TEXTUAL PROBLEMS IN AN EARLY CANONICAL JAINA TEXT*

By Herman Tieken, Leiden

Recently several passages from the Sūyagāḍa were edited and translated by W. B. Bollée (1977). The text is generally considered to belong to the oldest layer of the canon of the Śvetāmbara Jainas. The passages describe, and subsequently refute, certain deviating worldviews. The Sūyagāḍa, like, for instance, the Āyāra, is a notoriously difficult text. Therefore Bollée (henceforth referred to as Bo.) felt justified in freely drawing inspiration from the interpretations found in the available commentaries, in casu the Cūrpī (Cū.) and the Ṭīkā (Ṭī.). A considerable part of the book is, in fact, concerned with the study of the interpretations found in these commentaries. This involves many discussions on the relation between these interpretations and the text itself which is often obscure. However, the traditional interpretations are hardly ever questioned. The result is, as I intend to show below, a text and translation which cannot stand criticism, and many superfluous notes.

In defence of Bo. it must be added that he merely follows a virtually established tradition, for there is scarcely an editor or translator of a canonical text, past or present, who does not admit to or show a similar dependance on the commentaries1. The hazards of the use of such secondary sources are well known from the other fields of indology and are generally acknowledged in these cases as well2. The fact that in the

---

* I should like to thank Professor O. von Hinüber for his criticism on an earlier version of this article.


2 See the literature quoted in the preceding note. The situation is summed up by Schubring (1935: § 43) as follows: 'Zum Verständnis der Texte tragen die Kommentare bei. Um sie zu charakterisieren, genügt es zu sagen, daß sie die
interpretation of texts like the Śāyāṇa and Āyāra the influence of the commentaries has remained decisive, even when they are often conspicuously mistaken, reflects the absence of an attractive alternative.

In the present article I intend to edit and translate, by way of example, a short passage of the Śāyāṇa, namely 1.1.1.1–11a, dealt with by Bo. and before him by Schubring (Sch.) and Jacobi (Ja.). I will primarily concentrate on the text and its variants in order to see how far one may get without the help of the commentaries, which will only be considered secondarily for the sake of comparison. This approach has yielded several important conclusions regarding the state of the text and the position of the commentaries vis-à-vis this text. These conclusions, which apply only to the passage under consideration, would seem by their very nature to merit a further investigation into their applicability in the case of the other early canonical texts as well.

In the first place it will appear that the text, which is in Ślokas and which in the commentaries as well as in all the existing translations is consistently broken up into verses as autonomous and independent units, should in several instances be divided differently. Some sentences presumably continue into the following verses, twice for the length of a Pāda and once for the length of a whole line. Considering that the passage consists only of 11 verses the number of instances is unexpectedly high, which raises the question if, and to what extent, this phenomenon is also present in the metrical parts of the other early canonical texts. At the same time the occurrence of enjambement, even if established only for this small piece of text, might have important consequences for the project carried out in Berlin, where a concordance is being prepared of the verses found in, among other texts, those belonging to the Śvetāmbara canon. From the reports available on the project it appears that the possibility of enjambement has not been included; see Bruhn–Tripathi (1970 and 1977).

Secondly it will be shown that the text is irremediably corrupt at two places, the original readings no longer being available. These corruptions have been completely overlooked by the previous editors and translators. In one place the corruption seems to be due to a simple copying mistake. The other has a more complicated origin. The corruption is found in a verse which shows a remarkable, if only superficial, resemblance to an apparently well-known verse found elsewhere in the canon. I suggest that the former verse has been subjected to a reinter-

Vorzüge wie die Mängel scholastischer Schriften aufweisen, also zu Wörtern und Begriffen die Auffassungen ihrer Zeit wiedergeben, die wir nicht vernachlässigen dürfen, der wir aber auch oft nicht folgen können'.
pretation in the light of the latter and that under the influence of this 'new' interpretation its text has been changed.

This instance is not unique. In a discussion of the variants available in the commentaries on the Dasaveyāliya C. CAILLAT (1981) has shown that the text was constantly being subjected to 'new' interpretations. Some of these interpretations would indeed seem to have been suggested by parallels. The problem with the instance referred to above is that the stage in which the revision took place apparently lies far beyond the beginning of the present textual tradition of the text, the original reading being no longer available among the variants. The revised text is also older than the commentaries, which are meant to elucidate it.

On the basis of a single clerical error in the Uttarajjāyā, which is common to all the available MSS and the commentaries, AILSDORF (1962: 133–4) has drawn the conclusion that the whole textual tradition of this text goes back to one single MS. The same conclusion may now also be drawn regarding the Śuyagāda. As already noted by AILSDORF (1965: 42) this conclusion is to a large extent corroborated by the traditional account of the transmission of the Śvetāmbara canon. According to the account the canon in its present form goes back to a council held in Valabhi 980 or 993 years after Mahāvīra's nirvāṇa. At this occasion a correct text was established, which will inevitably have involved commenting upon, and where felt necessary editing, the text. One of the reasons to hold the council seems to have been the paucity of trustworthy MSS; significant in this connection is the emphasis in the account on the subsequent activity of copying and distributing the text sanctioned at this occasion. This would account for the unanimity of the textual tradition.

