**Zeitschrift:** Asiatische Studien : Zeitschrift der Schweizerischen Asiengesellschaft =

Études asiatiques : revue de la Société Suisse-Asie

**Herausgeber:** Schweizerische Asiengesellschaft

**Band:** 60 (2006)

Heft: 3

**Artikel:** The words kanhu and kanhu-rhassiya in some canonical Jaina texts

**Autor:** Tieken, Hermann

**DOI:** https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-147719

#### Nutzungsbedingungen

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist die Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften auf E-Periodica. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Zeitschriften und ist nicht verantwortlich für deren Inhalte. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern beziehungsweise den externen Rechteinhabern. Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen sowie auf Social Media-Kanälen oder Webseiten ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Mehr erfahren

#### **Conditions d'utilisation**

L'ETH Library est le fournisseur des revues numérisées. Elle ne détient aucun droit d'auteur sur les revues et n'est pas responsable de leur contenu. En règle générale, les droits sont détenus par les éditeurs ou les détenteurs de droits externes. La reproduction d'images dans des publications imprimées ou en ligne ainsi que sur des canaux de médias sociaux ou des sites web n'est autorisée qu'avec l'accord préalable des détenteurs des droits. En savoir plus

### Terms of use

The ETH Library is the provider of the digitised journals. It does not own any copyrights to the journals and is not responsible for their content. The rights usually lie with the publishers or the external rights holders. Publishing images in print and online publications, as well as on social media channels or websites, is only permitted with the prior consent of the rights holders. Find out more

**Download PDF:** 19.11.2025

ETH-Bibliothek Zürich, E-Periodica, https://www.e-periodica.ch

# THE WORDS KAŅHUĪ AND KAŅHUĪ-RĀHASSIYA IN SOME CANONICAL JAINA TEXTS

## Herman Tieken, Leiden

#### Abstract

Middle-Indic kanhuī is generally translated as an indefinite pronoun of place. A closer consideration of the instances of the word seem to suggest that it actually is an indefinite pronoun of time. It is noted, however, that, as shown by Sanskrit tatra, a pronoun of place might occasionally also be used as a pronoun of time. In practically all instances the word is part of the phrase na ... kanhuī. In addition, it is found in some kind of compound, namely kanhuī-rāhassiya, which seems to refer to people looking constantly (or everywhere) for a private place where they might have sex. Finally, it is suggested that kanhuī is most likely derived from Sanskrit karhicit.

The middle indic word kanhuī is rare. It is attested only in some canonical Jaina texts, to wit, Sūyagada and Uttarajjhāya. In the commentaries the word is glossed with kvacit, kutaścit and kutracit, that is, with indefinite pronouns of place. In at least one instance, though, there is a textual variant kayāi vi (note the double (v)i, Skt api), which assumes an underlying indefinite pronoun of time. Jacobi translates the word, which is mainly found at the end of a line and in conjunction with negative na, generally with "anywhere", except in  $S\bar{u}ya$ . 1.2.3.6 [148], where he translates it with "for some reason or other". Schubring renders this instance with "somehow" ("irgendwie"). In the most recent translation of this sūtra, by Bollée, the word has been left untranslated, which is curious if only because Bollée is the only scholar so far who has dedicated a separate, though brief, study to kanhuī, in which he, moreover, opts explicitly for the interpretation of the word as an indefinite pronoun of place.<sup>2</sup> However, on closer consideration this very passage seems instead to argue in favour of the interpretation of kanhuī as an indefinite pronoun of time. The texts reads as follows:

- The editions used are those of the Jaina-Āgama-Series: Sūyagaḍaṃgasuttaṃ, edited by muni JAMBŪVIJAYA and muni DHARMACANDRAVIJAYA (Jaina-Āgama-Series, 2), Bombay 1978, Dasaveyāliyasuttaṃ, Uttarajjhayaṇāiṃ, Āvassayasuttaṃ, edited by muni Puṇyavijaya and paṇḍita Amṛtalāla Mohanalāla BHOJAKA (Jaina-Āgama-Series, 15), Bombay 1977.
- 2 BOLLÉE, 1983:111-112.

evam kāmesaņam vidū ajja sue payahejja samthavam kāmī kāme ņa kāmae laddhe vāvi aladdha kanhuī.<sup>3</sup>

#### Bollée's German translation runs as follows:

So soll er, die Suche nach Sinnesgenüssen kennend, heute und morgen/künftig seine Bindung aufgeben. Wer noch im Bereich der Sinnesgelüste weilt, soll auf die Objekte seiner Wünsche verzichten, ob er sie (schon) erlangt oder (noch) nicht.<sup>4</sup>

As said, we seem to have to do with a clear case of *kanhuī* as an indefinite pronoun of time here:

A person who thus knows (what are the consequences of) chasing after sensual pleasures should give up (any form of) intimacy, today (or else) tomorrow. A person who is prey to sensual pleasures will <u>never</u> be satisfied, neither when he has gained such pleasures nor when he hasn't.

