

NORMALIZING TRENDS
IN JAINA NARRATIVE LITERATURE **

Because it preserves an abundant and continuous tradition handing down numerous versions of a given story, Jaina narrative literature has proved a rewarding field for both diachronical and comparative studies: scholars have rightly concluded that conservatism is its main tendency¹. However, to mention only one recent case, the detailed investigation of two Apabhraṃśa accounts of the Cārudatta-story undertaken by Dr. Colin Mayrhofer clearly shows that, even though isolated, examples of conscious and planned change do exist and are instructive².

The present paper is an attempt to call attention to a particular type of innovation which I propose to name with the technical term « bowdlerization »: strictly speaking, the term means « to expurgate from a work passages considered indecent or indelicate »³. Here, however, it will be used in a broader sense, viz. the expurgation of elements which seem not to be disturbing in a given version A, but would appear objectionable in another version B, so that version B may conform with

* CNRS, ERA 094 « Philologie Bouddhique et Jaina », Paris.

** My sincere thanks go to Mr. K. R. Norman (University of Cambridge, U.K.) who has been kind enough to read through the English text of this paper.

1. J. HERTEL, *On the Literature of the Shvetambaras of Gujarat*, Leipzig, 1922, pp. 8-9; e.g., about Universal History, K. BRUHN, Intr. to Śīlānka, *Cauppaṇṇamahā-purīṣacariya* (PrTS 3, 1961), p. 19 § 17: « ... the stories became as unchangeable as the dogma itself »; contra R. Williams, quoted below p. 14; *ubi alia*.

2. C. MAYRHOFFER, *Tradition and Innovation in Jain Narratives. A Study of Two Apabhraṃśa Versions of the story of Cārudatta*. Paper read at the International Symposium on Jaina Narrative and Canonical Literature, Strasbourg, 1981, IT, vol. XI, 1983, pp. 163-73.

3. Cf. M. H. ABRAMS, *A Glossary of Literary Terms*, New-York, 1981⁴ (Holt, Rinehart and Winston).

the newly accepted ethico-religious standards of a community⁴ and/or become in agreement with the evolution of mental attitudes. In other words, I deal here with a particular application of the more general, basically juridical, problem of *censorship*⁵ which obviously has to be faced by any organized society, especially with respect to the various forms of mass-communication (literature, press, cinema, or television)⁶.

Without lingering over them, let me start with a review of some Indian non-Jaina instances of this phenomenon. Thus, alterations aiming at a moral normalization concerned with marriage and sexual relations are listed, among others, in the Prolegomena to the Poona critical edition of the Mahābhārata⁷. *Sexual Ethics in the Mahābhārata in the light of Dharmaśāstra Rulings* also forms the subject of Mrs. Bhakti Datta's thesis⁸, which is, to my knowledge, one of the few works to analyse in precise terms the evolution of ethical concepts and their impact on the transformation of narrative texts. The author has selected four legends, « four representative examples constituting as it were

4. Cp. the impact of religious feelings on textual choices in the Jaina Pañcatantra: J. HERTEL, *The Panchatantra-Text of Purnabhadra*. Critical Introduction and List of Variants, Cambridge, Mass., 1912 (HOS 12), p. 28: though generally following the Tantrākhyāyika recension, Purnabhadra suddenly abandons it when it speaks of the brahmanical tīrthas, and prefers the Jaina recension which replaces its enumeration by a talk on dharma (« and chiefly because its wording was not offensive to his religious feeling »): see Specimen III in J. HERTEL, *The Panchatantra-Text of Purnabhadra and its Relation to Texts of allied Recensions as shown in Parallel Specimens*, Cambridge, Mass., 1912 (HOS 13).

5. A question which seems to have taken on particular acuteness in the United States of the fifties at the time of McCarthyism, hence: MORRIS L. ERNST and ALAN U. SCHWARTZ, *Censorship. The Search for the Obscene*, London, New York, 1964 (Milestones of Law Series); KINGSLEY and ELEANOR WIDMER, *Literary Censorship. Principles, Cases, Problems*, San Francisco, 1961 (Wadsworth Guides to Literary Study).

6. See various articles and a general bibliography in *La censure et le censurable*, in « Communications », Paris, 9 (1967), e.g. C. BRÉMOND, *Ethique du film et morale du censeur*, p. 28 ff.

7. *The Mahābhārata* (...) critically edited by Vishnu S. Sukthankar et alii. Poona, 1933-66 (Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute): Ādiparvan, Prolegomena, pp. XLIII-XLIV. For the Purāṇas « which are well-known for their sectarian multiplication of myths and legends and hyperbolic exaggeration of details », see A. N. UPADHYE's statement in his introduction to Haribhadra's *Dhūrtākhyāna* (SJS 19, 1944), pp. 12-3: « Even from amongst the custodians and adherents of these texts the revisionists have tried their hands on them partly to make the legends conform to the changing ethico-moral notions and partly to rationalise and humanise them by removing glaring inconsistencies etc. This is amply borne out by the recensions and textual variations detected by critical editors. The episode of Draupadī's marriage and the way in which the later kāvyas etc. use the Purāṇic legends sufficiently illustrate the above tendencies ». An example of such an evolution from the Harivaṃśa to the Viṣṇu- and the Bhāgavata-Purāṇa in DANIEL H. H. INGALLS, *The Harivaṃśa as a Mahākāvya*, in « Mélanges d'indianisme à la mémoire de Louis Renou », Paris, 1968 (Publ. Institut de Civilisation Indienne 28), p. 384 ff. (381-94): the account of the slaying of Pūtānā, « less pious, less brahmanical-orthodox » in the Harivaṃśa.

