dāṇḍa_ is concerned, it is a designation of the “stick”, “club” or “staff”, in MIA as well as in OIA.³

The _dāṇḍa(ga)_ even features as one of the items in the Jaina monk’s paraphernalia.⁴ It is also seen to be an offensive “weapon”,⁵ and one of the insignia of power. Hence it can mean the “blow”, physical, moral or spiritual, and the punishment (fine . . . ). More generally it refers to any act of violence. Further, thanks to the various implications derived from its primary meaning, the word lends itself to puns.⁶

There can be no doubt that in many Jaina contexts, _dāṇḍa_, the “stick”, is a weapon used to hit or “strike” (HAN). It is associated with arms (_sattha, śastra_),⁷ with fights and matches,⁸ with various means and instruments which serve to attack, e.g. Mahāvīra or the Jaina monks during their peregrinations. The word can initiate (more or less standard) lists, as it does in the ballad relating Mahāvīra’s life, at the end of _Āyār_ 1:

> haya-puvvō lattha dāṇḍenām adu vā muṭṭhinā adu phalenām  
> adu leluṇā kavālenām,⁹  
> “he was struck with a stick, the fist, [a lance, hit with] a fruit, a clod, a potsherdf”.¹⁰

Thus, even when _dāṇḍa_ alone is used, the word can be pregnant with all the kinds of objects and means with which to deal fierce blows. Hence _dāṇḍa_, an instrument of violence, will also, more widely, denote “violence” or “cruelty”, especially when modifying verbs which mean “to seize, resort to”,¹¹ or, conversely, “to throw away, leave”. For the transition is easy from “he has laid down the rod” to “he has foresworn violence”, “he abstains from
cruelty”, as can be seen from such compounds or expressions as nikkhitta-
danḍa, “having thrown away the d.”,12 or again, savvehi pānehi nihāya
danḍam,13 nihāya danḍam pānehim,14 “having laid aside (all) weapon (i.e. 
violence / cruelty) against (all) living beings”.15

As a matter of fact, a series of more or less violent activities, listed in Sūy 
2.2.4 ff. (JAS 694 ff.) can be assimilated to the taking up of as many danḍas 
(danḍa-samāyāna, d.-samādāna). They amount to the blow of “a stick hitting 
one’s own (people) or others” (sva-paropaghāta-rūpaṁ danḍam). According 
to the commentator, “one thrusts the danḍa” (danḍam iva danḍam 
upari pāṭayati, prāny-upamardaka-rinim kriyāṁ karoti.17

1.2. The five aggressive undertakings, danḍa-samāyānas, are alleged to 
be 1) aṭṭhā-danḍa, “prompted by (personal) interest”, 2) aṇaṭṭhā-d., not 
prompted by (personal) interest”, 3) hiṁsā-d., “in response to an (alleged) 
injury,18 4) akamhā-d., “accidental”, 5) diṭṭhi-vipariyāsiya-d., “prompted 
by an error of sight”.19

Whatever the variety of danḍa-samāyāṇa, it is clear, in the light of the Sūy 
sutta and T developments, that danḍa implies grave, sometimes mortal 
injury.20 Those who are guilty of such aggressions are here and there quoted as: “se hanta chettā bhettā lumpaṁta vihaṁta uddavatā” (Sūy 2.2.6 = 
JAS 696), “he knocks down, cuts, pierces, breaks, plunders, puts to death”.21

1.3. Such being the implications of danḍa, anyone who is said to be 
āya-danḍa, i.e., according to the Jaina tradition, ātma-danḍa,22 is to be seen 
as inflicting fatal blows upon himself. SūyT explains: “because he punishes / 
strikes himself, he is ā.: for, in reality, though he hits other people, he hits no 
other than himself” (ātmānam danḍayatity ātma-danḍah sa hi paramārthatah 
paropaghātenātmānam evopahanti 105, ad Sūy 1.7.9 = JAS 389).

The above interpretation might seem defendable considering the Amg 
phonology and the Jaina general doctrinal teachings. For āyā (āyā ∼ atta) is 
not rarelty the Amg counterpart of Sk ātman;23 and the boomerang effect of 
any aggression is often emphasised, for instance in the Sūy.24 To support 
this analysis it might also be possible to refer to the parallellism of the 
two even clausulas in Sūy 1.7.9. (JAS 389): āya-danḍe (b) “who harms his
own soul” (cf. Jacobi) / āya-sāe (d), “for the sake of their own pleasure” (Jacobi).

But if the immediate context of the āya-daṇḍa occurrences is considered, the meaning “self-destructive” is seen to be unsatisfactory (infra). On the contrary, the etymology recently proposed by W.B. Bollée fits perfectly, and can be further corroborated.

He notes that the word is restricted to Sūy, where it occurs mostly in triṣṭubhs (6 occurrences); that Jacobi differs in its rendering: sometimes “wicked”, but generally, “who does harm to his own soul” or an equivalent periphrase. The first translation seems to have been suggested by the context, the second is obviously based on the traditional exegesis as handed down by the commentaries, in which the explanations are mostly similar to that of SūyṬ 105 (supra); once, nevertheless, the Sk equivalent is quoted as being āyata-d..

The solution is arrived at thanks to a comparison with Pa atta-daṇḍa, evidently the counterpart of the Amg āya-daṇḍa. For atta-d., the Pa commentaries record two different etymons (cf. CPD I 97b): 1) atta-daṇḍa, mfn. (= gahita-d.) = Sk āṭṭa-d. (cf. Uv infra), “with uplifted staves”, 2) atta-d., m. / n. (= attano duccarita-) = Sk āṭma-d., “(due to) one’s own violent acts”.

In fact, there can be little doubt that both Pa words reflect the same Sk āṭta-d.. It will be borne in mind that the phonetic evolution here assumed for Sk āṭta- (*āta, āda, āya) is comparable with that of ātman (*ā(t)ta(n), ā(t)iḍa, āyā. Perhaps, even, the wording of Sūy 1.7.9 (supra) is the result of a pun based on the existence of these (possible) Amg homonyms. This nicety would have been forgotten later.

As far as the Amg material is concerned, Bollée concludes his survey by stating that an interpretation āya-(d.) = āṭma-(d.) “though nowhere semantically impossible is not cogent anywhere and therefore not completely satisfactory”.

As a matter of fact, from a detailed analysis of the Sūy occurrences it results that, in more than one passage, the meaning “self-destructive” is not in line with the context whereas “brutal, violent” tallies perfectly. To wit, the three following stanzas (from Sūy):
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je iha ārambha-nissiyā āya-dāṇḍa eganta-lūsagā
gantā te pāva-logayaṁ (1.2.3.9 = JAS 151),

translated by Jacobi as: “Those who engage in undertakings, who work the perdition of their souls, and who kill (living beings), will go to the world of the wicked”; but by Bollée, more convincingly: “rücksichtslos, aggressiv und grobschä digend”. The three adjectives, though not strictly synonyms evidently consider similar behaviours, in a sort of ascending progression: 1) being immersed in activities, 2) having an aggressive, a brutal demeanour, 3) utterly destroying the environment.²⁸

Sūy 1.7.9 (JAS 389) will be examined next:

...vināṣayante bīyāi, asaṃjaya āya-dāṇḍe—
ahāhu: se loe aṇajja-dhamme bīyāi je hiṃsai āya-sāe,

thus translated by Jacobi: “By destroying seeds ... a careless man does harm to his own soul. (The prophet) says: ‘People are wicked who destroy seeds for the sake of their own pleasure’”.

But, given the structure of the stanza, it is obvious that the statement is aimed not at the personal (future) fate of the culprit, but at his present violent conduct and lack of self-control which cause damage to the surroundings: “destroying the seeds (vināṣayan bījāni), unrestrained (a-saṃyataḥ), violent (ātta-d.), —<these people (sa lokaḥ) do not abide by the noble Law (anārya-dharmaḥ), who injure seeds (yo ...bījāni hinasti) for their own pleasure>”. The three qualifications asaṃjaya, āya-dāṇḍa, aṇajja-dhamma translate into other terms the actions definitely expressed by the present participle vināṣayante and the finite verbal form hiṃsai. In such a context, the meaning “self-destructive” for āya-dāṇḍa would disrupt the semantic chain, and make the general meaning clumsy, whereas “violent, cruel” fits perfectly in the context.