In the above translation na and  $kanhu\bar{\imath}$  and are taken together. It should be noted that both Jacobi and Schubring take  $kanhu\bar{\imath}$  and the negative particle na separately, construing na with the main verb and the pronoun  $kanhu\bar{\imath}$  with the phrase laddhe  $v\bar{a}$  vi aladdha. Thus, Jacobi translates:

So he who knows the pursuit of pleasures, must sooner or later give up their enjoyment (lest they drag him down). He who is still surrounded by pleasant things, should <u>not</u> love pleasures, whether he obtains them or for some reason or other does not obtain them;<sup>5</sup>

## Schubring's translation runs as follows:

- Note kanhuī with the dental instead of retroflex nasal and aladdha, which is unmarked for case. kaṇhuī has been passed over in ŚILĀNKĀCĀRYA's Sanskrit commentary (Ācārāṅgasūtram and Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtram with the Niryukti of ācārya Bhadrabāhusvāmī and Commentary of Śīlāṅkācārya, edited by ācārya SĀGARĀNANDASŪRIJĪ Mahārāja and muni JAMBŪVIJAYAJĪ [Lālā Sundarlāl Jain Āgamagranthamālā, vol. I], Delhi 1978:48). The cūrṇi commentary has kaṇhui tti kvacid grāme vā pure vā (Sūyagaḍaṅgasutta [Part I] with Bhadrabāhu's Niryukti and Cūrṇi by Anonymous Writer, edited by muni PuṇyavijayaJī [Prakrit Text Society Series, no. 19], Ahmedabad 1975:72).
- 4 BOLLÉE, 1988:72.
- 5 Јасові, 1973:258.

[E]benso möge, wer da weiß, wie das Begehren suchen heißt, [noch] heute [oder] morgen den Umgang [damit] aufgeben. Wenn man begehren möchte, soll man dem Begehren nicht nachgeben, mag es sich <u>irgendwie</u> erfüllt haben oder nicht.<sup>6</sup>

However, there is some evidence to suggest that we are indeed dealing with a phrase na ...  $kanhu\bar{\imath}$ , which means that  $kanhu\bar{\imath}$  is to be construed with the main verb of the sentence. This seems to be the case in  $Uttarajjh\bar{a}ya$  1.7 [7] irrespective of the question as to whether we are dealing with a pronoun of place or of time:

tamhā viņayam esejjā sīlam padilabhejjao buddhavutte niyāgaṭṭhī <u>na</u> nikkasijjai <u>kanhuī</u>.<sup>7</sup>

#### Jacobi translates:

Therefore be eager for discipline, that you may acquire righteousness; a son of the wise, who desires liberation, will <u>not</u> be turned away from anywhere.<sup>8</sup>

The critical apparatus notes a variant, transmitted in a Prākrit  $t\bar{t}k\bar{a}$ ,  $kay\bar{a}i\ vi$ . The interpretation of  $kanhu\bar{\iota}$  as an indefinite pronoun of time makes indeed equally good sense:

Therefore one should eagerly develop discipline and obtain good conduct. [For] one who is looking for the right way [taught by] the "Buddha's son" (read:  $buddhavuttaniy\bar{a}gatth\bar{i}$ ) is never turned away.

In the two remaining instances of kaṇhuī in the Uttarajjhāya the situation is less clear. In any case in his translation of Uttarajjhāya 2.42 [90],

se nūņa mae puvvim kammā'nāṇaphalā kaḍā jeṇāham nābhijāṇāmi puṭṭho keṇai kaṇhuī,

- 6 SCHUBRING, 1926:135. Schubring quotes the *cūrṇi* (*kaṇhui* [t]ti kvacit) and ŚILĀNKĀCĀRYA (*kaṇhaī kutracit*), which latter quotation I have not been able to find in the edition of ŚILĀNKĀCĀRYA's commentary, for which, see above, note 3.
- padilabhejjao is porbably to be divided into padilabhejja and o = (t)u. For buddhapatte niyāgaṭṭhī there is a variant reading buddhaputtaniyāgaṭṭhī, which is probably to be preferred (see below).
- 8 Јасові, 1973:2.