8. Under the guidance of Prof. P. Thieme: London, 1979 (Asia Publications).

milestones in following up changing moral values at various stages of social development »⁹ which are also known from the Epics and later works (mainly the Purāṇas). It is convincingly argued that, with their later modifications, they « essentially reflect a process of evolution and development of Hindu "dharma" with regard to sex morals ». Moreover, « the rise of a strong current of brahmanification »¹⁰ is evidenced from the later interpolations which attempt to bridge the differences shown by the stories « in order to bring them within the brahmanic fold », i.e. the strict rules of the śāstras.

In the elaboration of Buddhist edifying legends, the comparison of some Karmaśatakas and Avadāna passages has brought to light the part played by expurgation of so-called « immoral » themes (incest. etc.) as has been pointed out by J. Przyluski and M. Lalou¹¹. In the thirty-four Jātaka stories it retells, the Jātakamālā mostly keeps the outlines or essential features of the Pāli version. However, probably on purpose, the Sanskrit author has omitted some details of a horrible nature and has exhibited his « good taste », as has been indicated by J. S. Speyer, who mentions a few such cases¹². Another example has been adduced by E. W. Hopkins¹³: in the Jātakamālā (no. XXIII), the Bodhisattva is said to have « created by dint of magic a large monkey whose skin he stripped off, making the rest of his body disappear »¹⁴; in the corresponding Pāli Mahābodhi Jātaka (no. 528), he is depicted as eating the flesh of a monkey and using its skin as a robe. It has been shown that although « the Jātakas (...) frequently claim to be the champions of orthodoxy, there are numbers of stories in which the bodhisatta acts

9. *Ibid.*, pp. 8-9; 1) the story of Utatthya, Mamatā and Brhaspati; 2) of Yayāti and Sarmisthā, perhaps the most significant; 3) of Svetaketu; 4) of Dirghatamas.

10. *Ibid.*, conclusions, pp. 104-17.

11. J. PRZYLUSKI, M. LALOU, *Récits populaires et contes bouddhiques*, in JA, 228 (1936), pp. 183-84 (177-91): marriage between two heroes who are brother and sister is admitted in Karmaśataka 61. In the other group of narrations, the brotherly relation is suppressed.

12. *The Jātakamālā, Garland of Birth-Stories of Āryaśūra*. Translated by J. S. Speyer, London, 1895 (Sacred Books of the Buddhists 1), repr. in India, 1971, Intr. p. XXV: about the eye-operation in Jāt-m no. II (Sibi-Ja no. 499); Jāt-m no. XXIII (Ja 313): « the cruel act of the wicked king against the monk Kṣāntivādin ».

13. E. WASHBURN HOPKINS, *The Buddhist Rule against Eating Meat*, in JAOS, 27, 2 (1907), p. 461 (455-65). Whatever the injunctions of the doctrinal texts may be, it is accepted that eating meat was practised, under certain conditions, in the Buddha's time, even by the monks: see, recently, CHANDRA SHEKHAR PRASAD, *Meat-Eating and the Rule of Tikoṭiparisuddha*, in « Studies in Pali and Buddhism, A Homage Volume to the memory of Bhikkhu Jagdish Kashyap », ed. A. K. Narain, Delhi, 1979, pp. 289-95; D. SEYFORTH RUEGG, *Ahimsā and Vegetarianism in the History of Buddhism*, in « Buddhist Studies in honour of Walpola Rahula », London, 1980, pp. 234-41, has noted « the inconspicuous role of vegetarianism in comparison with non-harming (a[vi]himsā) which is universally acclaimed as a principle of primary importance for Buddhist thought and practice ».

14. Trsl. Speyer, p. 207.

in ways which the Nikāyas or the Vinaya would condemn »¹⁵. On the other hand, they also testify « a marked tendency to adopt a lenient attitude towards sexual aberration » and contain « stories in which the bodhisatta seems to fall below accepted standards of sexual propriety »¹⁶. Even then, « the incidents are recounted in a perfectly matter-of-fact way, without any hint of moral censure or any attempt to justify the bodhisatta's conduct »¹⁷. As will be seen, absence of censure also characterizes the Jaina *old* layer of stories.

I now come to them.

Useful indications of bowdlerized episodes can be found in R. Williams' study *Two Prakrit Versions of the Maṇipaticarita*¹⁸, which records a case of buffalo-killing (infra), and a case of matricide showing a distinction between the Śvetāmbara accounts, where the murder is actually committed, and the Digambara reports which water it down, the heroes' criminal thoughts being annihilated by their taking refuge in the Jaina initiation¹⁹.

On the other hand, statements by Jaina writers themselves suggest that bowdlerization is not an arbitrary subjective notion resulting from modern analyses and mental schemes. When faced with the Brahmanical legends, whether Vālmīki-Rāmāyaṇa or the Purāṇas and the Mahābhārata, Vimalasūri, Haribhadra and others do not accept them as they are²⁰; the former in the Paumacariya, the Jaina Rāmāyaṇa, and the latter in the Dhūrtākhyāna feel conscious of the problematic nature of some narrative details which cannot fit in with the Jaina tenets. Both express their opinion in rather polemic and ironic terms. Thus, Vimalasūri says:

« Again, it is said that Indra, when defeated in battle by Rāvaṇa, was bound in chains and taken to Lankā. How can anyone take Indra captive, Indra who rules over Jambūdvīpa with its gods and men?

15. J. GARRETT JONES, *Tales and Teachings of the Buddha. The Jātaka Stories in Relation to the Pali Canon*, London, 1979, p. 157; the Bodhisatta is often involved in killing or injuring, p. 61 ff.

16. *Ibid.*, p. 87, with reference to Ja 360, 425, 487, 491.

17. *Ibid.*, p. 91.

18. R. WILLIAMS, *Two Prakrit Versions of the Maṇipati-Carita*, London, 1959 (Jones G. Forlong Fund, vol XXVI), pp. 24-5.