From the above discussion it becomes clear that the commentaries on the Śuyagāda are relatively recent works. The text they commented upon had already a history of transmission as a written text, in the course of which it had incurred corruptions. Furthermore it appears that at the time the commentaries were composed the meaning of the text had been completely lost sight of as is shown by, for instance, their failure to recognize the instances of enjambment; instead the text

---

3 It is only in a rare case that it is possible to fix a more or less reliable date for a commentary. In this respect those on the Śuyagāda do not form an exception. The Čū., is anonymous. The date of Śilāṅka, the author of the Tī., is uncertain. It is generally assumed that the Čū. are older than the Tī. (see AILSDORF 1965: 38, and 1977). This assumption is, however, solely based on external evidence, the use by the Jainas of Prākrit, as seen in the Čū., otherwise preceding that of Sanskrit, as seen in the Tī.
was rather automatically broken up into verses. For the interpretation of the text the commentators could apparently not revert to existing older commentaries but had to start as it were from scratch. Their task was therefore certainly not an enviable one. However, while there is no reason to doubt the sincerity of the intentions of the commentators it has to be concluded that the way they bequeathed themselves of the task is often very immature. For instance, in the interpretation of words they let themselves be led by the vaguest possible associations and speculations. They seemed prepared to accept the most fanciful derivations and to recognize the most far-fetched meanings only in order to get rid of their own embarrassment with the text. As a result the commentaries abound in ad hoc solutions. It follows that one cannot expect to derive any useful information from the commentaries, at least as far as the literal meaning of the text is concerned. In any case, the dependance on the commentaries as has hitherto been shown, however half-heartedly and reluctantly, is in no way justified.

Below follow the edition and translation of Śūyagaḍa 1.1.1.1–11a. It should at the outset be mentioned that the passage has been selected in the first place for its textual problems. After an introduction of five verses in which in a rather discursive way the matter of the causes of 'bondage' is taken up, a certain doctrine is quoted, and subsequently refuted, which maintains that the individual consists of the five so-called 'gross elements' (mahābhūtas). These alone are eternal. Thus, when the five elements disintegrate the soul disintegrates with them. In the refutation no arguments are wasted: an individual who has committed a sin suffers grief himself as a whole person⁴.

The basis of the following edition is formed by the text and the variants collected by Bo. His translation will frequently be referred to. Occasionally those by SCH. (1926: 122–3) and JA. (1895: 235–7) will be referred to as well. For the commentaries, the Cū. and Śīlāṅka's Čr., in as far as not already quoted by Bo., I refer to the Śūyagaḍa edited by PUṆṆAVIJAYA (PTS) and to the Śūyagaḍa edited by JAMBŪVIJAYA (Bombay, 1978) respectively.

Finally it may be mentioned that the existence of the corruptions referred to above, whether introduced consciously or unconsciously, makes the success of ever being able to reconstruct anything like a dependable text very small. In these cases the only course open is

⁴ Compare the equally terse way in which the nihilistic doctrine (11b–13) is refuted, in 14(f.): 'But those who speak in this way, where is for them a world to live in? They go from darkness to darkness; they are slow-witted people bent on harmful actions'.
conjecture, the outcome of which is inevitably arbitrary. However, this does not affect the arguments of the conclusion that in a particular place the text is most likely corrupt. Where below an emendation is suggested it should be seen as merely one of the possible starting-points in an attempt to show the origin of the supposed corruption or as one of the possible ways out of the apparently unsolvable problems of the text.

The first verse reads as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{buijhi} &= \text{ti} \text{tu} \text{ti} \text{ji} \text{ja} \\
\text{bandh} &= \text{ani} \text{am} \\
\text{par} &= \text{i} \text{ji} \text{n} \text{iy} \text{a} \\
\text{ki} \text{m} &= \text{ahu} \\
\text{band} &= \text{h} \text{an} \text{am} \\
\text{viro} &= \text{ki} \text{m} \\
\text{va} &= \text{j} \text{a} \text{na} \text{am} \\
\text{ti} \text{u} &= \text{ti} \text{ta} \text{i}.
\end{align*}
\] (1)

My translation, which differs considerably from Bo.'s, is the following: ‘Because one should become enlightened, one should conquer bondage. (In order to be able to do so) one should know what one calls “bondage” and how the Hero, who acted with intentness of mind, conquered (it, sc. bondage).’

The possibility that the two questions in the second line are dependent on pari\(j\)\(a\)ni\(y\)\(a\) has so far not been considered. The commentaries take the second line by itself. It would contain two questions Jambusvāmī put to Sudharmā. This interpretation has been accepted by the earlier translators. It leaves us, however, with a first line which is virtually untranslatable. The existing attempts are in any case not convincing. For instance, Silāṅka takes the optative pari\(j\)\(a\)ni\(y\)\(a\) as an absolutive. Compare Jā.'s translation, which is a paraphrase of Silāṅka’s commentary: ‘One should know [buijhi\(j\)\(ja\)] what causes the bondage [bandha\(n\)\(a\)\(m\)] of Soul, and knowing (it) [pari\(j\)\(a\)ni\(y\)\(a\)] one should remove it [tiu\(t\)\(t\)\(j\)\(ja\)].’

It is to be noted that Jā. does not translate the particle \(t\)\(ti\). It is possible that it was actually missing in his text, as it apparently was in the one translated by Sch., in which case, however, the text is unmetrical. The particle is completely misrepresented by Bo., his translation ‘so’ (‘Erwachen soll man und so frei werden’) being restricted to certain specific idiomatic constructions; see Speijer (1886: § 492) and CPD II, p. 277.

Both Bo. and Sch. translate tiu\(t\)\(t\)\(a\)- with ‘frei werden’. The origin of this translation is not clear. tiu\(t\)\(t\)\(a\)-, which goes back to Sanskrit ativrt-, usually means ‘to pass beyond’ (from there my translation ‘to conquer’) or ‘to escape’. There is no reason to assume a different meaning here. tiu\(t\)\(t\)\(a\)- is constructed either with an accusative (as here) or with an ablative (as in verse 5). The verb rarely occurs by itself; see in this connection the instances of Pāli ativattāti collected in CPD I, pp. 88–9. Occasionally, though, as here in the fourth Pāda, the substantive has to be supplied.
Bo. takes vīro as the subject of āhu (skt. āhū). He does not comment on the incongruity in number between the subject and the predicate. vīro should, despite its position before kiṁ vā, be included in the second sentence. For āhu Bo. notes a variant āha. However, āhu is to be maintained as the lectio difficultior, for in the present context a change of āha into āhu is not likely to have taken place.