Finally, the triṣṭubh 2.6.25 (JAS 811), notes how absurd it would be to bring together or equal two opposite characters, on the one hand (25a–b), him who is “innocuous” (aḥiṃsaka), “compassionate towards all creatures” (sarvaprajānukampin), “well grounded in the Law” (dharma-sthita), on the other (25c) the āya-dāṇḍas. Here again the stanza evidently requires that the
alleged behaviours can be paralleled: just as the first part refers to the attitude shown towards living beings, in the same way āya-ṭ. will mean “who has seized the weapon (against), attacked, (others)”; the sense then appears to rejoin that of hiṃsaya:

ahimsayaṃ savva-payāṇukampī dhamme ṭhiyaṃ . . .
tam āya-dāndeḥī samāyarantā abohie te paḍirūvaṃ eyaṃ,
“Him who kills no (living beings), who has compassion on all creatures, who is well grounded in the Law . . ., him you would equal to these wicked men! This is the outcome of your folly” (Jacobi).29

1.4. The expression daṇḍaṃ (sam)ārambhai, “to undertake, to engage into, acts of violence”, will now be considered. The inherited verbal noun ārambha, “undertaking, exertion”, occurs frequently in the Aṅg texts. In Śūy it is often coupled with pariggaha (parigraha, “property”), and the pair refers to the activity or enterprise on the one hand, and its result, acquisition(s), on the other.30 As far as ārambha is concerned, it is almost from necessity bad.31 For it is directed towards the objects of the senses and satisfaction of desires,32 it diverts from self-control and from the Law.33 In fact, ārambha as well as pariggaha characterize the householder’s unrestrained way of life.34

When daṇḍa is the object of the verbs ārambhai, samārambhai, the phrase amounts to “to set in motion, to hurl, a daṇḍa in the form of strokes, torture, etc.”, ‘daṇḍaṃ’ saṁghaṭṭana-paritāpanādi-lakṣaṇaṃ ‘samārabheta’ pravartayet,35 i.e. “to engage into, to busy oneself with, acts of violence”. The aggressive activities thus implied are to be viewed as damageable for both the patient and the agent: knowing this, a wise man (mehāvi), “fearing violence, will not undertake acts of violence”,

no daṇḍa-bhī daṇḍaṃ samārabhejjāsi.36

The phrase no daṇḍaṃ samāra(m)bhe(jjā) occurs especially when it comes to the solemn renunciation of violence against the six classes of jīva-nikāyas and in similar contexts. The renunciation is currently said to be threefold, ti-daṇḍa-virao,37 in that the speaker pledges not to engage into
aggressive actions himself, not to cause others to do so, nor to let them do so: n'eva sayām eehīm dāndām samārabhējā, n'ev' anēhīm eehīm kāehīm dāndām samārabhēvejā, n'ev' anēhīm kāehīm dāndām samārabhante vi sāmanujānejā.\(^{38}\) It is also threefold in that it involves thought, speech and deed:

\[no \text{ tesim ārabhe dāndām maṇasā vayasa kāyasā c'eva.}\(^{39}\)

2. (--)ātipāta

In Dasav IV the aforesaid pledge is presented, on the one hand, as the consequence of the teachings concerning the (six classes of) jīva-nikāyas,\(^{40}\) on the other, as the general introduction to the extant text of the five “great vows”. More precisely, though n'eva . . . dāndām samārabhējā can have a general bearing, the phrase seems to introduce more specifically the first mahāvrata, viz. “the abstention from injuring any [living] being”, paḍhame, bhante, mahavvāe: pāṇḍivāyāo veramaṇān.\(^{41}\) In Dasav, the vow further runs thus: “O my master, I renounce all injury against any being ././. I [shall myself] not injure any living being, nor cause it to be injured by others, nor allow others who injure it, to do so”.\(^{42}\) Whatever the expanded formula, the initial sentence of the Jaina mahāvāya is very similar to the wording of the first “training precept” taught in the Buddhist Pa canon:

\[pāṇātipātā veramaṇā-sikkhāpadaṇṭ samādiyāmī (Khp II 1),\]
\[“I undertake the training precept of abstinence” from “killing breathing things”.\(^{43}\)

The Pa – Amg parallelism would tend to show that the association of MIA pāṇa, “a breathing, living being”, with the action noun Pa ātipāta, Amg aivāya is usual, and probably old, although in Sk prāṇātipāta appears not to be frequent.\(^{44}\)

The corresponding verbal phrase is not rare in Amg. It occurs, for instance, in the prohibition expressed in Utt 8.9 = JAS 217,
pāra ya nāvāejjā,

which (curiously) does not precede, but follows the recommendation not to permit the killing of living beings,

na hu pāṇa-vaham anujāne (ib. 8.8 = JAS 216).

In Śuy the phrase is clearly recognizable (in spite of the apocope affecting the preverb), e.g. in 1.1.1.3a (JAS 3a), where it refers to the first part of the threefold mahāvaya, whereas forms of HAN (or of a cognate word), “to strike”, are used for the complementary second and third parts of the prohibition:

sayām tivāyae pāṇe adivā annehī ghāyae
hanantaṃ vānujānāi . . .

“if a man kills living beings, or causes other men to kill them, or consents to their killing them . . .” (Jacobi).

It is seldom that the verb occurs without the modifier pāṇe. According to the JAS reading, it is so used in Śuy 1.5.1.22d (JAS 321d):

. . . tikkāhī sūlāhī tivāyayanti,

“they destroy with sharp pikes”\(^{45}\); but the usual reading 'bhītāvayanti would here seem preferable (= 1.5.2.10a = JAS 336).

Because of the apocope the commentators are prompted to propose two etymologies: they admit that ti- can be the MIA counterpart either of OIA tri-, “three”, or of the OIA preverb ati-.\(^{46}\) In fact, in spite of this ambivalent gloss, and even though the preverb ati- is of limited and comparatively archaic use in OIA,\(^{47}\) they certainly equate Amg (a)tivāei with the Sk causative atipātayati (cf. PW 4.396, s.v. PAT [ati-, caus. 3 “hinraffen”]). But perhaps they were taking in a more or less specialized (technical ?) sense, “to make fall beyond (recovery)”, “to utterly destroy, kill”.\(^{48}\) On the other hand, perhaps at one stage, it was felt desirable to disjoin the two meanings: 1) “to let fly beyond”, “to shoot (an arrow) through”, and 2) “to destroy, injure”; hence the canonical Pa tendency to specialize atipāteti in the first
sense, while preferring (pāṇaṇa) atimāpeti for the second.\textsuperscript{49} Even then, atipāteti is a common Pa v.l., as it is naturally supported by the corresponding nominal compound pāṇātipāta.\textsuperscript{50}

As for Amg aivāya, Pa atipāta ("injury"), it is seldom encountered outside the above compound; and the nominal construction is exceptional. Only a few clear instances can be quoted, mostly from Sūy 1:

\begin{quote}
\textit{sattham ege susikkhanī aivāyya pāṇiṇaṇa} (1.8.4 = JAS 414),

"some learn the teaching\textsuperscript{51} thoroughly, up to the destruction of living beings".
\end{quote}

As for the absolute use of the noun, when it occurs, it is soon followed by the compound:

\begin{quote}
\textit{[a]ivāyaō kīrai pāvakamman}

pāṇāivāya virae ṭhiy' appā (10.5c-6d = JAS 477f.),

"killing generates bad karman / . /

(one should have) ceased killing living beings, (should be) of settled mind".
\end{quote}