19. Cf. WILLIAMS, *ibid.*, quoting Haribhadra's commentary on the Daśavaikālikā-niryukti (E. Leumann, ZDMG, 46 [1892], p. 581 ff.), etc., versus *Brhatkathākośa* no. 28 and no. 100 (ed. A. N. Upadhye, SJS 17, 1943). For a comparable distinction between versions of one and the same story as told by the two sects, see below p. 31 (Cilātīputra).

20. See references in SHAKTIDHAR JHA, *Aspects of Brahmanical Influence on the Jaina Mythology*, Delhi, 1978: p. 18 about Raviṣeṇa, who, in « the introductory chapter (of his Padmacarita III, 17-27; VIII, 146-149, ed. MDJGM, 3, 1954) exhibits the same censorious attitude towards Vālmīki Rāmāyaṇa as Vimalasūri's work does »; p. 28 about Puṣpadanta who, in his Mahāpurāṇa « makes both Vālmīki and Vyāsa principal targets of his attack for deluding people with their (false) teachings »; etc.

One would be reduced to heaps of ashes at the mere thought of attacking him, who has Airāvata, the elephant-jewel and Vajra, the thunderbolt at his command! At that rate we might as well affirm that the lion is overcome by the deer, the elephant by the dog!... »²¹.

In his work, this reflection is staged through a dialogue (II 104-112; III 7-15), in which King Śreṇika questions the gaṇadhara Gautama about some puzzling facts in the Rāmāyaṇa as told in the *loya-sattha* (Sa. *loka-sāstra*-) ²², which are declared to be all lies ²³. One of them is the famous episode of the golden deer killed by Rāma in Vālmiki's epic ²⁴, which calls for three remarks. Firstly, it is counted among the inconsistencies of the *ku-sattha-vādī* which give rise to Śreṇika's surprise:

(*kaha*) Rāmeṇa kaṇaya-deho sareṇa bhinno mao araṇṇammi?
(III 10ab).

« How can Rāma have pierced with his arrow the golden-bodied deer in the forest? ».

As it is deemed inconsistent, it will not be told in the Paumacariya ²⁵. Thus, its absence can be explained as the result of a deliberate

21. Trsl. V.M. KULKARNI, p. 30, of the intr. to *Ācārya Vimalasūri's Paumacariyaṇ*, with Hindi Translation. Part I. Ed. by Dr. H. Jacobi, 2nd ed. revised by Muni Shri Punyavijayaji (...) (PrTS 6, 1962), II, 113-116:

annaṇ pi eva suvvai jaha Indo Rāvaṇeṇa saṃgāme
jīṇiṇa niyala-baddho Lankā-nayari samāṇio (113).
ko jīṇiṇa samattho, Indaṇ sa-surāsura vi te-lokke
jo sāgara-perantaṇ, Jambuddivaṇ samuddharai (114)?
Erāvaṇo ga'Indo, jassa ya vajjaṇ a-moha-pahar'atthaṇ
tassa kira cintieṇa vi, anno vi bhavēja masi-rāsiṇ (115)
siho maṇa nihao, sāṇeṇa ya kuṇjaro jahā bhaggo!
taha vivariya-pay'atthaṇ, kaṇhi Rāmāyaṇaṇ raiyaṇ (116).

See also Haribhadrasūri, *Dhūrtākhyāna* V, 117-118.

22. Paumac II, 107; also *Dhūrtākhyāna* V, 120; etc.

23. Paumac II, 117:

aliyaṇ pi savvam eyaṇ uvavatti-viruddha-paccaya-guṇehiṇ
na ya saddahanti purisā, havanti je paṇḍiyā loe.

« All this is lie, without any proof, opposed to logic: they do not believe it, the people who in this world are really wise ». *Ibid.*, III, 15cd:

aliyaṇ ti savvam eyaṇ, bhaṇanti jaṇ ku-kaiṇo (Sa. *ku-kavi*-) *mūdhā*.

Dhūrtākhyāna reviewing unbelievable legends current in the world (V, 111-122), states the falsehood of the epics:

annaṇ pi aliya-vayaṇ suvvai loyammi niggaṇaṇ iṇim-o (V, 114ab).

24. Vālmiki, *Rāmāyaṇa*, *Aranyakāṇḍa*, sarga XLIV; instances of incongruity in the Mahābhārata are pointed out by the Jaina writer Subhacandra in his *Pāṇḍava-purāṇa*: cf. JHA, *ibid.*, pp. 39-42, and the stimulating analysis of P. S. JAINI, *Mahābhārata motifs in the Jaina Pāṇḍava-Purāṇa*, BSOAS 47, 1 (1984), pp. 108-15.

25. Cf. V. M. KULKARNI, *The Origin and Development of the Rāma Story in Jaina Literature*, in JOIB, 9 (1959), p. 202 (189-204): the following points are emphasized in this study: expunction of exaggerated and incredible elements; purging the story of its Brahmanical atmosphere; building up of Jaina atmosphere; also m., Intr. to the PrTS ed., of the Paumac p. 29 ff.

suppression: the fact that we have here at hand both the justification of the author's intention and its effective realization is quite exceptional. As will be seen later, generally we can only observe the exclusion of a motif in a given version without any comment being made about it. Secondly, the controversial theme is related to *himsā*. Thirdly, *himsā* and Rāma's heroism are felt to be contradictory in Vimala's attempt to « clear the characters of blame »²⁶.

Let me now tackle, at a more general level, the last two questions implied by the above case: 1) the working out of *himsā* as favouring recasting; 2) the factors which, on the other hand, may limit the application of bowdlerization.

Himsā, in the shape of murder and meat-eating must have been one of the main taboo topics or stumbling-blocks liable to censorship, all the more so as *ahimsā*, on the other hand, became the characteristic of everyday Jainism and was equated with vegetarianism²⁷. In a few cases, which will be considered now, the evolution towards normalization takes place almost before our eyes, as the available versions manifest three stages: (i) the presence of the *himsā* motif; (ii) the intermediate stage where the motif is questioned; (iii) the definitive elimination or transformation of the motif, with the old one falling into oblivion.