The translation of the fourth Pāda requires some explanation. The problem is the present participle jāṇaṁ. Grammatically the most obvious translation would be ‘and by what knowledge (i.e. knowing what) the hero conquered (it, sc. bondage)’. However, in the light of what follows this hardly makes sense. Another possibility, which has been opted for here, is to assume jāṇaṁ is used absolutely. Other instances of this use may be found in Suttanipāta 1051: yo ye avidrā upadhiṁ karoti / punappuṇaṁ dukkhaṁ upeti mando // tasmā pajaṁ in upadiṁ na kayirā / dukkhassā jātiśabdhavānapassī // and 320: tathā eva dhammāṁ avibhāgajirā / bhavaśuddiṁ saṁsāmīyātthānā // saṁyojājāṁ avijñātakākho / kiṁ so pare sakkhato viṣhyattum // For later Prākrit, see ahaṁ in Saptasatakam, Gāthā 433. For the meaning assigned to jāṇaṁ here, ‘one who acts mindfully’ or ‘one who acts with intentness of mind’, compare especially Śuyagāda (ed. Bo.) 1.1.2.25: jānaṁ kāeṇ’ ahaṁ ca hiṁ saṁvajjānī / api saṁvedāḥ puṭṭho saṁvedāḥ param //, which should in my opinion be translated as follows:\footnote{How Bo.’s translation relates to the text I fail to see: ‘Wenn man zwar wissentlich [jānaṁ], aber ohne mit dem Körper Schaden zu verursachen, – und wenn man unbewusst [abuho] verletzt, ermahnt man die (Folgen dieser) religiöse(n) Verfehlung (nur) in beschränktem Umfang und wird höchstens (von ihr) gestreift’.}

‘Someone who acts with intentness of mind (jānaṁ) will not cause harm with his body, but if (jaṁ ca) someone who acts without intentness of mind (abuho) causes harm, his sin will not even be clear (to himself); when asked (about it) (puṭṭho), he will tell (saṁvedātha) some other person did it’.

In Bo.’s edition the second verse reads as follows:

cittamantaṁ acitthaṁ vā parijñijja kisām avi
aanām vā aṣṭānāṁ evaṁ dukkhaṁ na muceī. (2)

His translation runs as follows:

‘Wer Beseeeltes oder Unbeseeltes als Eigentum besitzt, wenn auch nur wenig,
– oder es einem anderen erlaubt – wird so nicht vom Leiden erlöst.’

The third Pāda is not grammatically integrated in the sentence. Sch. explains it as ‘eine störende Einfügung’. This explanation is taken up
by Bo., according to whom we have more in particular to do here with a cliché, namely an abbreviated form of the common formula ‘he himself (possesses), causes another/others (to possess) or allows (anuṣṭāṇī) another / others (to possess)’. However, other instances of the abbreviated form of this formula (see, for example, haṇantaṁ vānuṣṭāṇī in the following verse) show that in such cases anāna is omitted and not the participle denoting the action concerned. If anāna vā anuṣṭāṇī is not a cliché the explanation that we have to do here with an insertion becomes very unlikely.

In this connection I should like to suggest an alternative interpretation of the verse as a whole. Following the commentaries parīgījjaḥ has been taken as an absolute. It can, however, equally well be a gerundive to be read in a compound with kisām, i.e. parīgījjhasīm, ‘too thin to hold’; for the type of compound, see Wackernagel (1905: §95c.v. bhōjyalavaṇa ‘zum Genießen salzig’) and Renou (1968: §90, bhōjuṣna ‘trop chaud pour être mangé’). A full stop should be placed after anuṣṭāṇī which becomes the main verb of the sentence. In the present context a meaning ‘he showed favour to’ may be considered; compare PW, s.v. jū - anu (7) ‘sich Jmd. (acc.) gnädig erweisen, seine Gewogenheit an den Tag legen’. Consequently for dukkhāṇa muccai we should read dukkhāṇa muccai. For the genitive dukkhāṇa functioning as an ablative, see Spelker (1886: §126) and compare savākdukkhaṇa muccai(i) in Isibhāsiyāṁ, p.1 (=502), line 2. The verse should read:

cittamantakā caicitram vā parīgījjhasīm avi
anāna vā anuṣṭāṇī. evam dukkhaṇa muccai. (2)

‘To a being whether with or without a soul, even if it was (of the kind that is) too thin to hold,
or of any other kind he (i.e. the vīra) showed favour. In that way he was freed from all kinds of grief.’

Taken as such the verse gives a direct answer to the second question of the preceding verse. However, the present interpretation of the verse brings with it an entirely new problem. In the next three lines no subject is mentioned. On the other hand, the subject is clearly different from, if not the very opposite of, that of the second verse. In this connection it should be noted that the action ceram raḍḍhei appāna (3d) is otherwise explicitly ascribed to a ‘fool’; see Ayāra (JĀS), sū. 114 (ed.