Jacobi disconnects *kaṇhuī* and *ṇa* and assumes a phrase *puṭṭho keṇai kaṇhuī*, "when questioned by somebody somewhere":

Forsooth, in bygone times I have done actions productive of ignorance, for I do <u>not</u> remember them when asked by anybody <u>anywhere</u>.

If we are indeed dealing with a phrase na ... kanhuī, which is to be construed with the main verb, i.e. abhijāṇāmi, the interpretation of kanhuī as an pronoun of place hardly makes sense. The second line should instead be translated as follows:

For <u>whenever</u> someone questions me about [them, i.e. my former actions] I am <u>not</u> able to recollect them.

The sequence *puṭṭho keṇai kaṇhuī* is also found in *Uttarajjhāya* 1.2.48 [96]. However, in the latter instance *puṭṭha* does not seem to derive from *pṛṣṭa* "asked" but from *spṛṣṭa* "touched, attacked":

ee parīsahā savve kāsaveņa paveiyā je bhikkhū <u>na</u> vihaņņejjā puṭṭho keṇai <u>kaṇhu[ī]</u>,

which Jacobi translates as follows:

All these troubles have been declared by the Kāśyapa. A monk should <u>not</u> be vanquished by them, when attacked by any anywhere.<sup>10</sup>

An alternative translation of the second line, in which na ...  $kanhu\bar{\iota}$  are taken together, would be:

A real monk is one who, when attacked by any [of them], remains untouched.

Whatever is exactly the case in the instances just quoted,  $kanhu\bar{\imath}$  also occurs on its own without na, namely in what seems to be some kind of compound, namely  $kanhu\bar{\imath}-r\bar{a}hassiya$ . The expression is found in  $S\bar{u}yagada$  2.2.706, a passage which occurs again in 2.7.861 (with kanhui with short i):

- 9 JACOBI, 1973:14 (verse 40).
- 10 JACOBI, 1973:15 (top of page).

ahāvare bārasame kiriyāṭhāṇe lobhavattie tti āhijjati, taṃ jahā — je ime bhavaṃti āraṇṇiyā āvasahiyā gāmaṃtiyā kanhuīrāhassiyā, ņo bahusaṃjayā, ņo bahupaḍivirayā savvapāṇabhūta-jīva-sattehiṃ, te appaṇā saccāmosāiṃ evaṃ viuṃjaṃti — ahaṃ ṇa haṃtavvo anne haṃtavvā, ahaṃ ṇa ajjāvetavvo anne ajjāveyavvā, ahaṃ ṇa parighettavvo anne paritāveyavvo anne paritāveyavvā, ahaṃ ṇa uddaveyavvo anne uddaveyavvā, evāmeva te itthikāmehiṃ mucchiyā giddhā gaḍhitā garahitā ajjhovavaṇṇā jāva vāsāiṃ caupaṃcamāiṃ chaddasamāiṃ appayaro vā bhujjayaro vā bhuṃjittu bhogabhogāiṃ kālamāse kālaṃ kiccā annataresu āsuriesu kibbisiesu ṭhāṇesu uvavattāro bhavaṃti, tato vippamuccamāṇā bhujjo bhujjo elamūyattāe tamūyattāe jāimūyattāe paccāyaṃti, evaṃ khalu tassa tappattiyaṃ sāvajje tti āhijjati, duvālasame kiriyāṭhāṇe lobhavattie tti āhite.

## Jacobi translates this passage as follows:

We now treat of the twelfth kind of committing sins, viz. through greed. Those (heretical monks) who live in woods, in huts, about villages, or <u>practise some secret rites</u>, are not well controlled, nor do they well abstain (from slaying) all sorts of living beings. They employ speech that is true and untrue at the same time: "do not beat me, beat others; do not abuse me, abuse others; do not capture me, capture others; do not torment me, torment others; do not deprive me of life, deprive others of life." And thus they are given to sensual pleasures, desire them, are held captive by them, passionately love them for four or five years, for six or ten years – (the period) may be shorter or longer. After having enjoyed these pleasures, and having died at their allotted time, they will be born in some places inhabited by Asuras and evildoers. And when they are released therefrom, they will be born deaf and dum, or blind, or dumb by birth. Thereby the bad Karman accrues to him. This is the twelfth kind of committing sins, viz. through greed.<sup>11</sup>