My first example illustrates the re-adjustment, through linguistic re-interpretation, of a controversial passage in the canonical *Viyāhapannatti* (XV)²⁸, all the more important as it involves Mahāvīra himself²⁹. It has been partly discussed by L. Alsdorf³⁰. At the first stage, literally understood the words used in the *Viyāhapannatti* to designate the food which will cure the Jina from his illness, do undoubtedly refer to meat: *duve kavoya-sarīrā*, « two pigeons » and *majjāra-kaḍae kukkuḍa-maṃsae*, « the flesh of a cock killed by a cat »; but — and this is our second stage — they are not obvious to the Mediaeval commentator Abhayadeva (11th century), who, although retaining the literal interpretation, also proposes a vegetarian explanation for each of the terms, namely « two gourds » and « the pulp of a citron seasoned with *virālikā*

26. V. M. Kulkarni, Intr. to the Paumac p. 32.

27. Cf. H. P. SCHMIDT, *The Origin of Ahimsā*, in « Mél... Louis Renou », pp. 625-55; J. C. JAIN, *Life in Ancient India...*, Delhi, 1984², p. 170.

28. Ed. Suttāgame I, pp. 730-32; Jaina Āgama Series, Bombay, 1978, vol. IV, pt. II, p. 730; J. DELEU, *Viyāhapannatti (Bhagavañ). The fifth Āṅga of the Jaina Canon...*, Brugge, 1970, p. 219.

29. Cp. similar disputes about the Buddha's last meal, A. BAREAU, *La nourriture offerte au Buddha lors de son dernier repas*, in « Mél... Louis Renou », pp. 61-71; see A. FOUCHER's remarks on the different interpretations of the various translations in *La vie du Bouddha*, Paris, 1950, p. 306; *ubi alia* and fn. 13.

30. L. ALSDORF, *Beiträge zur Geschichte von Vegetarismus und Rinderverehrung in Indien*, pp. 11-4 (Akad. der Wiss. u. der Lit. Mainz, Abh. der Geistes u. Sozialwiss. Kl. 1961, Nr. 6).

herb »³¹. In the last stage, the latter meaning, ratified as it were by the commentator's authority, prevails and becomes the only one accepted. Hemacandra's *Triṣaṣṭiśalākāpuruṣacarita* and other biographies of Mahāvīra which narrate this episode³² all resort to the unambiguous names of plants previously alluded to (*bījapūra-kaṭāhausadha*, and so on). For present-day Jainas the old meaning simply *does not* and *cannot* exist, as they try to prove on a scientific basis (with the support of medical treatises, etc.)³³.

Let me now come to another method of recasting: the substitution of a motif as illustrated by the two following examples.

The first case can be traced by means of the comparison between Jaina versions of different periods showing a chronological differentiation according to the above defined three stages: (i) resorting to the eating of a human corpse in order to survive is admitted in the old Canonical versions of the Cilātīputra-Suṃsumā-story as narrated in the *Nāyādhammakahāo* (I 18)³⁴ and the *Āvaśyaka*-commentaries; in the latter case, it is remarkable that the chronological factor is of no importance in comparison with the strength of the literary tradition. Whether older (ĀvN, ĀvCu and ĀvṬH, 6th-8th centuries A.D.³⁵) or later (ĀvṬ of Malaya-

31. Cf. Jaina Āgama Series ed., p. 730, n. 1 and n. 4 respectively *kuṣmāṇḍa*, *bījapūra-kaṭāha* and *virālikā*; also A. F. Rudolf Hoernle, ed., *The Uvāsagadasāo*, Calcutta, 1890, Appendix, pp. 10-1, note.

32. Hemacandra, *Triṣaṣṭi* X, 8, 543-553 (ed. Bhavnagar, sam. 1965, pp. 117b-18a); trsl. Helen M. Johnson, vol. VI, pp. 227-28 (Baroda, 1962, Gaekwad's Oriental Series 140); other versions, cf. *Dānāṣṭakakathā*, Paris, 1982 (Publ. Institut de Civil. indienne 48), pp. 43-4; n. 3, p. 196.

33. E.g. H. R. KAPADIA, *Prohibition of Flesh-Eating in Jainism*, in « Review of Philosophy and Religion », 4, no. 2 (Sept. 1933), pp. 1-8: the article contains a reply by H. Jacobi to the Jainas who did not accept his translation of *maṃsa* and *maccha* in *Āyāraṃga* II, 1, 10, 6; his letter is an attempt to solve this thorny point in the best possible manner. From this point of view, some oral reactions of Jaina living Pandits are significant: advanced-minded though they may be, they remain strictly orthodox on this subject. References to Suśruta etc. are, for instance, adduced by H. Jacobi, in Kapadia's article, n. 1, p. 6; *ubi alia*.

34. Cf. W. SCHUBRING, *Nāyādhammakahāo. Das sechste Anga des Jaina Siddhānta* (...), Wiesbaden, 1978 (Ak. der Wiss. u. der Lit. Mainz, Abh. der Geistes u. Sozialwiss. Kl. 1978, 6), pp. 60-2.