---

6 In the paper MSS of Jaina texts a strict distinction is maintained between -v-, which occurs medially, and n-, which occurs initially. Bloch (1934: 79) has, however, noted that this distinction is the result of a secondary process of normalisation, the older palmleaf MSS having n initially as well. dukkhaṇa would first have been divided into dukkhaṇa, which latter word was subsequently written as na.
Sch. 1.3.3): *alaṁ bālassa sanīgenaṁ v.v.a.* This ‘fool’ is indeed mentioned but only as late as in 4c (bāle). Most likely it has to be supplied as the subject in verse 3. This abrupt change of subject in 3 is, to say the least, awkward and it probably accounts for the determination to interpret the preceding verse in a negative sense. A possible solution would be to maintain Bo.’s text of 2d: *evāṁ dukkkhā na muccai* ‘In the following way one is not freed from grief’. However, this use of *evam*, referring forwards, is as far as I have been able to check restricted to certain specific idioms; e.g. *evam me śrutam, evam śṛṣṭaye*. Furthermore, one would expect some kind of adversative particle. On the other hand, the change of subject may well be less abrupt as it appears. Thus, it is not unlikely that the mere mentioning of someone ‘who acts with intentness of mind’ already suffices to mentally prepare the reader for the mentioning of his opposite, namely ‘one who acts foolishly’. In this connection I may again refer to Sūyagāda (ed. Bo.) 1.1.2.25, quoted above, where one finds a *jānāṁ* immediately followed by his opposite, an *abuho*.

As already indicated above, in the commentaries the text is consistently broken up into verses as autonomous meaningful units. The same is done by Bo., Sch. and Jā. For the first two verses this appears to work. In my opinion in the case of the two following verses it does not work. Before discussing this problem Bo.’s text and translation may be quoted7:

```
sayaṁ tivāyae pāne aduva annachi ghāyae
hoṣantain vānujānāī veraṁ vaḍḍheī appano (3)
jaṁsi kule samuppamane jehiṁ vā samavesa nare
maninā loppai bāle anna-m-annehī mucchie (4)
```

Bo.’s translation runs as follows:
‘Wer selbst Lebewesen tötet oder von anderen töten lässt,
odem jemandem erlaubt zu töten, gegen dessen Person entsteht Hass
(oder: dessen “Sünde” wächst).’
‘In welchem Geschlecht jemand geboren ist oder mit welchen (Leuten)
man zusammenlebt –
von stets anderen verblendet bindet der Tor sich an diese (und) ist
verloren.’

At the outset it should be mentioned that I am unable to bring forward strong formal arguments why these four lines could not be broken up in this way. Also, I do not intend at this stage to discuss in detail the merits of Bo.’s translation. Some remarks should do. One

---

7 For a Śloka opening with a choriamb, as 4a (*jaṁsi kule*), see *Norman* (1971: LVIIIf.).
concerns his translation of *veraṁ vaddheī appaṇo* (3d), which seems inaccurate (see below). The other concerns his peculiar translation of *mamāi* with ‘bindet sich’, which would show his embarrassment in the present context with the usual meaning of the word, namely ‘is greedy’. Instead, what I intend to do is to present my own translation, which, it is hoped, will speak for itself. In my opinion we should introduce a full stop after the first line of verse 4. As I will try to show below, the second line of verse 4 most probably goes with verse 5. The three lines that remain, 3 and 4ab, should; again, be divided into two equal halves, each consisting of three Pādas, namely 3abc and 3d–4ab:

*sayāṁ tiṇḍyae pāne adnāvā annēhi śhāyae haṁantaṁ vāṁujāṁai.*

*veraṁ vaddheī appaṇo* (3)

*jāṁsi kule samappanne jehām vā saṁvase nare.* (4ab)

The translation of the first part (3abc) presents no serious problems (see below). More complicated is the translation of the following part. Crucial is the interpretation of the words *veraṁ vaddheī appaṇo*, of which the existing translations are in any case inaccurate. Thus, Bo.’s translation (see above) does not sufficiently account for the word *appaṇo*. Furthermore, *veraṁ* ‘hatred against or towards’ is usually constructed not with a genitive but with an instrumental. The same inaccuracies can be seen in Scn.’s translation: ‘(stets) fördert man das, was einem Feind ist’. More correct, at least grammatically, is JA.’s translation: ‘his iniquity will go on increasing’. In my opinion *v. v. a.* should be translated as literally as possible, i.e. ‘he fosters feelings of hatred in himself (instead of feelings of love or compassion)’8. Then the relative clauses follow naturally:

‘He kills living beings himself, has them killed by others or allows them to be killed.’ (3abc)

‘He fosters hatred in himself, in the (members of the) family in which he is born or (in the people) with whom he lives as a man.’ (3d–4ab)

The ‘he’ in my translation is the same as the ‘fool’ (*bāle*) in 4c (see above).

---

8 Compare the following *pratīkramayasūtra*, quoted in Williams (1963: 207): *khamemi savvajīve | sute jīvā khamantu me || metti me savabhāse | veraṁ mūrgaṁ na keṇa vi || ‘I ask pardon of all living creatures; may all of them pardon me. I have friendly feelings towards all, I have no feelings of hatred, with nobody.’ – Bo. compares *v. v. a.* with Suttanipāta 275: *rajaṁ vaddheti attaṇo*, which may now be translated with ‘He fosters passion in himself’. Compare the earlier translations: ‘He waxes fouler still’ (Chalmers 1932) and ‘der Unrat in ihm wächst zuhauf’ (Nyanaponika 1955).
Bo.'s text of the following three lines reads:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{mamāī}\ boppāi\ bōle\ anna-m-annehi\ mucchie\ (4\text{-}cd) \\
vītrām\ soyariyiā\ ceva\ savaam\ eyaṁ\ na\ tāṇai \\
saṅkhāe\ jīviyaṁ\ ceva\ kammunāo\ tiuṭtai.\ (5)
\end{align*}
\]

His translation, which includes the first line of verse 4 as well, runs as follows:

'In welchem Geschlecht jemand geboren ist oder mit welchen (Leuten) man zusammenlebt –
von stets anderen verblendet bindet der Tor sich an diese (und) ist verloren.'

'Besitz und Geschwister, all dies hilft (ihm) nicht. Nur indem man sich sein Leben wohl überlegt, wird man von Karmas frei.'

