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Book Review

MUNI SUVRATASVĀMICARITA of Śrī Candrasūri—a Prakrit text edited by Pt. Rupendra Kumar Pagariya, L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, 1989, Price Rs. 70.00

The Prakrit literature is enriched by the addition of a Prakrit Mahākāvyā, viz., Muni Suvaratasvāmicarita of Śrī Candrasūri edited by Pandit Rupendra Kumar Pagariya. The L. D. Institute of Indology is to be congratulated for publishing such a work for the benefit of the Prakrit world. It is a narrative tale in Prakrit, and the Jaina narrative literature is very rich and extensive even when compared with the extent and wealth of the narrative tales in Sanskrit. With regard to the plots and contents, the Jaina narrative tales have a dignity of their own. In the matter of fine descriptions and the art of narration the Muni Suvaratasvāmicarita possesses all the good qualities of a Mahākāvyā, though not divided by cantos. From a perusal of this Mahākāvyā, it appears that Śrī Candrasūri is a very good poet and a master of narration.

The Muni Suvaratasvāmicarita of Śrī Candrasūri written in the twelfth century (to be exact in 1193 v.s.=1137 A.D.) with some 10,995 Prakrit gāthās gives the account of the life of Muni Suvra, the 20th Tīrthaṅkara in the line of Jaina hagiology. It narrates the story of nine great births of Muni Suvaratasvāmi. In his life as a householder Suvra was a finance minister under Cālukya king Jayasimha of Gujarat, and it was at that time he had composed this extensive literary work. This Kāvyā shows his knowledge of Prakrit grammar, metres, rhetoric, diction and description. It has a foreword by Dr H. C. Bhayani.

The life of this twentieth Tīrthaṅkara is terribly shrouded in darkness. As far as it is known to us, for the life of Muni Suvra we have access to the other two works. In the eighth book of the Triṣaṣṭi-śalākā-puruṣa-caritra of Hemacandra (1088-1172 A. D.), we have the life-story of this sage. In a similar way, the Muni Suvrata-caritra of Arhaddāsa is a separate book altogether on his life. The work contains 10 cantos and is also called Kāryaratna. It was published with a commentary in 1929 A.D. by the Jaina Siddhānta Bhavana, Arrah. There are other works lying in manuscripts (for which see Jinaratnakosa).
It goes without saying that the credit goes to Pandit Pagariya for undertaking the difficult task of editing such a text based on two old MSS. Though he has not given any variant readings in the footnotes by which we can sometimes verify the readings embodied in the text, the edition seems to be quite reliable and readable. It is a huge work and it needs meticulous care for editing. Pandit Pagariya, the editor of the work, with his erudition and lofty scholarship, has written an elaborate Introduction in Hindi containing an account of the author and a detailed summary of the text. This summary will help the reader to understand the meaning of the text, even though no Hindi translation is provided. He has also discussed the style of the author. The work is interesting for the history of Jaina narratives and also for depicting the then life-style of India.

The Prakrit language found in the text does not seem to be very old. In most of the cases the intervocalic non-aspirate consonants are retained, as a result of which the language sounds like Sanskrit. A man of Sanskrit can, therefore, read the book fluently.

We once again congratulate Pandit Pagariya and the L. D. Institute of Indology for bringing out such a treasure of Prakrit which not only throws some light on 'Gujarat's great contribution to Prakrit and Jaina literature, but also on the literary and cultural traditions of Gujarat in the early mediaeval period'. I hope the text will be received well and will be studied extensively at a later period.