35. ĀvN gā. 872-875; ĀvCu I, pp. 496-98; ĀvṬH pp. 370b-71b.

giri and Tilaka, 11th-13th century A.D.³⁶), the Āv accounts are very similar to each other and all belong to stage one. In the Nāyā and the Āv, the story is to be interpreted as a religious allegory: overcome by hunger and exhausted in their pursuit of the thief Cilāya who has abducted and beheaded Suṃsumā, Dhaṇa and his five sons first think of killing and eating one of themselves, each one offering himself in turn³⁷. They finally decide to eat the girl's dead body because it is for them the only means available of living and returning home. No other motivation of their conduct than this has to be understood³⁸. Exactly in the same way, food is necessary for the monks to live and earn the bliss of Emancipation³⁹; (iii) when retelling the story, the Ākhyānakamaṇi-kośa-vṛtti and the « big » ṭīkā on Dharmadāsa's Uvaesamālā (11th-12th

36. ĀvṬ Malayagiri (ed. Bombay, DLJP, 85, 1936), pp. 479a-80a; Tilakācārya Sanskrit commentary on the ĀvN, i.e. Sanskrit rendering of the Prakrit narratives preserved in ṬCu traditions: folio 151a-151b of the Ahmedabad paper ms (no. 9016 in *Catalogue of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts*, pt. 4, L.D. Series 20, 1968), of which a photocopy is kept in the Institut für Indische Philologie u. Kunstgeschichte, Freie Universität, Berlin. I am grateful to Prof. Bruhn and Tripathi who kindly showed it to me.

For other references to the Cilātiputra-story, see *Dictionary of Prakrit Proper Names*, Ahmedabad, 1970 (L.D. Series 28), s.v. *Cilāiputta* and K. VON KAMPTZ, *Über die Sterbefasten handelnden älteren Pāṇṇa des Jaina Kanons*, Hamburg, 1929, p. 29; A. N. UPADHYE, *Bṛhatkathākośa*, p. 27; B. K. KHADGADI, *Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi and the Tale of Cilātiputra*, in « Tulsī Prajñā » (The Journal of Jain Vishva Bharati, Ladnun, Rajasthan), 12 (March 1981), pp. 15-23; they will not be used here as they do not give any information about the point I am concerned with. Muncicandrasūri's commentary on Haribhadra's *Upadeśapada* also belongs to this stage (i) (ad gā. 134, gā. 25-32, ed. Baroda, 1923).

37. In ĀvṬH version, p. 371a (~ Cu, p. 497): ... Dhaṇo putte bhaṇai: « mamaṃ mārettā khāha, tāhe vaccaha ṇayaraṃ »; te neccanti. jeṭṭho bhaṇai: « mamaṃ khā[ya]ha », evaṃ jāva ḍaharao. tāhe piyā se bhaṇai: « mā anna-m-annaṃ māremo. eyaṃ (v.l. evaṃ) Cilāyaṇa vavaroviyāṃ Suṃsumaṃ khāmo ». evaṃ āhārettā puttimaṇsaṃ...; cp. Nāyā I, 18 (Schubring p. 62; Suttāgame 1111, 5-1112, 9), slightly amplified. On endocannibalism, i.e. eating of the flesh of relatives, see e.g. S. AL GEORGE and A. ROŞU, *Indriya et le sacrifice des prāṇa (Contribution à la préhistoire d'un terme philosophique indien)*, in « Mitteilungen des Instituts für Orientforschung », 5, 3 (1957), p. 388 ff. (346-97).

38. The Nāyā takes care to forestall possible misinterpretations of this fact: *jahā vi (...)* Dhaṇeṇaṃ sattha-vāheṇaṃ no vaṇṇa-heuṃ vā, no rūva-heuṃ vā, no bala-heuṃ vā, no visaya-heuṃ vā, Suṃsumāe dāriyāe maṃsa-soniye āhārie, n'annattha egāe Rāyagihāṃ sampāvaṇ' aṭṭhayāe... (Suttāgame 1112, 12-14).

39. ... evāṃ eva... nigganṭho vā nigganṭhī vā... no vaṇṇa-heuṃ vā, no rūva-h. vā, no bala-h. vā, no visaya-h. vā, āhāraṃ āhārei, n'annattha egāe siddhi-gamaṇa-sampāvaṇ' aṭṭhayāe (1112, 15-18); cp. ĀvṬH p. 371a (~ ĀvCu p. 497): evaṃ sāhūṇa vi āhāro puttimaṇso vamo kāraṇio; teṇa āhāreṇa ṇayaraṃ gayā, puṇar avi bhogaṇaṃ ābhāgi jāyā, evaṃ sāhū vi nevvāṇa-sukassa ābhāgi bhavanti...; see also fn. 40.

century) retain this episode⁴⁰, but, in a verse common to both, the authors delicately express their disapproval of the heroes' conduct through a derogatory qualification indicative of their embarrassment:

*tā Suṃsumāe dehaṃ a-ratta-duṭṭhehi naṃ bhuttaṃ*⁴¹.

« And these cruel rogues ate Suṃsumā's body ».

(iii) The final step of normalization is reached in Hemacandra's *Yogaśāstravṛtti* version⁴², and this is all the more understandable as this religious compendium was purposely composed for the edification of king Kumārapāla, who had been recently converted to Jainism⁴³. There the « shocking » episode is simply ousted and replaced by a commonplace development⁴⁴: instead of taking any type of decision, Dhana resorts to lamentation, bewailing the whims, cruelty and strength of fate which has placed him in such a difficult position that nothing can be done to help him⁴⁵. Differing slightly on some points of details, the

40. Nemicandra, *Ā(khyānaka)M(aṇi)K(ośa)* (...), ed. by Muni Puṇyavijaya, with an Intr. by Umakant P. Shah (PrTS 5, 1962), p. 126, gā. 27-29. Likewise, the father proposes to his sons that they kill him. Each of the boys says the same thing also. But this solution is not adopted:

*tāva puris'usiya-kaṇṭhā maraṇāvattthaṃ gayā chuhābhīhayā
jānae'uttā « duhiyaṃ maṇi khāuṃ taraha vasaṇaṃ imaṃ » (27).
iya sesehiṃ vi bhāṇiyaṃ kameṇa, no manniyaṃ imaṃ jāva (28ab)
ey' uvamāe jānaṃ āhāro vannaṃ Jīn' indehiṃ
nitthariyaṃ te vasaṇaṃ puṇaṃ avi suha-bhāyaṇaṃ jāyā (29).*

Ratnaprabhāsūri, *Doghaṭṭi-vṛtti* (ad Dharmadāsa Uvaesamālā gā. 38), Bhavnagar, 1958 (Ātmananda Jain Granthamālā 6), p. 187, gā. 31-34. On the contrary, the later commentary by Rāmavijaya (18th century; Hindi translation by Muni Padmavijaya, Delhi, 1971) is to be considered as belonging to stage (iii), since this episode is suppressed.