In itself the first line, 4cd, does not present any problem; Bo.'s ad hoc translation of \textit{mamāī}, 'is greedy', with 'bindet sich' has already been discussed above. In fact the problems begin only with the following two lines, which form verse 5. According to Bo. the idea expressed in this verse is not uncommon. He is able to refer to several other verses in which a man is warned that after death wealth and relatives will no longer be able to help him. In this connection Bo. fails to comment on a rather obvious problem, namely why of all a man's relatives his sisters (\textit{soyariyiā} = \textit{sadarikāh}) should be singled out here. Another, less obvious, problem concerns the word \textit{tāṇai}. In the commentaries it is translated with \textit{trajate}, 'it rescues'. Bo. explains it conformingly as a denominative verb of \textit{t(r)āna}. I do not intend to go into the merits of this derivation but only like to note that the occurrence of this verb is restricted to this one instance. This is peculiar, the more so if one takes into account that it is a verb, and not a technical term, and that it has a quite pedestrian meaning.

From this brief discussion it should have become clear that Bo. has in any case too easily accepted the interpretation of the commentaries, in the process ignoring certain problems and neglecting to explore alternative possibilities. The latter is precisely what I intend to do below.

I should first like to quote in full one of the supposed parallels for verse 5 referred to by Bo., namely Śūyagaḍa (JĀS), sū. 441: \textit{mātā pīlā nhusā bhāyā \ bhājā putā ya orasa / / ṇalām te tāna tānāe \ loppaṁtassa sakampūnā / / 'Mother, father, daughter-in-law, brother, wife and lawful sons will not be able to rescue you when you are being destroyed by

\[\text{Sch.'s translation of these two lines is, to say the least, peculiar. He completely mixes up the lines, translating 5cd before 4cd.}\]
your own karman’. It is to be noted that this particular list of relatives does not include ‘sisters’. They are mentioned, though, in other such lists; see, for instance, Āyāra (JĀS), sū. 63 (ed. Sch. 1.2.1.1): mātā me pitā me bhūya me bhāgī me bhajjā me putā me dhūta me sūpā me sahīsamājasamāgāthasamāṅbhūtā me vīrīvottavakāvanaparīṣṭaparībhonya- acchāyaṇam me. Otherwise the similarities between Sūyagaḍa 441 and the verse under consideration including line 4 ed are indeed conspicuous.

What is particularly conspicuous is the close verbal agreement, both passages having in common a number of more or less pivotal words, namely luippa-, kamma and tānai/tāṇāe. At this point I should like to come back to the problem, already discussed above, concerning the verb tānai, which apparently is a ḍāvē, legermennov of a suspect nature. A possible explanation is that tānai actually is a ‘ghost’-word, which was secondarily introduced as a result of a reinterpretation of the verse under consideration in the light of, for instance, Sūyagaḍa 441 quoted above10. To put it more precisely, it is my contention that tānai has actually been introduced for another word, the original, on the basis of tāṇāe. The original word, which has been irretrievably lost, must then have been very similar to tānai so as to suggest it was a clerical error for the latter. A possible reconstruction of the original word is tānai (jānāti), 5ab may originally have read as follows: vittain sojariya ceva

10 In this connection it should be noted that the same verse Sūyagaḍa 441 is also found in Uttarajhāyā 6, 3. This would indicate that we have to do with a rather well-known independent verse here. See, furthermore, Sūyagaḍa (JĀS), sū. 158: vittain (!) pasavo ya nāgāya (!) | tain bāle savaṇaṁ ti maṇṇi / | ate mama tesu vi aham | no tānaṁ savaṇaṁ ca vijjai / |, and sū. 567: ya tassa jātī (!) va kūlaṁ va tānaṁ...

11 Another instance where the text has been altered in order to suit a ‘new’ interpretation is found in Sūyagaḍa (ed. Bo.) 1.1.2.12. In this case, too, the original text is lost completely and has to be reconstructed. The necessity of a new interpretation apparently arose as the original meaning of the text was lost sight of completely. In Bo.’s edition the text reads as follows: savappagnaṁ viṅkassanī / savaṇā nūmaṁ viṅkāya / | appāṭīyatam akkammaṁ ca evam atham migce cae / |. Bo., who follows the commentaries closely, gives the following translation: ‘Erst wenn man jede Gier [savappagāṁ = savālmukam] und Selbstüberhebung [viṅkassanī = eyukkārām], alles, was einen falschen Eindruck erweckt (?)[nūmaṁ] und jeden Unmut (!)[appāṭīyatam = appāṭītam] von sich geworfen hat, wird man von Karman freu [akkammaṁ = akkammaṁ] (Handelt man anders) stirbt man deswegen (wie) das Wild (und wird wiedergeboren).’ – I do not at this stage intend to discuss each and every detail of this translation. One point should suffice, namely Bo.’s translation of viṅkāya as an absolute. This is impossible, viṅkāya being an optative. It is unlikely then that the verse sums up the four Kaśyapas, occurring here under such rare denominations: savappagāṁ (lobba), viṅkassanā (nūna), nūmaṁ (māya) and
Possessions, even (or: and [ceva]) sisters born from the same mother, all this he does not acknowledge’. This reconstruction is supported by the following verse quoted by Sternbach (1974: 95, no. 555): atīthir bālakaś caivea / strījano nṛpatis tuhā // ete vītān na jānantī / jāmatā caivea pañcamah //.

The phrase soyarīyā ceva ... na ānai needs some explanation. In the first place the occurrence of the word soyarīyā instead of a more neutral word for ‘sisters’ would emphasize a very close relationship and as such suggest certain responsibilities of the brother towards his sisters\(^\text{12}\), which are disregarded by the fool. Most likely it concerns here in particular his responsibility to arrange or make possible a proper marriage for his sisters. The lawbooks specify that on the partition of an inheritance between brothers they should reserve a certain part for the marriage-expenses for their unmarried sisters (see Kane 1946: 619 ff.).