Satya Ranjan Banerjee

MANORAMĀ-KĀḤA of Vardhamānasūrī—a Prakrit text edited by Pt. Rupendra Kumar Pagariya, L. D. Institute of Indology, Ahmedabad, 1983, Price Rs. 66.00

Prior to the publication of Muni Suvratasāmicarita, the L. D. Institute of Indology published Maṇoramā-kāḥa of Vardhamānasūrī in 1983. Pt. R. K. Pagariya with his painstaking labour and characteristic accuracy has edited this narrative tale from a hitherto unpublished manuscript. The Maṇoramā-kāḥa was composed in prose and verse by Vardhamānasūrī in 1140 v. s. (=1083-84 A.D.) at Dhandhuka in North Gujarat. It is an extensive Dharmakathā kāvyā in Prakrit. It contains nearly 80 stories and a rich material for linguistic and cultural studies. It has an elaborate introduction in Hindi.

Pt. R. K. Pagariya is to be congratulated for editing this text; and I believe all lovers of Prakrit will welcome this narrative tale.

Satya Ranjan Banerjee
SUZUKO OHIRA— A Study of Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya with special reference to Authorship and Date, L. D. Series 86, L. D. Institute of Ahmedabad, 1982, pp. x + 182, Price Rs. 48.00

Dr Suzuki Ohira is to be congratulated for her work, A Study of the Tattvārthasūtra with Bhāṣya and L. D. Institute is to be thanked for undertaking such a publication for the benefit of the Jaina scholars. The work shows the deep and strenuous research of Dr Ohira.

The Tattvārthasūtra is recognized as an authoritative text both by the Śvetāmbaras and Digambaras; both claim that it belongs to their traditions. The Śvetāmbaras think that the Bhāṣya is written by the author himself, while the Digambaras proclaim that it is not written by the author. However, Dr Ohira has tried to solve this problem. The date of the work is assigned to the 5th cent. A.D. The controversial point about the name of the author, Umāsvāmi or Umāsvāti, still remains unsolved.

The book has three chapters with several sub-sections along with notes and Bibliography in the Appendix. In Chapter I, the author has discussed the original version of the text, Tattvārthasūtra; whereas in Ch. II, it is discussed whether the Bhāṣya is an autocommentary or not. In Ch. III, the historical evaluation of the Tattvārthasūtra is discussed.

The Tattvārthasūtra is a very important book on Jaina logic. A thorough analysis of the text together with a comparative study with other schools prevalent at that time has long been a desideratum. Dr Ohira has nicely discussed the historical aspect of the work, but the Jaina world would have been much benefited, if she had discussed the above mentioned problem of the text in her book. We can only hope that Dr Ohira would take up this subject in future.

On the whole, the book shows a thorough mastery over the subject, and I hope the work will be appreciated by the scholars.

Satya Ranjan Banerjee

FILITA BHARUCHA— Role of Space-Time in Jaina’s Syādvāda and Quantum Theory, Sri Satguru Publications of Indian Books Centre, Shakti Nagar, Delhi, 1993, pp, vii+69. Price Rs. 120.00

It is one of the rarest contributions to the field of Jainism where the Syādvāda in Jain Philosophy is interpreted in the light of Quantum Theory of Space and Time. Dr Bharucha is to be praised for unfolding such an acute problem to the world of Jainistic studies.
The book has six chapters: Ch. 1. Advent of Space-Time, Ch. 2. Jaina views of Reality as Modern Thought of Space and Time, Ch. 3. Role of Quantum Theory in Deviant Logic, Ch. 4. Role of Universals, Thought Experiments: Reductio ad Absurdum, Ch. 5. General Theories of Space-Time, Ch. 6. Logico-Spatio-Temporal Space.

The book, in short, presents the role of the Syādvāda theory in the unification of Space and Time as enunciated by Einstein in his Quantum Theory. The reading of this book will help us to understand how the Eastern and Western thoughts of Space and Time can go on a par with each other, and how the Jains in those days thought of it. The book also proves the Jain’s contribution to the scientific world, I can only say that every lover of Indian culture will have to read this book.

Satya Ranjan Banerjee

WENDY DONIGER (ed)—Purāṇa Perennis, Reciprocity and Transformation in Hindu and Jaina Texts, Sri Satguru Publications of Indian Books Centre, Shakti Nagar, Delhi, 1993, pp. xii+331, Price Rs. 300.00 only.