Jacobi's translation of *kaṇhuī-rāhassiya* is based on the commentaries.<sup>12</sup> Unfortunately he did not take into account the immediate context, which deals specifically with people who are *itthikāmehiṃ mucchiyā*, or "blinded by a passionate desire for women". Accordingly, the word *rāhassiya* may be connected with *rahas* occurring in the phrase *rahas upacāra* in, for instance, *Mahābhārata* 3.279.21:

tathaiva priyavādena naipuņena śamena ca rahaścaivopacāreņa bhartāram paryatoṣayat, <sup>13</sup>

- 11 JACOBI, 1973:363; see also p. 430.
- 12 Quoted by Bollée, 1983:112: kimcid rahasyam eşām bhavati yathā homam mantrāś ca āraṇyagam vā ityādi. sarve devā eṣām rahasyam yenābrāhmaṇāya na dīyante, kārye maṇḍalapraveśadike rahasyam yeṣām te kvacid-rāhasikāḥ.
- 13 The Mahābhārata, edited by V.S. SUKTHANKAR et al., vol. 4, Poona 1942.

Likewise she [Sāvitrī] contented her husband with her pleasant speech, dexterity, and even tenor, as well as her private ministrations.<sup>14</sup>

The phrase rahas upacāra, "private ministrations", clearly refers to the sexual services Sāvitrī renders to her husband Satyavān here. Similarly, kanhuīrāhassiya may refer to men who "are kanhuī seeking privacy (rahas) to have sex". Admittedly, it is difficult to decide if kanhuī in the compound is an indefinite pronoun of time or place. If the enumeration āranniyā āvasahiyā gāmamtiyā forms a unit with kanhuī-rāhassiyā only then the interpretation of kanhuī as a pronoun of place seems the more logical one: "those men who are seeking privacy to have sex wherever they are, that is, in a forest, a house [or] a village, who lack self-restraint [...]". However, in the other case, namely when āranniyā āvasahiyā gāmamtiyā anticipates not only kanhuīrahassiyā but what follows after that (no bahusamjayā ...) as well, kanhuī could be taken as a pronoun of time as well as of place: "those men, whether they live in forests, houses [or] villages, who are seeking privacy everywhere/who are constantly seeking privacy to have sex, who lack self-restraint [...]").

In fact, when all is said and done in the case of *kaṇhuī* the attempt to make a distinction between an indefinite pronoun of time or place may well be too subtle, as it is in the case of, for instance, *tatra*, which, dependent on the context, may mean both "in that place" and "on that occasion". Even so, originally *kaṇhuī* most probably was either the one or the other. In this connection the derivation of the word *kaṇhuī* might be considered. Bollée, who takes *kaṇhuī* as an indefinite pronoun of place, divides the word into *kva* and *svid* (Vedic *kvá svid*). While *svid* is supposed to account for *hui*, Bollée admits that he has no solution for the -ṇ-.¹6 By way of alternative I would in the first place like to draw attention to the fact that the use of *kaṇhuī* parallels that of Sanskrit *karhicit*, which is likewise invariably found at the end of a sentence and in collocation

- 14 VAN BUITENEN, 1981:766.
- A similar expression (rahaḥ paricar-) is found in Mahābhārata 1.71. 24. In the available studies of the love story of Kaca and Devayānī, for instance, by M. Defourny and G. Dumézil, the implication of this expression have not been considered. Note, however, the word lalanā preceding it, which describes Devayānī as a temptress:

devayānyapi tam vipram niyamavratacāriņam anugāyamānā lalanā rahaḥ paryacarat tadā.

(The Mahābhārata, edited by V.S. SUKTHANKAR et al., vol. 1, Poona 1997 [reprint]).