In the word-index Bo. identifies ceva (Sanskrit caivea) as an emphatic particle. As such it may be compared to Māhārāṣṭrī Prakrit (c)cev and (c)cia. Besides, it seems occasionally to function as a copulative; see, for

\[\text{appattiyai} (\text{krodha})\] It is my contention that the verse originally read: \[\text{saveappagai pi ukkassai} / \text{saveva nūmaiv vitāriyā} // \text{appattiyai akammāse} / \text{eyam} \text{āsthān miye cey} //\]. Before giving a translation the meaning and derivation of some of the words should be discussed. \[\text{saveappagai}\] stands for \[\text{saveñlpaka}‘small in every respect’; \text{ukkassai}\] is the present participle of \text{uktes}‘to pull out’. The derivation and meaning of the word \text{nūma} would require a more thorough discussion than can possibly be carried out here. For the present purpose it would suffice to note that \text{nūma} denotes something which is lying deep in the ground or which is hidden. \[\text{appattiyai}\] is the negated present participle of \[\text{pattiya}‘to believe, to recognize’.\] The verb, which occurs in, among other texts, the Saptaśatākam (Gathās 216, 245, 353 and 376), probably derives from Sanskrit \text{pratī}-\text{akammāsa} stands for \text{akalmāsa}, which seems to provide a pun here, describing the appearance of the deer (compare Sanskrit \text{kalmāsa}, which refers to a kind of spotted deer), on the one hand, and its innocence, on the other. The context in which the verse occurs is the following. In the preceding verses it is said that a person who is careless (\text{aniyutta}) will inevitably come to grief. This idea is elaborated upon through a comparison with a deer. This animal runs away from danger which is visible. However, unable to divine danger which is not clearly visible it dies in a footnoose. A translation of the verse under consideration is the following: ‘Pulling out a thing, however small it is, one should remove everything that is \text{nūma}. Not believing (this to be necessary) (being innocent), therefore the (spotless) deer has died’.\(^\text{12}\) Compare in this connection the occurrence of the adjective soyarā in Sīyagāda (JĀS), sū. 184, where it is added to the word bhāyaro, ‘brothers’: \[
\text{piīta te theero tāta / saṣṭe te khudiṣyā imā // bhāyaro te sagā tāta / soyarā kiṁ cayāsi ne //.}
\]

The monk addressed is blackmailed into not leaving his parents’ house by pointing out the responsibilities he has towards his parents, brothers and sisters.
instance, Sūyagāda (Bo.) 1.1.1.13 (kuvaṇṭ ca kāravaṇ caeva). In line 5ab both functions seem possible. In the next line (5cd) it seems ceva can only function as an emphatic particle. As a copulative it would have to connect the sentence of that line with the one of the preceding line, in which case it would have to have an adversative meaning. While ca is indeed occasionally found having an adversative meaning, ceva (i.e. caeva), at least to my knowledge, is not.

For saṁkhaē in the second line of verse 5 Bo. suggests several possible derivations, namely saṁkhyātaḥ, saṁkhyāte and saṁkhyāyet, but he finally decides in favour of the interpretation found in the commentaries, which take it as an absolutive of saṁkhyā-. However, the occurrence of the word in Āyāra (JĀS), sū. 230, anusupvanē saṁkhaē āraṁbhē(-)ya tīvṭati, which is actually quoted by Bo. himself, shows that we almost certainly have to do here with the instrumental singular of the substantive saṁkha (saṁkhyā), meaning ‘deliberation’; compare Āyāra (JĀS), sū. 191, sīlamanaṇā vasanaṇā saṁkhaē rīyaṇāṇā aśīla anusupvanānā bātiyē maṇḍānā bāliyē ‘People who are virtuous, tranquil and wandering with deliberation, calling those “people without virtues”, that is the second foolishness of the slow-witted man’

13 Then jīviyāṇ ca can no longer be directly linked to saṁkhaē as is done by Bo. Instead it would seem to be an accusative of time, meaning ‘during one’s life’ or, with the emphatic particle ceva, ‘one’s whole life long’.

As already mentioned above this line would require the presence of an adversative particle. Bo. suggests to attribute this function to ca, while the text actually reads ceva. Besides, he discusses the possibility to adopt instead of kammunā the variant kammunā u, in which u represents Sanskrit tu (see Pischel 1900: § 185), but he concludes that it is not necessary to do so as the adversative particle need not always actually occur. In this connection it should be noted that in Bo.’s interpretation (and translation) of the verse as a whole the presence or absence of an adversative particle does not really matter. However, given the fact that one has a choice between basically two variants, kammunāo and kammunā u, and that the sentence in the ‘new’ context does require an adversative particle or with such a particle fits in much better than without it, I do not see why one should not adopt kammunā
u. Furthermore, it seems easier to understand why and how kammattha, read as kammuṇā, was changed into kammuṇāo than the other way around. In this connection the forms of kammuṇā and kammuṇāo should be considered more closely. As to kammuṇā, it should be noted that apparently no other instances of an ablative of a neutre an-stem are found. On the other hand, its existence may be inferred, at least for Pali, from such ablatives as pilara and attanā (Geiger 1916: § 91–2). These ablatives are identical to the respective instrumentals. In fact, an instrumental kammuṇā is found in Ardha-Māgadhī texts as well (for instances, see Pischel 1900: § 404). The ablative kammuṇāo is equally problematic. Bo. explains it as a ‘double’ ablative. It should be noted that the ending -āo, which is regular with original thematic nouns, is found only very rarely with secondary thematic nouns. Pischel (loc. cit.) quotes only one example, namely jammā. The word kammuṇāo is itself found once more, namely in Āyāra (JĀS), sū. 230, quoted above, but there, as here, as a variant, namely beside, among other variants, āraṁbhāo. In the case of āraṁbhāo the ending -āo is, again, regular. Both kammuṇā and kammuṇāo would, as ablatives, seem unsupported in Ardha-Māgadhī. At the same time it is difficult to understand why, if the text originally read kammuṇāo, which at least clearly looks like an ablative, the latter word was changed into the much ‘darker’ kammuṇā(-)u. 5ab should probably read as follows: saṁkhāre jīviyam ceva \ kammuṇā u tiuṭṭai // ‘But only by (acting with) deliberation one’s whole life long one escapes from karma.’