The leading American, European and Indian scholars discuss in this book the subject of the Purāṇas focusing mainly on the relationship between the Great Purāṇas of the Sanskrit traditions and many other Purāṇas of different traditions. This book is a collection of essays beginning from the Vedic down to Jaina Purāṇas. The book has three parts, and in part III, the Jaina Purāṇas are discussed. John E. Cort has surveyed the Jaina Purāṇas in his paper, An Overview of the Jaina Purāṇas (pp. 185—206). This survey of the Jaina purāṇas is quite good, particularly when the space is limited. The author has rightly said that the Jaina Purāṇas ‘would total about seven hundred’ (p. 185). Padmanabh S. Jaini in his article, Jaina Purāṇas: a Purānic Counter Tradition (pp. 207—249) has excellently discussed the Jaina-Hindu interactions of the Purāṇas. It involves his insight into the problem. This paper shows how rich the Jaina Purāṇas are as a nexus for investigating and understanding the Jaina Purāṇas in all its aspects.

The book has notes to each chapter and an excellent Bibliography.

I recommend the book to all readers of Indology.

Satya Ranjan Banerjee
Sacred Literature of the Jains

[from the previous issue]

This entire statement has been given on p. 257. We have already seen (pp. 284 ff. 349, 352, 361, 363 and 3) that its appearance in aṅga 4 was secondary, and that here we frequently meet with the older readings. When in the insertions in the aṅgas made by the redactor (even in aṅga 4) any reference is paid to his enumeration, the citation is from the Nandī and not from aṅga 4. The Nandī and not aṅga 4 is therefore indisputably the source whence these citations are drawn. But whether or no the account here is really to be regarded as the source whence came the account in aṅga 4, appears to me to be still in dubiis. This assumption is rendered improbable by the fact there are very great differences in these accounts, not to mention that that of aṅga 4 is much more detailed. If, however, we regard the account in the N. as the source, then that in aṅga 4 is secondary and enlarged after it had effected a lodgment in that aṅgas. [19] But on the other hand it is a perfectly legitimate conclusion that the account in N. and in aṅga 4 were drawn from a common source now no longer extant. Finally, it must be stated that the entire section in N. almost gives me the impression of being a secondary insertion. The fact that it too contains the most wonderful statements, called into existence by the effort of pure fancy (cf. especially the statements concerning aṅga 6 and aṅga 12), cannot readily be reconciled with that tradition which regards the Nandī as the work of Devarddhigāṇi, the nominal redactor of the whole Siddhānta. Devarddhigāṇi would have expressed himself in a more sober, definite way, and would not have given rein to such monstrous figments of the imagination. We must not, however, suppress the fact that the Pāksīkasūtram takes no notice of this detailed statement of contents and extent945 of the 12 aṅgas, but limits itself merely to the enumeration of the twelve names.946

Then, too, the general observations in reference to the duvālāsārīgāṁ gaṇipidagaṁ, which are joined on to the account of each of the twelve aṅgas, are found here in just the same form as in aṅga 4; cf. pp. 368, 369. The five kārikās form the conclusion. They

945 I call attention here to the mention of the name Bhaddabāhu on aṅga 12, pp. 360, 367. It is noteworthy that he appears in the same gradation (though last in order) as the names Daśāra, Baladeva, Vasudeva, Harivānśa, and consequently as a mythological personage.

946 This is introduced in just the same manner as the previous one. See pp. 10, 13:—namo āsīṁ khamāsāpanāṁ saukṣembhāṁ imāṁ vālyīṁ duvālāsāṁgaṁ gaṇipidagaṁ, taṁ jahā…, and concludes in the same way: soyēhiṁ pi eyamāṁ duvālāsāṁgaṁ gaṇipidagaṁ bhagavante saśutte…….
contain statements in reference to the correct [20] attainment of the suanañam; the last one reads: suttattho khulu pañhama, bto nijjutti (ë) mësi bhënio t aiou niravaseso, esa vih hoı aṇuoe |15| According to Leumann, the reference in Bhag. 25, 3 cites this verse as the conclusion of this entire account (jëva suttattho aṇuoe). The nijjutti is also mentioned.