Again, in 1.16 (JAS 635), pāṇa is easily supplied in the list of the catchwords referring to the mahavvayas, and in any case the compound occurs soon afterwards:

\begin{quote}
\textit{ādāṇam ca aivāyaṃ ca mūsā-vāyaṃ ca l. / viřae pāṇāivāyō}.\textsuperscript{52}
\end{quote}

Further, in Sūy 1.5.1.5a (JAS 304) = 1.7.8d (JAS 388), the adjective aivāī also appears to have the verbal construction, as it is accompanied by the plur. acc.:

\begin{quote}
pāgabbhi pāṇe bahu naṃ tivāī.\textsuperscript{53}

"the impudent sinner, who injures many beings" (Jacobi).
\end{quote}

Concerning the meaning of pāṇāivāya there is no special discussion. Having accepted atipātayet prāṇān as the Sk rendering of Amg (a)iivāyae pāne, Ṭ adds that the prāṇas have been taught to be ten; that to suppress them amounts to himsā.\textsuperscript{54} Another equivalent would be vyāpādayati, "to cause to perish, destroy".\textsuperscript{55} Yet another gloss is given ad Sūy 1.10.5 (supra):
prāṇa-vyaparopana, "to tear breath, life, out"\textsuperscript{56}; and there is every reason to regard as a synonym pāṇa-vaha, used in Śūy 2.6.26(δ) f. (JAS 812 f.). Moreover, it will be remembered how, in the third stanza of Śūy (a)jvāyae pāṇe is seen to be in complementary distribution with various forms of HAN. Thus both the verbal phrase and nominal compound denote the utter destruction of beings, and emphasise the violent process which results in the final suppression of breath and lives.

3. HAN

Turning to HAN, attention will be called 1) to the vitality of this root, and 2) to some stereotyped phrases showing the meaning of the verb.

3.1. Several verbal forms of this root have already been met with. More can be added (whether without, or with, preverbs). The present stem has been remoulded generally following the normal MIA pattern. Most forms are listed in Pi 499, are comparatively common and easily accounted for. Only a few will need some comment. In Āyār, Śūy, Utt, Dasav, the following occur.

In the ind. pr., the 3 pl. is currently of the "thematic" type: haṇanti. The tradition also hands down vi-ni-hanti (mandā), Śūy 1.7.16 (JAS 396), which is accepted in all editions and Pi 499 ("im Verse")!, without explanation; T renders it as 'vinighnantī' vyāpadayanti (107); only the Cu apparently had some misgiving, as it writes viheḍhanti\textsuperscript{57}; this vinihanti probably results from a blend of the old (Sk) 3 sg. hanti with the usual MIA 3 pl. ending.\textsuperscript{58} In the 3 sg. haṇai (Utt 20.44 = JAS 747) is influenced by the "9th" present class, in the same way as bhanāi is seen to be (Pi 514), whether in Amg or in Pa.\textsuperscript{59}

Further, in a somewhat confused passage of Āyār, hammai appears to be taken as an active 3 sg.\textsuperscript{60}:

\begin{quote}
na hammai kaṃcaṇāṃ savva-loe.
\end{quote}

The imper.2 sg. / pl. haṇa, haṇaha are frequent.

So are, in the optative, haṇe, haṇejja (passim). According to the ctt, in Utt 18.49 (JAS 599), pahaṇe is to be understood as a preterite (= prāhan, prahatavān).\textsuperscript{61} One instance of the old "athematic" type (Sk hanyai) is
quoted from Āyār p. 15.10* (=1.3.2.4, cf. Pi 464): haṇiyā. A third type (a blend of the “thematic” and the “athematic” opt.) appears to have been in use: in Utt 2.27b (JAS 77) most editions (Ee JAS Gurgaon) write:

\[\text{samaṇṭḥ...haṇeįjā koi...}\\\]

“should any one hit a samaṇṭḥ”;

but the ĀgS ed. (168) has haṇiįjjā, quoted as pāṭha in JAS. Though not very frequent, this “double optative suffix” did certainly exist in (early) MIA. Several examples occur. As a matter of fact, several, whether in Pa or in BHS and in the Asokan Pk., are from HAN. CPD I (s.v. asṇāṭi) quotes haṇṇe (A IV 254.17*, v.i. hāṇe [both - ]; cf. vi-hāṇe, Sn 348). The Subaśi Uv 5.18 (ed H. Nakatāni) also seems to write (haṇ)nṛy(e). Further there is little doubt that in Asoka’s Major Rock Edict XIII (N) Erragudi na haṃṇesu, Shahbazgarhi na haṃṇeyasu are to be taken as opt. active, “let them not kill”.

For the present participle the base haṇa-nta is generalized (despite the nom. sg. haṇ-ה, Sūy 2.1.24 = JAS 657, or the acc. pl. haṇ-ו (Āyār p. 31.3 = 1.6.4.2).

Also in the active, Āyār has the 3. pl. “aorist” nihaṇiįmsu, in the series lūsiįmsu...kandiįmsu...luncįmsu...uvakariįmsu...nihaṇiįmsu...khalaiįmsu...,”they attacked...howled at...struck...” (p. 43.12* ff. = 1.8.3.9.; cf. Pi 516).

The passive is not rare, with many instances of the present indic. and participle, normally hamma(nt)i63: uva-hammaṭ (Dasav VII.13), vinihammanti (Utt 3.6 = 102), and hammanāṇa (cf. Pi 540). For Utt 22.19 (JAS 806), the pāṭha hammihinti (future 3 pl., cf. Pi 549) is recorded in one ms. and the ctt. On the other hand Sūy 1.11.37 (JAS 533) has the opt. vinihanneįjā,64 possibly from a rival passive stem.

Though perhaps comparatively late, a passive hanna- base, albeit ignored by Hc 4.244, seems to be generally accepted.65 It can be compared with khanna- (Erz; quoted Pi 420) and could be a reflex of the OIA passive. If these forms have any authenticity, then the pattern taught by Hc (cf. n. 63) will have to be supplemented: hammai haṇįjjai hannai, khammai khaṇįjjai khannai.

The caus. is also well exemplified, whether in verbal forms, ghāya, Sūy
1.1.1.3 (JAS 3), or in nominal forms, pres. participle or absolutive: 
\textit{ghāyamāṇe} \textit{\textemdash} \textit{ghāyamīṇe} (Āyār p. 31.3 = 1.6.4.2), \textit{ghāyūttā} (Sūy 2.1.24 = JAS 657).

Verbal nouns are derived from the root: \textit{āhantuṇ} (Āyār p. 43.2* = 1.8.3.4); moreover the frequent kṛtya (na) hantavva, the agent noun hantā.

Whatever its original derivation the action noun \textit{ghāya} (ghāta) is also common, especially in such phrases as \textit{ghāyam enti} (Sūy 1.1.3.3 = JAS 62), or \textit{ghāyam uvei} (1.5.1.5 = JAS 304), further \textit{vinighāyam ei} (1.7.3 = JAS 383); the word is generally glossed \textit{vināśa}.

To the above list can be added various more or less technical terms, e.g. the name of the “destructive” ("ghāi") categories of karman, (Utt 29.7 = JAS 1109), or words denoting the final “destruction”, desintegration of the body at the hour of death, \textit{sammugghāya}, sometimes \textit{āghāya} (Utt 5.32 = JAS 161), etc., which need not be examined here.

As for \textit{*ghannu} (used in the instr. sg., Utt 18.7d = JAS 557) and (a-vi-\textit{-})\textit{hannu} (used in the nom. sg. -\textit{hannū}, Sūy 1.2.2.5d = JAS 115), they will be examined elsewhere.

3.2. Several of the above forms occur in stock-phrases built with verbs endowed with closely related meanings: the ctt try to define the different shades separating them. According to their explanations, the specific meaning of \textit{HAN} is “to strike” (with a club, a whip, etc.), “to hit violently”.