The three lines together read:

māmāi luppaṁ bāle anna-m-annehī mucchie (4cd)
viṭṭaṁ soyariyā ceva savvaṁ eyam na ānai
saṁkhāre jīviyam ceva kammuṇā u tiuṭṭai (5)

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

The next unit comprises verse 6, for which, however, I have adopted a text different from Bo.’s. The latter, on the authority of the Tīr, reads ayāṇantā viussitti. So did Sch. and JA. The derivation and meaning of viussitti constitute a problem. Bo. discusses several possibilities but his

---

14 It is not be ruled out that the variant kammuṇāo in Āyāra (JĀS), sū. 230 was introduced on the basis of a conflation of the text with the line under consideration: saṁkhāre jīviyam ceva kammuṇāo (kammuṇā u) tiuṭṭai vs. ampuvāe saṁkhāre kammuṇāo (āraṁbhāo) tiuṭṭai(t).
final position does not become clear. In any case I fail to see any connection between the text and his translation: ‘unwissende Leute trotz ihrer prahlerischen Reden’. SCH. suggests, and translates accordingly, that viussittā stands for viussanti (= *vidvayamanāh*), which he compares with viussanti in Sūyagaḍa (ed. Bo.) 1.1.2.23: je u tattha viussanti / samsāram te viussiyā / /. The latter verb most probably goes back to cyut-śrayanti ‘they resort to’. It remains unclear, though, what particular formation viussittā is supposed to be, irrespective of the question how the meaning ‘to resort to’ should fit in the present context. Instead, I should like to suggest to read ayaṇantā vi ussittā, in which ussittā stands for utsiktāh ‘arrogant’. For my translation of ganthe with ‘words’, see Bo.’s discussion of the word, who himself, however, translates it with ‘Bindungen’; compare SCH.: ‘Fessel’. For the instrumental kāmekhi, which would function as a locative here, see Bo.

"ee ganthe viukkamma ege sanaṇamāhasāyā
dyaṇantā vi ussittā satā kāmekhi mānavā (6)"

‘Some śramaṇaś and brāhmanaś, having disregarded the foregoing words, even though they thus betray their ignorance, behave arrogantly; they are people sticking to passions.’

I intend to discuss the next seven lines together. Starting-point is the text and the translation of Bo.:

"santi pañca mahabhūyā iha-m-eyesim āhiyā
puḍhavā āu teū ya vāv ṣāpiṃcaṃma (7)
ee pañca mahabhūyā tebbbhō ego tti āhiyā
aha tesim viśūse u viṇāso hoi dehiṇa (8)
jahā ya puḍhavahūbe ege nāvāhi dīsai
evam bho kāsine loe viṇnā nāvāhi dīsai (9)
evam ege tti jappanti mandā aṭrambhānissiyā (10ab)"

‘Es gibt in dieser Welt nach der Lehre einiger fünf große Elemente: Erde, Wasser, Feuer, Wind und als fünftes die Luft.’

‘Das sind die fünf großen Elemente. Daraus (geht) der Ein (hervor). In dieser Weise lehrt man sie.

Wenn sie sich aber auflösen, geht das Individuum zugrunde.’

‘Ebenso, wie die Erdmaterie mit ihrer Vielheit (von Bestandteilen doch) als eine Einzige erscheint, so – merkt Euch – erscheint die ganze Welt mit ihrer Vielheit als (ein) geistiges Prinzip (d.h. bildet eine geistige Einheit).’


This passage may be broken up into several smaller segments, the first comprising the lines 7–8ab. Before giving a translation of these three
lines the meaning and derivation of the word āhiya should be considered. In the commentaries this word is translated with ākhyāta ‘enumerated’ or with ākhyātavantaḥ ‘they enumerated’. This interpretation is accepted by Bo., who, undaunted by any phonetical considerations, suggests that āhiya is actually derived from ākhyāta. In doing so he completely ignores the fact that there are no convincing parallels for the development of (ākhy)āta into (āh)iya. Rather āhiya stands for ākhyāta, as has already been suggested earlier by Sch. This āhiya in the present context seems to mean either ‘put forward’ (derived from ‘placed’) or ‘accepted’ (derived from ‘taken, received’). In the translation given below ‘accepted’ has been opted for.

santi at the beginning of the sentence in 7ab requires some explanation. The sentence should almost certainly be translated with ‘by some here are “accepted” five gross elements’ (i.e. as against people who accept six; see 1.1.1.15). This supposedly redundant usage of santi is in itself not unknown. What is rare, though, or has apparently not yet been established otherwise, is the construction of santi with a past participle. CPD 1, p. 112b, quotes only instances of santi either with a verb inflected for person or with an adjective. The present construction may be compared especially to the latter. A translation of 7–8ab is the following:

‘By some here are “accepted” five gross elements,
(namely) earth, water, fire, wind and, as the fifth, ether.’

‘These five gross elements are “accepted”, saying: “From these is (made) the individual”.’