16 BOLLÉE, 1983:112.

with the negative particle *na*. For examples of the phrase *na* ... *karhicit* I may refer to, e.g. *Mānavadharmaśāstra* 2.97:

vedās tyāgāśca yajñāśca niyamāśca tapāṃsi ca na vipraduṣṭabhāvasya siddhiṃ gacchanti <u>karhicit</u>, <sup>17</sup>

## and Mahābhārata 14.21.15:

tataḥ prāṇaḥ prādurabhūd vācam āpyāyayan punaḥ tasmād ucchvāsam āsādya na vāg vadati karhicit. 18

If kaṇhuī is indeed the same word as the Sanskrit indefinite pronoun of time karhicit, we would be dealing with quite an irregular derivation. On the other hand, every syllable of kar-hi-cit has a correspondence in kaṇ-hu-ī. The really problematical part in the derivation is the development of rh to ṇh, which is otherwise completely unknown. In this connection it should be noted that the same combination is also found in the Middle Indic adverb of time eṇhiṃ "now", in which case it is not accounted for either. It is not unlikely that specific usages of these words, for instance, to mark different degrees of emphasis or the use as a filler, have resulted in irregular sound developments. If, then, kaṇhuī is indeed derived from karhicit we should in the first place try to fit in the meaning "(n)ever". What I hope to have made clear by the analysis presented here is that this is not a problem. In fact, in some cases this meaning might even be preferred. This does not rule out, however, that in certain contexts kaṇhuī might have been used in such a way that it can equally well be translated as a pronoun of time.

- 17 *Mānava Dharma-Śātra: The Code of Manu*, edited by J. JOLLY, London 1887. See also 2.4 and 40, 4.77, 6.50, 7.39 and 84, 9.82 and 89, 10.95, 11.24, 190 and 224.
- 18 The Mahābhārata, edited by V.S. SUKTHANKAR et al., vol. 18, Poona 1960. See also 14.22.5: guṇājñānam avijñānam guṇijñānam abhijñatā/parasparaguṇān ete <u>na</u> vijñānanti karhicit.
- 19 enhim is mentioned but not explained by PISCHEL, 1900: § 144 and SCHWARZSCHILD, 1957:241–252. Incidentally, in connetion with the -h(u)- in enhim and kanhuī I would like to point to such Apabhramśa forms as taiyahum and taiyaho, pronouns of time followed by suffixes of the genitive plural (-hum/ho).

## **Bibliography**

## **Primary Sources**

Ācārāṅgasūtram and Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtram with the Niryukti of ācārya Bhadrabāhusvāmī and Commentary of Śīlāṅkācārya, edited by ācārya SĀGARĀNANDASŪRIJĪ Mahārāja and muni JAMBŪVIJAYAJĪ (Lālā Sundarlāl Jain Āgamagranthamālā, vol. I), Delhi 1978.

Dasaveyāliyasuttam, Uttarajjhayaṇāim, Āvassayasuttam, edited by muni PUŅYAVIJAYA and paṇḍita Amṛtalāla Mohanalāla BHOJAKA (Jaina-Āgama-Series, 15), Bombay 1977.

The Mahābhārata, edited by V.S. SUKTHANKAR et al., Poona 1933-1959.

Mānava Dharma-Śātra: The Code of Manu, edited by J. JOLLY, London 1887.

Sūyagaḍaṅgasutta [Part I] with Bhadrabāhu's Niryukti and Cūrṇi by Anonymous Writer, edited by muni PUŅYAVIJAYAJI (Prakrit Text Society Series, no. 19), Ahmedabad 1975.

Sūyagaḍaṃgasuttaṃ, edited by muni JAMBŪVIJAYA and muni DHARMACANDRAVIJAYA (Jaina-Āgama-Series, 2), Bombay 1978.

## Secondary Sources

BOLLÉE W.B.,

"Notes on Middle Indo-Aryan Vocabulary II", in *Journal of the Oriental Institute Baroda* 33:108–122.

1988 Studien zum Sūyagaḍa: Textteile, Nijjutti, Übersetzung und Anmerkungen Teil II (Schriftenreihe der Südasien-Instituts der Universität Heidelberg 31), Wiesbaden.

VAN BUITENEN, J.A.B.

1981 (reprint) The Mahābhārata: 2 The Book of the Assembly Hall, 3 The Book of the Forest, Chicago.

JACOBI, H.

1973 (reprint) Jaina Sūtras Part II: The Uttarādhyayana Sūtra, The Sūtrakṛtānga Sūtra (Sacred Books of the East, 45), New Delhi.

PISCHEL, R.

1900 Grammatik der Prakrit-Sprachen, Strassburg.

SCHUBRING, W.

1926 Worte Mahāvīras: Kritische Übersetzungen aus dem Kanon der Jaina. (Quellen der Religionsgeschichte), Göttingen.

SCHWARZSCHILD, L.A.

"Quelques adverbes pronominaux du Moyen Indien", in *Journal Asiatique* CCXLV:241–252.