The verb is more than once mentioned at the start or towards the beginning of a chain of words expressing acts of violence which end in killing. Several of the clichés are met with in prose developments, in Āyār 1, and in Sūy 2. E.g.:

\begin{quote}
\textit{savve pāṇā savve bhūyā savve jīvā savve sattā na hantavvā na ajjāveyyavvā na parighettavvā na pariyyāveyyavvā na uddaveyyavvā,} \\
“all breathing, existing, living, sentient beings should not be struck, nor be commanded, nor crushed, nor tormented, nor slain”.
\end{quote}

Slight lexicographical variations, and amplifications can be introduced:

\begin{quote}
\textit{mama l. l daṇḍena vā l. l āudijjamāṇassa vā hammanāṇassa vā tajjijjamāṇassa}
\end{quote}
vā tādījjamānassa vā parītāvijjamānassa vā kilāmijjamānassa vā uddavijjamānassa vā l. l evam l. l savve pānā l. l āūdījjamānā . . . .73
“(as is my pain when I am) knocked or struck with a stick, l. l or menaced, beaten, burned, tormented . . .” (Jacobi).

Elsewhere, HAN is associated with several other roots, especially CHID, BHID, DAH, e.g., in the stanza Sūy 1.5.1.6 (JAS 305):

‘haṇa chindaha bhindaha naṃ dahaha’.74
“beat, cut, split, burn him” (Jacobi).75

Blending two formulas, Āyār 1 writes (p. 15.29*-16.1* = 1.3.3.2):

se na chijjai na bhijjai na ḍajjhai
na hammai kaṃcāṇaṃ savva-loe,
“one is not cut, nor slit, nor burnt,—one does not strike any one in the whole world”.76

Again, with the verbal nouns, Āyār p. 7.1 (= 1.2.1.3; cf. 11.19 = 1.2.5.6) writes:

se hantā chettā bhettā lumpittyā vilumpitta uddavettā uttāsaitā.77

In spite of the various distinctions alleged by the commentators the root HAN appears to have had a general meaning: it is liable to express any form of aggression, of violence, torture (as in the Naraga-chapter, Sūy 1.5), etc., including those which result in death. In fact the above lists could probably be further developed, for they only detail the possible implications of HAN — which, so to say, is the key-word for this semantic field. As a matter of fact, when HAN occurs outside stock-phrases, the ctt do not hesitate to define it as meaning “to harass, destroy . . .”.

One of the most frequent synonyms is the caus. of vyāPAD, e.g., when explaining Sūy 1.2.1.12c (JAS 100):

pāṇe na haṇanti savvaso,
T (38) writes: ‘na ghantī' na vyāpādayanti; cf. ‘hanyante' vyāpādyante, 135 ad 1.11.18 (JAS 514); similarly hantā (Sūy 2.1.17 = 651) is glossed vyāpādako bhavati (T 186).

It is also noteworthy that, in the gloss of 1.2.3.21a (JAS 163):

tiviheṇa vi pāṇī (v.l. -a) mā hāne,

T refers to the first mahavvaya, prohibiting “pāṇāivaya”, (T 51).78

For the passive, equivalents in SūyT are pīḍyante, “are oppressed, harassed” (93 ad 1.5.2.17 = 343; pīḍyamānāḥ, 110 ad 1.7.30 = 410); or tāḍyamānāḥ, naṣṭāḥ, “wounded, destroyed, perished” (88 ad 5.1.20 = 319).

Further it will be remembered how parallel Jaina and Buddhist canonical passages seem to waver between HAN and HIMŚ.79 SūyT admits the synonymy, e.g. in the gloss of 2.1.24 (= 657): according to the canonical text the nāstikas maintain that there is nothing reprehensible if one “buys and causes to buy, kills and causes to kill, cooks and causes to cook” (Jacobi), se kiṇam kiṇāvemāṇe, haṇam ghāyamāṇe, payam payāvemāṇe — for which T (189) adduces the following equivalents: ‘ghnan' himsan, ‘ghātayan' vyāpādayan.80

Such glosses actually confirm the wide semantic extension of HAN.

4. HIMŚ

4.1. It has just been seen how, in the ctt, various forms of HAN have sometimes been glossed by the corresponding forms from HIMŚ; moreover, how, in several canonical pādas, HIMŚ and HAN have been exchanged.82 Further the Cu also replaces HAN by HIMŚ when quoting Utt 6.6c (= 167), the vulgate text of which is

na hane pāṇino pāne,

“do not strike (out) the breaths of the breathing”, i.e. “do not deprive the living being(s) of life”, “do not kill”.

The related Cu changes to the (unmetrical)
no himsēja pānīnaḥ pāne,\textsuperscript{83}

though the mūla text was probably well established, to judge from the later rendering by Bhāvavijaya,

na hanyāt prānīnaḥ prānān (= indriyādīn) (p. 118).

Conversely, the adjective himsā (himsrā),\textsuperscript{84} is explained as sva-bhāvata eva prānīghātaka, “destroying living beings, due to precisely one’s own disposition”.

Further the ctt do not hesitate to gloss himsai, etc., with the same vyāpādayati, which they give as a synonym of ‘hani’\textsuperscript{85}; or with paritāpayati, “to torment”, which occurs in one of the clichés headed by forms of HAN.\textsuperscript{86}

But himsā is also regarded as one of the possible equivalents of pānāvāya: commenting upon Sūy 1.1.1.3 (= 3) sayam tivāya pāne, Ṭ states that to deprive of the ten breaths, i.e. life, is himsā: prānā daśāte bhagavadbhir utkās, teśām viyojj-karaṇām tu himsā.\textsuperscript{87}

Canonical pādas already admit this equivalence, which is clear in various enumerations of Utt, e.g. 35.3 (= 1434):

\begin{quote}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{tah’eva 1) himsām 2) aliyaṃ 3) cojjam 4) abbaṃbha-sevaṇaṃ,}
\item \textit{5) icchā-kāmaṇaḥ . . . saṃjao parivaijjae,}
\end{itemize}

“a restrained monk should abstain from killing, lying, stealing, carnal intercourse, from desire . . .” (Jacobi);
\end{quote}

or again, 21.12 (= 775):

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{1+2) ahimsā saccaṃ ca 3) atenaṃyaṃ ca}
\item \textit{tatto ya 4) baṃbhaṃ 5) apariggaṃaṃ ca.}\textsuperscript{88}
\end{itemize}

The corresponding adjective Amg himsā (himsra) also can imply a reference to the initial mahāvāya, as in Utt 5.9a (= 138) = 7.5a (= 183):

\begin{quote}

\textit{himsē bāle musā-vāī . . .}
\textit{. . . . ‘seyam eyaṃ’ ti mannaṛ,}

“killing, lying, an ignoramus / / considers this the best (thing to do)”.
\end{quote}
Evidently musā-vār refers to the second great vow (not to lie), and himse (himśraḥ) to the first.

4.2. Can the above lexical choices be accounted for?

As far as avāya is concerned, it has been seen to be of limited use: it occurs mostly in the compound pāṇḍāvāya, is certainly felt to be archaic and technical; moreover it does not seem to be possessed of a regular privative counterpart, whereas the pairs himśa: ahimsā, or vishṇa: a-vishṇa are well established.

As for HAN, though the nominal derivation does not seem to have been extremely productive in the seniors of the Jaina canon, the verbal forms are conspicuous for their great number and variety. By contrast the paradigm of HIMS is relatively poor, as the following examples show.

Apart from the usual pr. ind. 3 sg. (vi)himśa ~ (-himśae) (Āyār, Sūy, Utt, Dasav), the opt. (vi)himśejja is commonly met with (ib.); Āyār 1 also has three occurrences of the 3. aor. himśi(mṣu). Moreover, Dasav uses the part. pr. vishṇsanto, and Āyār 1 the (exceptional) ahimsanāndo (p. 44.13* =1.8.4.13).

Leaving apart these forms, a noteworthy sequence associates, in the 3. person (sg. / pl.), the aor., pres., and future. Similar phrases, whether positive or negative recur:

app-ege ‘himśiṣu me’ tti vā vahanti, app-ege ‘himśanti me’ tti vā vahanti,
appege ‘himśsanti me’ tti vā vahanti (Āyār p. 5.16 = 1.1.6.5),

“some people kill (animals) thinking ‘they have injured me, injure me, will injure me’”.