Bo. links the word aha (atha) in 8c to immediately following viṇāse. He ingeniously suggests that we have to do here with a contamination of the two following phrases, namely aha viṇāse (nominative) hoï, ‘when there is a destruction’, and viṇāse (locative), ‘id.’. In doing so he explicitly rejects the solution put forward by Sch., who takes aha as a kind of interjection by the person who enumerates the main arguments of the materialists. Partly in agreement with Sch. I should like to link aha directly to jappanti mandā ārambhanissiyā in 10ab. Already at this point I should also like to introduce an emendation on Bo.’s text, namely jampanti (of the majority of the witnesses) for jappanti. For jampanti (jalpanti), see Pischel (1900: § 296). It is in fact not clear why Bo. preferred the latter form, which is uncertain; see Pischel, loc. cit. ya (ca) in 9 (jahā ya . . .) belongs in my opinion to the same level as aha, i.e. aha . . . ya . . . tī jampani mandā ārambhanissiyā ‘Furthermore [aha] they, slow-witted people bent on harmful actions, say . . ., and [ya] (they say). . .’.

A translation of 8cd is the following: ‘Furthermore, they . . . say:
“But in case they (i.e. the five gross elements) are destroyed, there is also the destruction of the soul”.

Verse 9 contains some serious textual problems, which, however, have so far remained unnoticed. The first problem concerns the word nānāhi. Bo. does not discuss the word, which is strange as it concerns a formation, the adverb nānā followed by the ending -hi, which is otherwise unknown, and as beyond the two instances of the word in the verse under consideration no other instances seem to be known; nānāhi is virtually a ζπαξ λεγόμενον. Beside all this, Bo.’s translation is inaccurate as it assumes a word corresponding to Sanskrit nānarūpa, linked to thābe in the first line and to viṇṇā in the second. As already said above a formation like nānāhi is otherwise unknown. A comparison with, for instance, piṭṭhāhi, ‘from behind’, is probably not justifiable, and would still leave us with the problem of its meaning: ‘from diverse or manifold . . . (1)’. -ahī in, for instance, alāhi, ‘stop’, probably originates from the conflation of alam with such phrases as mā vaṭṭāhi. Another possibility is to suppose nānā is for once inflected as an adjective here as it is, however rarely, in Sanskrit (PW, s.v., quotes nārīsu nānāsu from Pañcar.). This, however, would saddle us with an adjective in the ablative singular or in the instrumental plural feminine, which as far as I see is impossible to fit into the respective contexts. By way of alternative I suggest in the first line to read instead of nānāhi, nānā hi: jahā ya pudhavihūbe ege nānā hi dīsa ‘and (they say): “For [hi] as one heap of earth is seen (to consist of) diverse (elements) (nānā), so . . .” ‘. The same solution does not seem to be possible for nānāhi in the second line; the causal particle hi hardly makes sense here. The same line contains yet another problem, namely the meaning of the word viṇṇā (viṭṭha). Its usual meaning ‘wise’ or ‘intelligent’ does not make sense. In the commentaries it has been given a very specific sense. The Ėu. equates it with the so-called bhūtātman as mentioned in Brahmabindūpaniṣad 12. Śīlaṅka identifies viṇṇā with ātman. Bo. translates it accordingly with ‘geistige Prinzip’, SCH. with ‘Geist’ and JA. with ‘the intelligent (principle, viz. the ātman)’. These meanings are quite unexpected. On the other hand, the text as it stands does not seem to allow a very much different interpretation. This suggests the possibility that the text is actually corrupt. In this connection I may refer again to the word nānāhi in this same line. The only available variant, nānā ya, does not seem to be an improvement. It would appear then that the original reading has been irretrievably lost. It therefore has to be reconstructed. A possible emendation is to read for viṇṇā nānā(-)hi dīsa, nānā viṇṇāhi dīsa. The corruption may be reconstructed as follows. A scribe while copying Pādād got it mixed up with Pāda b (ege nānā[-]hi dīsa), which
resulted in nānā(-)hi dīsai. On detecting his error he may have corrected it by, as was a common practice, adding vinnā in the margin and indicating its original position with a small cross or some other sign. When subsequently this particular MS was copied vinnā may have come to be misplaced before nānā(-)hi.

At this point the text of 7–10ab may be given in its entirety with the changes I have suggested above. It should be noticed that my translation of the first part of Pāda 10a (evas ege) is again completely different from those given earlier. This difference should be evident.

\[
\begin{align*}
santi pañca maha-bhūyā iha-m-ejesim ākiyā 
puñlavā an te ṣa vau āgāsapācāmā. (7) 
\text{ee pañca maha-bhūyā tebhho ego tī ākiyā.} 
\text{aha tesim vināsē u vināsā hoi dehiṇo (8)} 
\text{jaḥa ya puñlavāthābe ege nānā hi dīsai} 
\text{evam bho kasiṇe loe nānā vinnāhi dīsai (9)} 
\text{evam ege tī jampanti mandā āraṃbhāṇissiyā (10ab)}
\end{align*}
\]

‘By some here are accepted (the) five gross elements: earth, water, fire, wind, and, as the fifth, ether.’

‘These five gross elements are accepted, saying: “From these is (made) the individual”.

Furthermore (they say): “But in case they (the five gross elements) are destroyed, there is also the destruction of the soul”,’

‘and: “For as one heap of earth is seen (to consist of) diverse (elements), so, mark you, the wise consider the whole earth (to consist of) diverse (elements),’

‘so (also) the individual”; so (they) say, slow-witted people, bent on harmful actions.’

Only so far this particular materialistic doctrine has been quoted. A refutation is to follow. It is obvious that as such the second line of verse 10 does not suffice. In my opinion it includes the first Pāda of verse 11 as well, i.e.:

\[
\begin{align*}
ege kiccā sayaṁ pāram tiyavām dukkham niyacchāi (10cd) 
patteyaṁ kasiṇe āyā. (11a)
\end{align*}
\]

A translation is the following:

‘When an individuel [ege] himself has committed a sin (he) will come to terrible grief’,

‘he himself [āyā] by himself [patteyaṁ] (and) all of him [kasiṇe].’
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