

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. 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. [Siehe Rechtliche Hinweise.](#)

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. [Voir Informations légales.](#)

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. [See Legal notice.](#)

Download PDF: 30.03.2025

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

THE WORDS *KAN̐HUĪ* AND *KAN̐HUĪ-RĀHASSIYA* IN SOME CANONICAL JAINA TEXTS

Herman Tieken, Leiden

Abstract

Middle-Indic *kan̐huĪ* 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 ... kan̐huĪ*. In addition, it is found in some kind of compound, namely *kan̐huĪ-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 *kan̐huĪ* is most likely derived from Sanskrit *karhicit*.

The middle indic word *kan̐huĪ* is rare. It is attested only in some canonical Jaina texts, to wit, *Sūyagaḍa* and *Uttarajjhāya*.¹ In the commentaries the word is glossed with *kvacit*, *kutaścīt* and *kuṭracit*, 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 *Sūya*. 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 *kan̐huĪ*, in which he, moreover, opts explicitly for the interpretation of the word as an indefinite pronoun of place.² However, on closer consideration this very passage seems instead to argue in favour of the interpretation of *kan̐huĪ* as an indefinite pronoun of time. The texts reads as follows:

1 The editions used are those of the Jaina-Āgama-Series: *Sūyagaḍaṃgasuttam*, edited by muni JAMBŪVIJAYA and muni DHARMACANDRAVIJAYA (*Jaina-Āgama-Series*, 2), Bombay 1978, *Dasaveyāliyasuttam*, *Uttarajjhayaṇāim*, *Āvassayasuttam*, edited by muni PUṆYAVIJAYA and paṇḍita Amṛtalāla Mohanalāla BHOJAKA (*Jaina-Āgama-Series*, 15), Bombay 1977.

2 BOLLÉE, 1983:111–112.

*evaṃ kāmesaṇaṃ vidū ajja sue payahejja saṃthavaṃ
kāṃī kāṃe ṇa kāmae laddhe vāvi aladdha kaṇhuī.*³

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.⁴

As said, we seem to have to do with a clear case of *kaṇhuī* 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 never be satisfied, neither when he has gained such pleasures nor when he hasn't.

In the above translation *ṇa* and *kaṇhuī* are taken together. It should be noted that both Jacobi and Schubring take *kaṇhuī* and the negative particle *ṇa* separately, construing *ṇa* with the main verb and the pronoun *kaṇhuī* with the phrase *laddhe vā 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 not love pleasures, whether he obtains them or for some reason or other does not obtain them;⁵

Schubring's translation runs as follows:

3 Note *kaṇhuī* with the dental instead of retroflex nasal and *aladdha*, which is unmarked for case. *kaṇhuī* has been passed over in ŚĪLĀṆKĀCĀRYA's Sanskrit commentary (*Ācārāṅgasūtram and Sūtrakṛtāṅgasūtram with the Nirukti of ācārya Bhadrabāhusvāmī and Commentary of Śīlāṅkācārya*, edited by ācārya SĀGARĀNANDASŪRIJ Mahārāja and muni JAMBŪVIJAYAJI [*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 Nirukti and Cūrṇi by Anonymous Writer*, edited by muni PUṆYAVIJAYAJI [*Prakrit Text Society Series*, no. 19], Ahmedabad 1975:72).

4 BOLLÉE, 1988:72.

5 JACOBI, 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 irgendwie erfüllt haben oder nicht.⁶

However, there is some evidence to suggest that we are indeed dealing with a phrase *na ... kaṇhuī*, which means that *kaṇhuī* is to be construed with the main verb of the sentence. This seems to be the case in *Uttarajjhāya* 1.7 [7] irrespective of the question as to whether we are dealing with a pronoun of place or of time:

*tamhā viṇayam esejjā sīlaṃ paḍilabhejjao
buddhavutte niyāgaṭṭhī na nikkasijjai kaṇhuī.*⁷

Jacobi translates:

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

The critical apparatus notes a variant, transmitted in a Prākṛit *ṭīkā*, *kayāi vi*. The interpretation of *kaṇhuī* 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: *buddhavuttaniyāgaṭṭhī*) 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 nūṇa mae puvviṃ kammā’nāṇaphalā kaḍḍā
jeṇāhaṃ nābhijāṇāmi puṭṭho kenai kaṇhuī,*

6 SCHUBRING, 1926:135. Schubring quotes the *cūrṇi* (*kaṇhui [t]ti kvacit*) and ŚĪLĀṆKĀCĀRYA (*kaṇhai kutracit*), which latter quotation I have not been able to find in the edition of ŚĪLĀṆKĀCĀRYA’s commentary, for which, see above, note 3.

7 *paḍilabhejjao* is probably to be divided into *paḍilabhejja* and *o* (= (t)u). For *buddhapatte niyāgaṭṭhī* there is a variant reading *buddhaputtaniyāgaṭṭhī*, which is probably to be preferred (see below).