The negative counterpart occurs Sūy 2.2.6 (= 696.1):

‘no himśiṣu me’ tti, ‘no himśanti me’ tti, ‘no himśsanti me’ tti.

Is it because HIMS is associated with the first of the great vows prohibiting all injury? It is remarkable that the verbal forms of this root are often used in negative sentences, as can be seen in the pādas where HAN and HIMS are exchanged⁹⁰; similarly the nominal forms derived from the same root are
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commonly privative compounds — a characteristic underlined, consciously or not, in the above sophisticated sequence ahimṣā saccam... just quoted from Uttarajñāyā.

The parallelism between the nominal and verbal expressions is particularly clear in such phrases as

\[
na \text{ hiṃsai } \text{ kiṃcanaṃ} \text{ (Sūy 1.1.4.10 } [= 85] = 1.11.10 [= 506 } \text{ kaṃcanaṃ } ] \sim \\
na \text{ hiṃsae } \text{ kaṃcana } \text{ savva-loe, (1.5.2.24 } [= 350])
\]
and

\[
savve \text{ ahimṣiyyā } \text{ (Sūy 1.1.4.9 } = 84; \text{ v.l. -ayā; } Cu \text{'-agā' } = \text{ ahimṣaniyāni, quoted JAS p.15 n.4) } \sim \\
savve \text{ na-} \text{ hiṃsayā. (1.11.9 } = 505 Cu \text{ ahimṣagā)}
\]

To some extent the presence of the negative or privative particle underlines the definite aspect of  
HĪMS \(^{91}\); therefore emphasises the total exclusion of injury, and the actual positive bearing of the above pādas.\(^{92}\) The negative predicate also enhances the definition of the true brāhmaṇa proposed in Utt 25.23 (= 974):

\[
\ldots (\sim)pāṇe \text{ viyāṇitā } \ldots \\
jo \text{ na } \text{ hiṃsai } \text{ tīvheṇaṃ } \text{ taṇ } \text{ vayaṃ } \text{ būma } \text{ 'māhanaṃ', }^{93} \\
\text{ "he who thoroughly knows living beings }/./ \text{ and does not injure them in any of the three ways, him we call a Brāhmaṇa" (Jacobi).}
\]

The positive implications of such grammatically negative expressions are all the more conspicuous as the negative sentence is often preceded or followed by some corresponding affirmative counterpart. Exactly as

\[
\text{ ahimṣā } (+) \text{ saṃjamo tavo,}^{94}
\]

"non-injury - self-control, asceticism" are extolled in Dasav I.1 (supra), attention is called, in Āyār p. 31.11 (= 1.6.4.3) on those "who abstain from injury — are true to the vows, calm",

\[
\text{ avihimṣe } (+) \text{ suvvae dante.}^{95}
\]
A perfect complement or periphrase is provided by Sūy 2.6.5 (= 811), where ahimsaya is expanded by savva-payānukampī (sarva-prajānukampin), “who has compassion on all”, followed by dhamme ṭhiya (dharme sthita), “well-grounded in the Law”, and contrasted with āya-daṇḍa “brutal”, “violent”96: undoubtedly the positive aspect of ahimsā is already emphasised in the old canonical scriptures, so clearly that the later authors will quote them when teaching dayā, “compassion”.97

In the above passages it can be seen how grammar, vocabulary, style combine to impress upon the Jaina mind the necessity to respect and spare all life, “not to injure” (na HIMŚ) the living: there is little doubt that the seniors of the canon insist on “non-injury” (ahimsā) so consistently that from the start Jainism can be termed a doctrine of non-violence, ahimsā-samaya.98 There is no denying that ahimsā is an old concept in the Indian traditions: H.-P. Schmidt has shown how it has originated, has evolved, has been transformed, enriched, and has become essential in India.99 But it is no less certain that from the beginning it was central in the Jaina system, which has explored it indefatigably. As far as the seniors of the canon are concerned, it is clear that the vocabulary relating to (non-)violence is particularly rich. Some terms appear to be archaic, technical and of limited use, thus pāṇādivāya, which seems to refer to the destructive process itself. Others have a comparatively wide semantic range, thus HAN, which moreover, is abundantly used also because of its grammatical vitality. As for the aggressive process, its beginning is expressed by such phrases as daṇḍam (sam)ārambhai, while the verbal and nominal forms of HIMŚ point to its final result.

In a way these two last expressions refer to the two essential moments characterizing brutal and cruel undertakings, which they summarize, as they do in Asoka’s fourth Major Rock-Edict when the emperor contrasts his own benevolence with his predecessors’ brutal behaviour. Girnar writes: (A) vaḍhito eva prānāraṁbho vihimśa ca bhūtānaṁ; (C) aja vaṛhite [sic] /. / anāraṁbho prānānapaṁ avihīsa bhūtānaṁ, “killing of animals and injury of livings beings were only made to grow; now on the contrary . . .”. In this antithetic statement, prānāraṁbho and anāraṁbho prānānapaṁ mark the initial phase of the conduct which had previously ended in vihimśā, but now culminates in perfect benevolence, a-vihīsa. Thus the Jaina phraseology
Words for violence in the “Seniors” of the Jaina Canon could help to penetrate the implications of the imperial message and of the old Indian statements concerning violence.

ABBREVIATIONS:

LANGUAGES: Amg = ArdhMaṅgala; BHS = Buddhist Hybrid Sanskrit; Gdh = Gāndhārī; JM = Jaina Māhārāṣṭrī; MIA = Middle Indo-Aryan; OIA = Old Indo-Aryan; Pa = Pāli; Sk = Sanskrit.

NOTES

1. Dasav I.1: "The best word to begin with, is Dharma. [Dharma consists in] non-violence, self-control and asceticism" (Schubring).


4. Cf. Lehre 145; Dasav ch. IV, Ec 617.15 = JAS 54; Åyäk 2.2.3.2.
6. Ācār 1, gloss., s.v.: “Strafe und Gewalttat”.
7. Dasav IV.2.8:
   
   *danda-sattha-parijunna,*
   
   “ill-treated with sticks and sharp instruments” (Schubring). — Compare, in
   Pa, PED, s.v. *danda* 4.
8. Åyäk p. 40.27* = 1.8.1.8:
   
   *danda-jujjhām mutthi-jujjhām* ,
   
   “fights at quarter-staff and boxing-matches” (Jacobi).
9. Åyäk p. 43.13* = 1.8.3.10.
   
   Compare Sūy 1.3.1.16 = JAS 180:
   
   *dandaṇe saṃvī mutṭhiṇā adu phalenā vā;*
   
   or, in Åyäk 2.1.3.4 = JAS 342:
   
   *dandaṇa vā atṭhīṇa vā mutṭhiṇa vā . . . abhihaya-puvve bhavai;*
   
   further Utt 12.18 = JAS 377:
   
   *eyam khu dandaṇa phal(ana)ṇa hanta*
   
10. Cf. Åyäk p. 40.25* = 1.8.1.7:
    
    *haya-puvvō tattha dandaheṁ lūsiya-puvvō appa-punneheṁ,*
    
    “he was beaten with sticks, and struck by sinful people” (Jacobi).
11. Compare PED, s.v. *danda*.
12. Åyäk p. 19.11 = 1.4.3.1; p. 27.5 = 1.6.1. Cf. SBE 22, 39 and n. 1; 53.
    
    Compare nikkhitta-sattha; and similar bahuvrīhis in Pa, PED, s.v. *danda* 4.
14. Åyäk p. 35.9 = 1.7.3.1; p. 43.7* = 1.8.3.7.
    
    Compare Pa nidhāya dandaṁ bhūtesu, Sn 629 = Dhp 405, cf. PED, s.v. *danda* 4.
15. For a similar evolution, v. *salla* (*sālya*), “dart”, “piercing sting (of evil)”, etc., Utt
    19.91b (JAS 696):
    
    *danda-salla-bhaesu ya niyatto,*
    
    “he turned away from injurious, hurtful, and dangerous actions” (Jacobi).
    