41. AMK gā. 28cd = UvaesT gā. 33cd.

42. Ad *Yogaśāstra* I, 13, pp. 98-104, in Hemacandra, *Yogaśāstra. Prathamō vi-bhāgaḥ: prathama-dvītiyau prakāśau*, ed. Jambūvijaya Muni (Jaina Sāhitya Vikāsa Maṇḍala), Bombay, 1977.

43. Cf. Jambūvijaya Muni's Gujarati Introduction, pp. 4-5; G. BÜHLER, *Über das Leben des Jaina-Monches Hemacandra*, Vienna, 1889 = *The Life of Hemacandrācārya* (SJS 11, 1936), p. 39; *ibid.*, pp. 44-7, about the reinforcement of religious orthodoxy as a consequence of Kumārapāla's conversion.

44. Cp. W. NORMAN BROWN, *Escaping One's Fate: A Hindu Paradox... in Hindu Fiction*, in « Studies in Honor of M. Bloomfield », New Haven, 1920, p. 91 (89-104) = *India and Indology. Selected Papers*, by W. NORMAN BROWN, ed. by R. Rocher, New-Delhi, 1978, pp. 153-61.

45. *Yogaśāstravṛtti*, verses 46-54, pp. 101-2:

*« mama sarva-sva-nāśo 'bhūt, putrī prāṇa-priyā mṛtā
mṛtyu-koṭiṃ vayaṃ prāptā, dhig aho daiva-jṛmbhitam! (46)
na yat puruṣa-kāreṇa sādhyāṃ dhī-sampadā na ca
tad ekaṃ daivam evēha balibhyo balavattaram (47)...
aho daivaṃ mitram iva kadā cid anukampate
kadācit paripanthīva niṣsaṅkaṃ praṇihanti ca! » (50).*

Digambara versions completely drop this part of the story, as they are concerned only with Cilātīputra's destiny ⁴⁶.

In the second example, the Jaina versions are opposed to the other versions of Aarne-Thompson's tale type 567A, « The Magic Bird-Heart and the Separated Brothers » ⁴⁷. Whether Brahmanical or Buddhist ⁴⁸, the non-Jaina accounts are based upon the following main motif: two heroes respectively eat the head and the heart of a bird, thanks to which they gain sovereignty and wealth. In contradistinction to them, the two Jaina texts stand alone — the Prakrit one in the Uvaesamālā commentary of the 12th century ⁴⁹, and the Sanskrit one in the anonymous Kathākośa assigned to the 14th-15th century ⁵⁰. In them, sovereignty and wealth are acquired by means of two magic gems which have been bestowed upon one of the heroes by a yakṣa which appeared to him while it was his turn to keep the watch at night ⁵¹. Though no conclusive evidence is available, it may be assumed, with Prof. Bhayani, that « the substitution of magic gems for magic birds is the result of Jainistic reworking, as killing and eating of birds has been always one of the cardinal sins for

46. In the various *Ārāḍhanā-Kathākośas* developing Śivārya's *Mūlārāḍhanā* gā. 1553 (1549 in Sholapur revised ed. 1978²): references in A. N. UPADHYE, *Bṛhatkathākośa*, p. 79, and B. K. Khadbadi's article, pp. 18-19 (see above, fn. 36).

47. A. AARNE, S. THOMPSON, *The Types of the Folktale. A Classification and Bibliography*, Helsinki, 1973² (FF Communications no. 184). Type 567A is specific to India. It is a subdivision of type 567 « The Magic Bird-Heart », found in various parts of the world, which itself has to be considered with type 566 « The Three Magic Objects and the Wonderful Fruits »: see « Communications » (Paris), no. 39 (1984).

48. For a survey and study of the type as represented through the Indian versions, see H. C. BHAYANI, *The Magic Bird-Heart. Four Old and Medieval Indian Versions*, in « Proc. of the 26th International Congress of Orientalists », vol. III, pt. 1, ed. R. N. Dandekar, 1970, pp. 99-114; ID., *On The Prakrit Sources of Certain Indian Popular Tale Types and Tale Motifs*, in « Journal of the Ganganatha Jha Kendriya Sanskrit Vidyapeetha, Gangānātha Jha Centenary Volume », 29 (1973), pts. 1-4, pp. 146-47 (145-58).

49. *Doghaṭṭī* of Ratnaprabhasūri (see fn. 40), ad *Uvaesamālā* gā. 37, as a part of Jambūsvāmī story, gā. 523-679, pp. 169-77: studied by H. C. BHAYANI, *The Magic Bird-Heart*, p. 106 ff.

50. See C. H. TAWNEY, *The Kathākośa or Treasury of Stories (...)*, London, 1895, repr. Delhi, 1975, pp. 125-30: Story of Prince Virāṅgada and his friend Sumitra; ed. I. Hoffmann, München, 1974, pp. 301-37. This version is not mentioned in Prof. H. C. Bhayani's articles.

51. *Uvaesamālā* Ṭ, gā. 549 ff.:

(tassa) appae donni rayañāṇi (553d)

eg'ega tāṇa rajjaṇ, sijjhai annēṇa icchīyā lacchī (554).