8 JACOBI, 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 not remember them when asked by anybody anywhere.⁹

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

For whenever someone questions me about [them, i.e. my former actions] I am not 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 *prṣṭa* “asked” but from *sprṣṭa* “touched, attacked”:

ee parīsahā savve kāsavena paveiyā
je bhikkhū na vihaṇṇejjā puṭṭho keṇai kaṇhu[ī],

which Jacobi translates as follows:

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

An alternative translation of the second line, in which *ṇa ... kaṇhuī* 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, *kaṇhuī* also occurs on its own without *ṇa*, namely in what seems to be some kind of compound, namely *kaṇhuī-rāhassiya*. The expression is found in *Sūyagāḍa* 2.2.706, a passage which occurs again in 2.7.861 (with *kaṇhui* 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, ṇo bahusaṃjayā, ṇo bahupaḍivirayā savvapāṇa-bhūta-jīva-sattehiṃ, te appaṇā saccāmosāṃ evaṃ viumjaṃti – ahaṃ ṇa haṃtavvo anne haṃtavvā, ahaṃ ṇa ajjāvetavvo anne ajjāveyavvā, ahaṃ ṇa parighettavvo anne parighet-tavvā, ahaṃ ṇa paritāveyavvo anne paritāveyavvā, ahaṃ ṇa uddaveyavvo anne ud-daveyavvā, evāmeva te itthikāmehiṃ mucchiyā giddhā gaḍhitā garahitā ajjhovavaṇṇā jāva vāsāṃ caupaṃcamāṃ chaddasamāṃ appayaro vā bhujjayaro vā bhumjittu bhog-abhogāṃ kālamāse kālaṃ kiccā annataresu āsuriesu kibbisiesu ṭhāṇesu uvavattāro bha-vaṃti, tato vippamuccamāṇā bhujjo bhujjo elamūyattāe tamūyattāe jāimūyattāe paccāyaṃti, evaṃ khalu tassa tappattiyaṃ sāvajje tti āhijjati, duvālasame kiriyāṭhāṇe lob-havattie 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 practise some secret rites, 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 dumb, or blind, or dumb by birth. Thereby the bad Karman accrues to him. This is the twelfth kind of committing sins, viz. through greed.¹¹

Jacobi’s translation of *kanhuī-rāhassiya* is based on the commentaries.¹² 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 naipuṇena śamena ca
rahaścaivopacāreṇa bhartāraṃ paryatoṣayat,*¹³

11 JACOBI, 1973:363; see also p. 430.

12 Quoted by BOLLÉE, 1983:112 : *kiṃcid rahasyaṃ eṣāṃ bhavati yathā homaṃ mantrās ca āraṇyagaṃ vā ityādi. sarve devā eṣāṃ rahasyaṃ yenābrāhmaṇāya na dīyante, kārye maṇḍalapraveśadīke rahasyaṃ yeṣāṃ te kvacid-rāhasikāḥ.*

13 *The Mahābhārata*, edited by V.S. SUKTHANKAR et al., vol. 4, Poona 1942.

Likewise she [Sāvitṛī] contented her husband with her pleasant speech, dexterity, and even tenor, as well as her private ministrations.¹⁴

The phrase *rahas upacāra*, “private ministrations”, clearly refers to the sexual services Sāvitṛī renders to her husband Satyavān here.¹⁵ Similarly, *kaṇhuī-rāhassiyā* may refer to men who “are *kaṇhuī* seeking privacy (*rahas*) to have sex”. Admittedly, it is difficult to decide if *kaṇhuī* in the compound is an indefinite pronoun of time or place. If the enumeration *āraṇṇiyā āvasahiyā gāmaṁtiyā* forms a unit with *kaṇhuī-rāhassiyā* only then the interpretation of *kaṇhuī* 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 *āraṇṇiyā āvasahiyā gāmaṁtiyā* anticipates not only *kaṇhuīrahassiyā* but what follows after that (*no bahusaṁjayā ...*) as well, *kaṇhuī* 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.

15 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 taṁ vipraṁ niyamavratācārīṇam
anugāyamānā lalanā rahaḥ paryacarāt 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. *Mānavadharmasāstra* 2.97:

*vedās tyāgāśca yajñāśca niyamāśca tapāmsi ca
na vipraduṣṭabhāvasya siddhiṃ gacchanti karhicit.*¹⁷

and *Mahābhārata* 14.21.15:

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

If *kanhuī* 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.¹⁹ 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, *kanhuī* 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 *kanhuī* might have been used in such a way that it can equally well be translated as a pronoun of time.

17 *Mānava Dharma-Śāstra: 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 abhijñātā/parasparaguṇān ete na vijñānanti karhicit.*

19 *eṇhiṃ* is mentioned but not explained by PISCHEL, 1900: § 144 and SCHWARZSCHILD, 1957:241–252. Incidentally, in connection with the *-h(u)-* in *eṇhiṃ* 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 Nirukti of ācārya Bhadrabāhusvāmī and Commentary of Śīlāṅkācārya*, edited by ācārya SĀGARĀNANDASŪRIJĪ Mahārāja and muni JAMBŪVIJAYAJĪ (*Lālā Sundarlāl Jain Āgamagranthamālā*, vol. I), Delhi 1978.
- Dasaveyāliyasuttaṃ, Uttarajjhayaṇāṃ, Āvassayasuttaṃ*, edited by muni PUṆYAVIJAYA 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-Śāstra: The Code of Manu*, edited by J. JOLLY, London 1887.
- Sūyagaḍaṅgasutta [Part I] with Bhadrabāhu's Nirukti and Cūrṇi by Anonymous Writer*, edited by muni PUṆYAVIJAYAJĪ (*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.,
1983 “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 Sūtrakṛtāṅga 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.
1957 “Quelques adverbes pronominaux du Moyen Indien”, in *Journal Asiatique* CCXLV:241–252.