    Compare PED, s.v. *salla*.
16. Ṭ equates nisirati with nisrjati (!) = nikṣipati.
17. SūyṬ 205.3 f., Ṇ Sūy 2.2.5 (JAS 695).
    
    In this passage Jacobi renders *danda-samāyāṇa* with “sinning”, “committing
    sins”: a somewhat loose translation; but in Åyäk p. 7.29 = 1.2.2.3, with “violence
    is done” (“wird Gewalttat gehandhabt”, Worte 74).
18. “Sinning by slaying”, Jacobi. But this translation does not tally with the development of Sūy, māmaṃ va ... hīṁśisumu vā hīṁsai vā hīṁsisai vā, tanm dandaṃ ... sayam eva nisirai, 2.2.9 (JAS 697), cf. SūyṬ, ghāṭayīśsyātītī evaṃ matvā ... vyāpādayīśvātītī matvā, 206.7 ff.

19. Cf. Jacobi’s translation in SBE.

20. Compare ‘hīṁśisumu’ vā ‘hīṁsai’ vā ‘hīṁsisai’ vā, tanm dandaṃ ... nisirai ..., Sūy 2.2.9 (JAS 697), and app’ege ‘hīṁśisumu me’ tī vā vahanti, app’ege ‘hīṁsantī me’ tī vā vahanti, appege ‘hīṁsissanti me’ tī vā vahanti, Ayār p. 5.16 f. = 1.1.6.5, where “to slay” (VADH) is the counterpart of dandaṃ ... nisirai (supra, n. 18).

21. On these formations, Pi 582; Āćār 98 (gloss. s.v. lampaittar- “pitṛ-, ubi alia).

22. “Who is a d. to himself”, or “who does harm to his own soul” (Jacobi, infra), “self-destructive”: an etymology accepted in the ĀgŚK, s.v. -Compare n.36.


24. Cf. Sūy 1.7.2 (= JAS 382), etc.


26. Cf. the quotations from Sūy CuṬ in BSS II ib. – Prof. S. Insler calls my attention to the existence of Vedic compounds like udyata-daṇḍa, udyatāyudha, udyatāstra (in a personal letter, 30.7.1991).

27. Pa 1. atta-d. (glossed gahita-d.) occurs in an old floating śloka (Dhp, Sn, S); Pa 2. atta-d. is isolated (Sn 935).

From Sk Bollée quotes only atta-śastra and āttāyudha, but āttā-d. also occurs (cf. PW 3.571, s.v. DĀ, ā-DĀ 4, quoting Šakuntalā 105; glossed gṛhitā-d.). Moreover, it is used in Uv 33.39:

aviruddho [sic] viruddhesu tv āttā-daṇḍesu nirvṛtah,

the BHS counterpart of Dhp 406:

aviruddham viruddhesu atta-daṇḍesu nibbutam,

“peaceful among those with uplifted staves” (Radhakrishnan), “who have embraced violence” (K. R. Norman), “among the violent” (I. B. Horner-Rahula) for Sn 630.

The interpretation by āttā-d. is warranted by GDbp 29b:

atta-daṇḍesu nivuddu;

for in Gdh ata can only continue Sk āttā, whereas ātman is represented by atva
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(c.f. Brough, index and §53). Thus, in Buddhism, the linguistic etymology appears to have survived.

28. Cf. KEWAI s.v. lūṣati and 3.111, on Amg lūs-, “brechen”, finally “verletzen”. – Compare the proximity of ā. and lūsanti in Sūy 1.3.1.14 (JAS 178).

29. Again, in 2.6.23 (JAS 809), āya-d. appears as so to say summarizing the preceding statement, in which an aggressive behaviour is described:

ārambhayaṃ c’eva pariggaḥaṃ ca aviussiyā nissiya, āya-danḍā,
‘ārambhaṃ’ . . . ca tathā pariggaḥaṃ ca ‘avyutṣṭyā’ aparityajja . . . tasminn
evārambahhe . . . parigrahe ca . . . avabaddhoh niḥśrutāḥ (T 264), “not having abandoned activities and properties, being entangled . . . , being ā.” For further details (on 1.3.1.14, 1.7.2), cf. my article in Bulletin d’Études Indiennes 7 (supra n. 25).

For JAS 827b (= 2.6.41) ihāya-d. read ni(d)hāya danḍaṃ (cf. T 266–7).

30. Cf. Sūy 2.6.23 (supra n. 29); 1.9.2 f. (JAS 438 f.). Similarly, sārambha sa-pariggaḥa, Sūy 2.1.43 f. (JAS 677 f.); or the privative appārambha + appa-pariggaḥa, 2.7.21 (JAS 860). Further, the secondary adjectives ārambh(n), pariggah(n), 1.9.9 (JAS 445: nārāmbhe na pariggaḥ). For the possible pejorative meaning of ārambha, compare CPD s.v. c): «initial effort», energy, persevered; «evil act, offence, injury»; further 1. ārabhaṭi, «to begin», and 2. ārabhaṭi, «to take hold of, seize, grasp; to attack (in the sense of ‘to kill, sacrifice’» – referring to Sadd 409.6 ff. ‘hiṃsā’). – Cf., in the Brāhmaṇa prose, ā labhate, H.-P. Schmidt, op. cit. 646.

31. pāvovagā ya ārambhā, Sūy 1.8.7 = JAS 417;

compare the sequence in Sūy 1.2.3.9 = JAS 151:

je iha ārambha-nissiyā āya-danḍā eganta-lūṣagā,
“those who engage in undertakings, . . . and who kill (living beings)” (Jacobi).

32. Cf. Sūy 1.9.35 = JAS 471 (concerning, in the privative, men):

agiddhe sadda-phāsesu ārambhhesu anissie,

“not longing for sensual pleasures, not engaged in works”.

33. Sūy 1.10.16 = JAS 488:

ārambha-sattā gaḍhiyā ya loe, . . . dhammaṃ na yāṇanti,
“those occupied with works and held in worldly bondage . . . do not know the Law”.

34. Cf. Sūy 2.1.43 f. (= JAS 677.1–2): iha khalu gāratthā sārambhā sa-pariggaḥā, sant’ egaiyā samāna-māhaṇā sārambhā sa-pariggaḥā, je ime tasa-thāvarā pāṇā te sayan samārambhanti, annena vi samārambhāventi, annaṃ pi samārambhantam samanujāṇanti. -iha khalu gāratthā s. s., sant’ egaiyā s.-m. vi
s. s., je ime kāma-bhogā sa-cittā vā a-cittā vā te sayam c'eva parigīṅhanti, anēna vi . . ., “Here, indeed, householders are killers (of beings) and acquirers of property, and so are even some śramaṇas and brāhmaṇas. They themselves kill movable and immovable living beings, have them killed by another. . . /They themselves acquire sentient or senseless objects of pleasure . . .” (Jacobi).


36. Āyār p. 34.5 (= 1.7.1.5).

37. Utt 20.60 (JAS 763).

38. Āyār 1.33.28–34.2 (= 1.7.1.5). Cf. Dasav IV Ee 615.13 ff. = JAS 41 ff. :

    icc esīṃ chanḥam jīva-nikāyānaṃ n'eva sayam daṇḍam samārambhējā, . . . jāvajīvāe tivihām tivihēam maṇēam vāyāe kāṇēam na karemi na kāraṇemi karentam pi annam na samanujānām,

    “Towards these six groups of souls he should not perform any act of violence himself . . . As long as I live I [shall] not perform [an act of violence] in [one of the] three ways, viz. with mind, . . .” (Schubring’s translation, 84).


40. Benevolence is an obligation as soon as it has been recognized that “earth-bodies” etc. are sentient beings, which suffer and dislike pain, etc.

41. Āyār 2.15 I (p. 132.34) = Dasav IV p. 615.20 (JAS 42).