Kathākośa, ed. p. 305: ... yakṣaḥ pratyakṣi babhūva. (...) « grhāṇēmau dvau maṇi ». (...) « eko nīla-maṇiḥ sapta-rātraṇ pūjito rājyaṇ dadāti. dvitīyo rakta-maṇis tava manorathād adhikaṇ divasa-bhoga-sāmagrīṇ dāsyati. nīla-maṇi rāja-kumārāya dātavyaḥ ».

the Jainas »⁵². On the other hand, however, the motif of bird-eating providing kingship was certainly known in Jaina circles: inserted in another narrative frame, it appears in the Kāṣṭhamuni-story as narrated in the Canonical literature⁵³, and also in the later versions⁵⁴!

Thus, an analysis of significant cases may speak in favour of religious normalization. But — and the final restriction of the last example considered proves it — we must guard against an oversimplified view of the facts. If normalization exists, it is as a trend, always tempered by fantasy and diversity. Murders, evil deeds, etc. do, after all, find a place in Jaina narrative literature. They even play their own part in moral teaching, provided they are clearly stamped in a negative way in order to illustrate the all-pervading law of karman and the behaviour of a bad character. To confine myself to *himsā*: such persons as hunters, butchers, meat-eaters, fishermen, etc. are the heroes of the first part of the *Vivāgasūya* (11th Anga)⁵⁵, which aims at showing the results of bad actions (*duḥa-vivāgā*). According to the *Uvāsagadasāo* 8⁵⁶, murder of her rivals, indulging in meat, alcohol, amorous pleasures were the achievements of Lady Revatī, who was reborn in the *narakas*. Here, the presentation of immorality is, so-to-say, apotropaic.

Elsewhere, it helps to emphasize the spiritual progress of a character or to enhance the opposition between a positive and a negative figure. For example, the Jainas, like the Buddhists, narrate the legend of King *Sodāsa*, of which several versions are available and have been studied by F. R. Hamm⁵⁷. All of them first tell how people are led to commit

52. H. C. BHAYANI, *The Magic Bird-Heart*, p. 113; for an extreme consequence of this idea, see M. BLOOMFIELD, *Life and Stories of the Jaina Savior Pārçvanātha*, Baltimore, 1919: Additional note 16: « The sin of sacrificing a dough cock (*piṣṭakur-kuta*) », pp. 195-98: invited to do so by his mother, the prince Surendradatta eats the « flesh » of a doughcock she had « slain »: both of them will undergo various rebirths in the shape of animals.

53. See *ĀvTH* pp. 428b-29b (ad *ĀvN* 949): *jo eyassa* (i.e. of the bird) *sīsaṃ khāi, so rāyā hoi tti*: « who eats the head of this (bird), will become king »; German translation and analysis of this story with various references in A. METTE, *Pind' esanā. Das Kapitel der Oha-nijjuttī über den Bettelgang*, Wiesbaden, 1974 (Ak. der Wiss. u. der Lit., Mainz, Abh. der Geistes u. Sozialwiss. Kl. 1973, 11), pp. 98-101.

54. Cf. Hēmaṇvijaya, *Kathāratnākara*, no. 57, etc., quoted by R. WILLIAMS, *Two Prakrit Versions...*, p. 37; various Gujarati *rāsas* are also mentioned by H. C. BHAYANI, *The Magic Bird-Heart*, p. 114.

55. Ed. *Suttāgame* 1241-1282; a short analysis in W. SCHUBRING, *Die Lehre der Jainas*, p. 67; ed. P. L. Vaidya, Poona, 1933, Intr. pp. II-XV.

56. Ed. *Suttāgame* 1156-1160; A. F. Rudolf Hoernle (see fn. 31), text pp. 140-59; trsl., pp. 152-65.

57. F. R. HAMM, *Jaina-Versionen der Sodāsa-Sage*, in « Beiträge zur indischen Philologie u. Altertumskunde, Walther Schubring zum 70 Geburtstag dargebracht von der deutschen Indologie », Hamburg, 1951, pp. 66-74: *ĀvCu* I, p. 534, 2-7; *ĀvTH* pp. 401b-2a; *Vasudevahindī*, ed. Caturvijaya and Puṇyavijaya Muni, Bhavnagar, 1930, p. 197, 5-21; Vimalasūri, *Paumac* XXII, 72-78; 90; Raviṣeṇa, *Padmacarita* XXII, 132-148; Hemacandra, *Triṣaṣṭi* VII, 4, 85-100 (trsl., vol. IV, p. 187 ff.); also *Dictionary of Prakrit Proper Names*, s.v. *Sodāsa*.

crimes in order to satisfy the king's love for (human) flesh; by contrast, the final part shows his conversion by a monk, and, as may be expected, stress is laid in Hemacandra's account on the absence of flesh as a characteristic of the dharma taught to him (against for instance ĀvṛCu which have only the catchword *dharmma-kahaṇaṃ!*). Buffalo-killing, « which was in violent conflict with the tenets of Jainism », as Williams says⁵⁸, forms the basic framework of the Kālaśaukarika-Sulasa story which goes back to the Āvaśyaka texts, and appears in the anonymous Maṇipaticarita⁵⁹. The former hero, a « carnivorous » man⁶⁰, kills five hundred buffaloes and undergoes rebirth in hell, his sense perceptions becoming inverted; on the other hand, his son, a pious layman, refuses to kill even one, though invited to do so by other persons.

On the whole, from the collation of cases *with* bowdlerization and counter-cases *without* bowdlerization, it appears that this process is highly dependent on the didactic purpose of the narrative, even more than on the moral appropriateness inherent in a given topic⁶¹. If it is open to unfavourable interpretation which could darken the picture of a good hero, it can become a problem and may be expurgated, or at least diminished by giving it a religious tinge. As an illustration: both the Bṛhatkathā recensions and the Vasudevahiṇḍi, as well as the later Jaina versions, insert an episode where Cārudatta kills and then eats a goat, although he is unwilling to do so⁶². This reluctance, together with the introduction in the Jaina texts⁶³ of a religious discourse pronounced by the young man in order to save the goat's soul, as well as the utterance of the *pañcanamaskāra*-formula⁶⁴, may have accounted for the survival and the preservation of the motif as handed down by the tradition.