42. savvaṃ bhante pāṇāvīyaṃ paccakkhami // n'eva sayam pāne aivāejjā, n'ev' annehiṃ pāne aivāvējā, pāne aivāyante vi anne na samanujānejjā, jāvajīvāe tivihām tivihēam . . . - Cf. paccakkhami savvaṃ pāṇāvīyaṃ // n'eva sayam pāṇāvīyaṃ karejjā 3 . . ., Āyār 2 p. 131.32 ff.

43. Nāṇamoli’s trsl., 19 f.

44. Cf. PW, s.v. – With Pa pāṇātipāta compare Asoka IV (A), infra.

45. Cf. ‘nipātayanti’ tti vindhanti (Cu, quoted JAS p. 57 n. 15); cf. (ib.) the v.l. nivāyatanti; further atitpayanti apanayanti (Śīlākka, quoted ib.). – Most ed. prefer the reading ‘bhitāvayanti’ (LSJA, Gurgaon, Jain Vishva Bharati), cf. not only 1.5.2.10a (JAS 336; compare the v.l. JAS p. 59 n. 19); but also (a)bhitaventi and (a)bhitapamānā in 1.5.1.13: the root TAP is certainly expected in a Naraga-chapter. Jacobi translates: “torment”.

46. ‘tribhyo’ mano-vāk-kāyabhya āyur-bala-sarīrebhyo vā ‘pātayet’ cyāvayet ‘prānān’ prānīnaḥ; a-kāra-lopād vā ‘atitpātayet’ prānān iti, cf. ŚūṬ 9, “should one deprive beings of their three (constituents, viz. manas, . . ., or span of life, . . .); or (rather) given the disappearance of a-1, should one knock the breaths

47. Renou, Grammaire sanscrite, 139 §111.

48. In PW and DCD the references for this meaning are to Šuśruta and Caraka. Further, Prof. C. B. Tripathi calls my attention to atipāta, denoting an incurable disease (cf. DCD, s.v. E ii; I).

49. CPD I s.v. atipāteti, atiṃāpeti.

50. Which survives in Sinhalese, paṇivā (CDIAL 8931).

51. The treatises (śāstra), or / and the (practice of) arms (śastra), cf. Jacobi, SBE 45, 298 n. 1.

52. Possibly aivāya occurs also in two or three difficult or uncertain passages of Āyār 1 (cf. Schubring's Glossar).

53. The particle nāṃ seems to have sometimes been taken as the gen. pl. ending.

54. SūyṬ 9, infra. Cf. the Cu ad Āyār p. 41.13*: aivājjai jeṇa so aivāo, hiṃṣ'āi (cf. Schubring's Glossar, s.v. aivāiya).

55. SūyṬ 9.

56. SūyṬ 127.

57. Quoted ad loc. in JVBh; and in JAS (headsā vibādhane bādhante ity arthah) p. 71 n. 8.—Compare pāṇa-bhūya-viheḍhinō, Sūy 1.8.4 (JAS 414).

58. For the neutralisation of the opposition 3 sg. / 3pl., Pi 515; 518; 459; etc. CPD I s.v. atthi (p. 111).

59. Here in the opening of a triṣṭubh:

   hanāi sattham jaha kuggahīyaṁ (20.44b)
   hanāi veyāla ... (d),

   "as a weapon injures if awkwardly handled, as a Vetāla injures ...". For hanāti in Pa, cf. PED s.v. hanati, referring to Ja V 461.28* (Burmese v.l. hanati); further VI 210.32* yo hanāti (triṣṭubh cadence), quoted Sadd 398 n.e, q.v.; cf. 1541.38.

   For Pa bhaṇāti, paṭībhaṇāsi (Ja*), Sadd 1647, s.v. bhaṇati. On 3 sg. ind. pres. -āti, IF 75 (1970) 302; also infra n. 74.

60. Āyār p. 16.1* = 1.3.3.2 (v.l. hannai); cf. SBE 22 p. 32, n. 3; Worte 84. About hammāi, "aktivisch", Schubring, Glossar, refers to Hc 4.244 [hammāi hanājjai and hammāi hantīy arthah]. In the notes of his edition he compares Sūy 1.5.2.24 (= 350):

   na hiṃsate kaṃcāna savva-loe.

Cf. further, Sn (515):

   na so hiṃsati kanci (v.l. kimci) sabba-loke (515); and
   na ca bhikkhu hiṃseyya kanci (v.l. kimci) loke (368).
Also see Mvu 3.395.16*:

*na ca so himsati kamci loke.*

61. Quoted JAS p. 175 n. 2. – On this usage, Überblick 445, referring to Pi 466; 515; Nalini Balbir, in Dialectes dans les littératures indo-aryennes, Paris 1989 (ICI 55), 509 ff., ubi alia.


Another possibility would be to assume a MIA active present base *harya- haṅṇa*- (cf. Pi 487 f. on the present -ya- stems in Prk). But this seems less likely.

63. For the passive of HAN and KHAN, Hc 4.244 teaches hammai haṇijjai, khammai khaṇijjai; in the future hammiihii haṇiihii, khammi hi khaṇihii (Pi 540). Consequently, in his edition of Utt 2, Charpentier always writes (-)hamm- even “in spite of all the MSS.” (sic, Ee p. 287, ad 2.17; 22). As a matter of fact, a passive stem hanna- seems to have spread in the mss. tradition, which is normally followed by JAS. Compare, e.g. in Utt 2: JAS 67 vinihannījā (v.l. vihammejjā, Ee 17 -mm-); 72 vihannejjā (no v.l., but Ee 22 -mm-); 96 vihannejjā (Cu nihaṇejjā [sic], Ee 46 -mm-). But Charpentier has evidently overlooked the existence of a “double optative suffix” and of a possible intransitive value of vi-ni-HAN (cf. n. 62; 64).

64. For Sūy 1.11.37 the vulgate reads:

*aḥa ṇaṇ vaya-m-āvannaḥ phāsā uccāvayaḥ phuse
na tesi vinihannejjā – vāṇēva Mahāgiri,
* (LSJA, JAS, Gurgaon); but the Cu (quoted JAS p. 95 n. 2):

na tehiṃ vinihannejjā.

In fact, according to the PrTS ed of Sūy I (with Bhadrabāhu’s Niryukti and Cūṇi by anonymous writer, ed. Punyavijaya, Ahmedabad-Varanasi 1975, PrTS 19), the Cu quotes ‘na tehiṃ vinihannejjā’, and comments thus: na tehi udinnehi vi nāṇa-dāṃṣaṇa-caritta-samjuttāo maggāo vinihannejjā. Sūy is therefore taken as meaning: “should troubles (‘sparśāḥ’ = pariśahopasarga-rūpāḥ) befall him who has entered the vows (vratāṇi āpannam, Cu), he will not, because (if when) they (have surged up), be struck away (from the Path), no more than the Great Mountain (is) by the wind” (but tesu ~ tehiṃ probably only mean “on these
occasions").

But T appears to take the above -hannejjā as an opt. active (= vihanyāt, cf. supra and n. 62): sa ca sādhus tair abhidrutah /. / na tair anukūla-pratikūlaír
vihanyāt, nalva samyamānuśṭhānān manāg api vicalet (138), “due to these
pleasant or unpleasant (circumstances) he should not ruin, he should not swerve
from the practice of self-control”. The Sūy śūtra and corresponding T have an
exact parallel in Utt 2.17c (JAS 67), warning against the 8th parīsaha (women!):

no tāhiṃ vinihannejjā (v.l., Ee-mm-),
glossed by Śāntisūri as atipātayet, ātmānam iti gamyate (152 f.), “should not
utterly destroy (viz. the Self)”. Could this ‘no vinihannejjā’ = nalva vinihanyāt
continue an old formula with the active verb used absolutely: “he should not
-crash, collapse, break down in front of them”; or “he should not strike at them”?

– Other remnants of this usage exist: they are dealt with in a forthcoming paper.

65. For a passive stem hanna-, see PSM, s.v. haña (passive: hammai / hannai); also
the Cūrṇi reading (-)hanna- for (-)hamma-māṇe, quoted by Schubring ad Āyār p.
32.22 = 1.6.5.6. – For Hc 4.244, see n. 63.

66. 3.sg. opt. – Compare Sūy 1.1.1.3a–b (on which supra):
sayam tīvāyae pāñe aduvā annēhi ghāyae

. . . . . . . . . . veram vaḍḍheī appaño

and Dasav VI 10d:
na hane no vi ghāyae;

further Āyār p. 15.19 (= 1.3.3.1) = 25.24 (= 1.5.5.4):
tamhā na hantā na vi ghāyae.

Cf. Schubring Gl, s.v. ghātay, referring to Sn 705d,
na haneyya na ghātaye.

The same pāda recurs in various versions of the Dhp: Pa Dhp 129; cf. “Patna
Dhp” (ed.G. Roth) 203:
neva hamyye na ghātaye;
Uv Subaśi 5.18:
(han)ny(e) n(a) ghātayet;
Uv (ed. Bernhard) 5.19:
nalva hanyān na ghātayet;
compare Mvu 3.387.13*:
nalva himse nā ghātaye.

In the above passages the opposition between han- and ghātaya- is in evidence,
and functions like the usual opposition between the simple and the causative
stems. Cf. also Sūy 2.24 (JAS 657): se kiṇaṃ kiṇāvemāne, haṇaṃ ghāyamāne,
payān payāvemāne, “buys and causes to buy, kills and causes to kill, cooks...” (Jacobi). – On the discussions concerning the etymological relationship between HAN and ghātaya-, KEWAI 3.576 f.

67. “Problematisch bleibt die Auffassung der ghāt-Formen”, KEWAI ib.

68. On ghātī, Lehre §87.

On the complete “knocking out”, annihilation of karman particles and their ejection at the time of death (māraṇ'āntiya sammugghāya), ib. -89. – In Utt 5.32b (JAS 161), the verbal construction of āghāya (in the dat. + acc.) will be noted:

aha kālaṁni sampatte āghāyāya samussayaṁ,
(vināśāya l. / kārmaṇa-dehasya, Bhāvavijaya), “when the time for quitting the body has come” (Jacobi). The privative an-āghāya is applied to a “smooth” death which generates no injury, Utt 5.18 (= 147).


70. Cf. SūyṬ 92 ad Sūy 1.5.2.9 (JAS 335): hanyante mudgarādibhiḥ; etc.; Worte 96 and n. 1 (ad Āyār p. 25.20 = 1.5.5.4). Cf. infra n. 72; 73.

Obviously, in the present Jaina contexts, the connotations of HAN differ from those which seem to prevail in the RV and AV, according to Saverio Sani, “Valore semantico e identificazione di funzioni: il verbo hanti nel Ṛgveda e nell’ Atharvaveda” in Studi e saggi linguistici 30, Supplemento alla Rivista “L’Italia dialettale”, 53 (N.S. 30), Pisa 1990, 61–77. [Compare L. Renou, JA 1939, 167 n. 1: HAN almost exclusively said of gods who strike, destroy their enemies.]

71. Āyār p. 17.19 (= 1.4.1.1), etc.

72. na hantavyāḥ daṅda-kaśādibhiḥ, l./l nājnāpāyitavyāḥ l./l, na parigrāhyāḥ l./l, nāpadrāvayitavyāḥ praṇa-vyaparopaṅataḥ, ĀyārṬ 119.

73. Sūy 2.1.48 (JAS 679); ‘hanyāṁnāsya’ kaśādibhiḥ, Ṭ 199.

74. V.I. daheha (metrically correct). Should one read this imper. as dahāha? – Cf. khamāha (bhante), Uut 12.30 f. (= 389 f.; quoted Pi 471), and dalāha (majjhaṁ), 12.12 (= 371), both in a ṭriṣṭubh cadence. – Also supra n. 59. SūyṬ 86 specifies: ‘hata’ mudgarādinā, ‘chinta’ khaḍgādinā, ‘bhinta’ sūḷādinā, ‘dahata’ mumarādinā.

75. Cf. Sūy 2.1.17 (= 651) = Āyār p. 34.26 (= 1.7.2.4).

76. With Āyār p. 16.1* compare the pādas quoted supra n. 60.

77. Cf. Schubring Gl, s.v. lumpaittar.

78. Ṭ 51: prathamam idaṁ mahāvratam. Also see supra n. 65.

79. Cf. supra n. 60.

80. Compare n. 66.
81. SüyṬ 189 (ad Süy 2.1.24).
82. Cf. n. 60; 66.
84. On Ved. hiṃsrā- “verwundend”, AiG 2.2.851.
85. Cf. supra, and, on the other hand, SüyṬ 85 (ad Süy 1.5.1.4 = 303), 104 (ad 1.7.5 = 385), etc.; na kam api prāṇinaṁ ‘hiṃsyā’ na vyāpādayet, 94 (ad 1.5.2.24 = 350, na hiṃsae).
87. SüyṬ 9, cf. supra section 2.
88. “Not to injure, to tell the truth, not to steal, to be chaste, not to hoard property”. Cf. ahimsā satyam astainyam, Baudhāyana DhSū 2.10.18.2 = Manu 10.63, quoted in Schmidt, op. cit., 637 and n. 1, 628 and n. 1.
89. Cf. Süy 2.2.9 (= 697), ‘hiṃsīṃsu vā hiṃsai (v.l. -anti) vā hiṃsīssai (v.l. -anti) vā’. Cf. supra; also n. 58.
90. Cf. n. 60; 66; 93.
91. From SüyṬ 9 (supra) it follows that HIMS points particularly to the physical injury resulting from violence; cf. Süy 1.1.2.25, opposing he who intends (to kill) a living being, but actually does not do it; and he who unknowingly does injure one (merely in consequence of his physical activity):

\[
\text{abuho jañ ca hiṃsai}
\]  
(ajanānaḥ kāya-vyāpāra-mātreṇa yaṁ ca hinasti prāṇinaṁ, Ṭ 25).

The definite aspect of HIMS is clear: there can be little doubt that the result (not the intention) is in evidence (cf. Süy 1.7.5 [= 385]; 1.7.9 [= 389]).
93. The Buddhist counterparts use HAN:

\[
yo na hanti na ghāteti tam ahaṁ brūmi brāhmaṇaṁ,
\]
Sn 629 = Dhp 405; also GDhp 1.18:

\[
yo na hadi na ghadhedi tam aho bromi bramana;
\]
further, in part, Uv 33.36:

\[
yo na hanti hi bhūtānī bravīmi brāhmaṇaṁ hi tam.
\]
Compare mā haṇe, Süy 1.2.3.21a (JAS 163), supra.
94. Compare Uṭ 3.8 (= 104):

\[
\ldots \text{paḍivajjanti tavaṁ khantiṁ (+) ahimsayam,}
\]
"they practise asceticism, forbearance - non-injury".


In a sense, redundant expressions. Compare Utt 4.4 (= 117) vihiṃsā ajayā (vihiṃsra + ayata); 36.256 (= 1709); or the emphatic repetition, Dasav VI 28 ff. (= 290):

puḍhavi-kāyaṃ vihiṃsanto hiṃsaḥ tu tay-asse.

96. Quoted supra (cf. the discussion on āya-daṇḍa).

97. For details and references, R. Williams, Jaina Yoga, London 1963 (London Oriental Series 14), 70 f.

98. For a discussion on the morpho-syntax and meaning of the acc. ahiṃsā-samayam, Śūy 1.1.4.10 (= 85) = 1.11.10 (= 506), BSS I, 127 f.

99. Cf. Hans-Peter Schmidt, "The origin of ahiṃsā". – On ahiṃsā / dayā in Gautama Dharma Sūtra, 634; 655 (also underlining "the transition of the idea of ahiṃsā / dayā which was mainly concerned with bodily injury, to that of a general fellow feeling for all living beings").


Colette Caillat (URA 1058)