To conclude: this survey is naturally far from being exhaustive. Nevertheless, a few general observations may be made here:

- 1) In a way comparable to the cinema or television in modern times, narrative literature was, as it were, the mass-medium *par excellence* of the (Mediaeval) Jains. As such, it was necessary that it should convey the recognized values of the « *honnête homme* »; and we have seen that the Jaina intelligentsia, repre-

58. R. WILLIAMS, *Two Prakrit Versions*, p. 24.

59. Gā. 428-440.

60. Gā. 428.

61. Cp. J. HERTEL, *On the Literature of the Shvetambaras of Gujarat*, Leipzig, 1922, pp. 8-9.

62. Cf. J. C. JAIN, *The Vasudevahiṇḍi. An Authentic Jain Version of the Bṛhatkathā*, Ahmedabad, 1977 (L.D. Series 59), pp. 48; 290 ff.

63. *Vasudevahiṇḍi*, *ibid.*; Hemacandra, *Triṣaṣṭi*, trsl., vol. V, pp. 53-4; ĀMK gā. 612 ff., p. 214; etc.

64. See G. ROTH, *Notes on the Pañca-namokkāra-parama-maṅgala in Jaina Literature*, in ALB, 38 (1974), « Mahāvīra Jayanti Volume », pp. 1-18: « the employment of the *p.n.* invocations for the sake of protection against all sorts of evils and dangers » (p. 5).

sented by the great Mediaeval authors (Hemacandra, Abhayadeva), has played an important part in their establishment and preservation: these writers act as social guardians endowed with great moral authority^{64bis}. Conversely, old beliefs may be seen in the Canonical stories (Revatī, Cīlātīputra, Magic Bird-Heart): thus the system of values must have undergone a considerable change between the two periods, a new set having progressively been installed.

- 2) In most cases, it is only *our* comparative analysis which shows that there is censorship or bowdlerization; as a rule, the exclusion of a motif is implicitly made, without the author pointing it out.
- 3) No topic is by itself positive or negative; but some areas of thought are more sensitive than others. The focus on narratives connected with *hiṃsā* is not the result of a deliberate choice; it is undoubtedly a recurring difficult point, though certainly not the only one.
- 4) Conditions of bowdlerization:
A critical theme is excluded if it may disturb the moral logic of the narrative by tarnishing a good hero's personality.
A critical theme is kept if it is connected with a negative hero, and the logic of acts and retribution is respected; or in other cases, provided that it is balanced by the tone of the story, e.g. the narrator's condemnation of bad conduct, or the addition of religious considerations, etc.

Finally, however limited or difficult it is to grasp with certainty, bowdlerization may be considered as a device which has contributed to the adaptation of narratives to evolving ideologies. From this point of view, I would quote Sukthankar's statement concerning the *Mahābhārata*⁶⁵: « *If the epic is to continue to be a vital force in the life of any progressive people, it must be a slow-changing book!* The fact of expurgation and elaboration is only an outward indication of its being a book of inspiration and guidance in life ». Likewise, Jaina narrative literature preserves some traces which prove that, indeed, « the changelessness of Jainism is no more than a myth »⁶⁶.

64bis. See additional note below.

65. *The Mahābhārata...*, Prolegomena p. CI; cp. another type of approach, I. PROUDFOOT, *Interpreting Mahābhārata Episodes as Sources for the History of Ideas*, in ABORI, 60 (1979), pp. 41-63.

66. R. WILLIAMS, *Jaina Yoga. A Survey of the Mediaeval Śrāvakācāras*, London, 1963 (London Oriental Series 14), p. XIX.

ADDITIONAL NOTE

Hemacandra's rôle in standardizing the narratives has been underlined above. A systematic confrontation of his works with his main source, the Āvaśyaka-tradition, would reveal further cases of expurgation etc. Thus, for instance, the Triṣaṣṭi X, 6 closely follows ĀvCu 159 ff. and/or ĀvṬH 671b ff. in the account of Śreṇika's dynasty but simply jumps over a somewhat improper passage about Śiva-Maheśvara's origin embedded in the source-text (Cu 174, 13-176, 10; ṬH 685b, 6-687a, 7).

ABBREVIATIONS

- ĀvCu = Āvaśyaka-cūrṇi śrīmaj-Jinadāsa-gaṇimahattara-kṛtayā sūtra-cūrṇyā sametaṃ śrīmad-Āvaśyaka-sūtram. Ed. Ānandasāgarasūri. Ratlam, 1928-29 (part I; ref. to page and line).
 ĀvN = Āvaśyaka-niryukti. Quotations and numbering of verses following: śrīmad-bhavaviraha-Haribhadrāsūri-sūtrita-vṛtty-alaṃkṛtaṃ śrīmad-Āvaśyaka-sūtra, Āgamodaya samiti, Bombay, 1916-17.
 ĀvṬH = Haribhadra's Āvaśyaka-ṭikā. See the preceding.
 gā. = gāthā.
 HOS = Harvard Oriental Series, Cambridge, Mass.
 Intr. = Introduction.
 PrTS = Prakrit Text Society Series, Varanasi, Ahmedabad.
 SJS = Singhi Jaina Series, Bombay.
 Suttāgame = Ed. of the eleven Angas of the Jaina Śvetāmbara Canon. Vol. I, ed. Gurgaon, 1953 (page and line).
 Ṭ = ṭikā.
 ~ indicates a very close correspondence between two verses or two passages.

Other abbreviations of books, series, etc. as W. SCHUBRING, *Die Lehre der Jainas*, Berlin, Leipzig, 1935 (Grundriss der indo-arischen Philologie und Altertumskunde, III, 7).