Next follow some statements which are not noticed by the author of the avacūri, from which we may conclude that they were inserted at a later period, though they may in reality be of great age. They comprise a section in prose in reference to the aṇunnā, aṇujñā, and a renewed repetition of the titles of the 12 aṅgas and a reference to Usabhaseṇa, as the original source of the aṇunnā. See p. 15.

The commentary, which I have before me (avacūri), the work of an anonymous author, is very short. The Calcutta edition contains the commentary of Malayagiri, according to Leumann. We have already seen that a Nandīvrțti is frequently cited—see pp. 353, 354 (Vicārāmītaṇgraṇa), 360 (Abhayadeva), — the citations from it being partly in Prakrit (gāthā), partly in Sanskrit. In the scholium on the Gaṇḍharasārdhaṇa (see pp. 371, 458) Sarvarājagāni ascribes a nandīvrțti to the old Haribhadra, who is said to have died 75 years after Devardhīgaṇi. The author of the Vicārāmītaṇgraṇa appears to ascribe such a nandīvrțti to Umāsvāmivācaka who was about 50 years older (see pp. 371, 372). He says (fol. 3a of the Berlin MS) tathā ca "ha bhagavān Umāsvāmivācakā: samyogdarśanajñānaacāritrāṇi mokṣaṁārga iti Nandīvrțtau, vācakaśabdaś ca pūrvagataśrutadhare rūḍhā, yathā : pūrvagataṁ sūtram anyac ca vineyān vācayamītī vācakāḥ, Nandīvrțtau : [21] vṛdi ya (see p. 353a). Such statements as these in reference to commentaries of so great an age are of great importance as regards the age of the Nandi.

XLII. The Anuyogadvārasūtram is an encyclopaedic review of everything worth knowing.947 composed in anuogas, questions and answers. It is composed in prose though there is a frequent admixture of gāthās. There are no subdivisions though a systemic arrangement prevails throughout.

As in the Nandi, the nīṇam is especially treated of here. The text commences forthwith with an enumeration of the same five forms of

947 An account of the method of defining and explaining the Śāstras, Kash.
the nāṇa, which we find also in N. ābhiniṃbhīya, suya, ohi, maṇapāyaṃvā, kevala. The second form, the suyaṇāṃ, śrutajñāṇam, is the one par excellence which is discussed further on in the Anuv. The subdivisions of the suyaṇ, are indicated by means of the same names which we find in N, though the gradations are somewhat different; see p. 11. It is divided into amgapavītham and into amgabāhīram,448 the latter into kāliyam and ukkāliyam; the latter of which again into āvassayam and āvassayavairattam.

Here in the An., the āvassayam alone is discussed. The author states that he desires to explain his work according to the following four points of view, though the real reason for this statement is not clear: āvassayam nikkhivissāmi, suam (śrutam) ni, khaṇḍham ni, ajjhayaṇam ni.4 After a kārikā inserted here the author proceeds to a discussion of the āvassayam per se, [22] which is caūvīham, viz.: nāma, thavaṇa, dāvā, bhāvā, respectively, the latter two being distinguished from the others as āgamo and no-āgamo. At the end the synonyms (egaṭṭhiyā naṇōghosā niṇāvanjanā nāmadhiyyā) are stated as follows: āvassayam, avassakaranīya, dhuvaniggho, visohī ya ajjhayaṇachakavaggo nao ārāhanā maggo // samaṇena sāvāṇa ya āvassakāyavayam āhavi jambū/āmito aho-nissassat yathā āvassayam nāma //449

This designation as ajjhayaṇapacchakkavagga points unequivocally to a definite text, divided into 6 adhyayanas. By the 6 adhyayanas we may understand the six kinds of āvassayam enumerated in the Nandi, above p. 11, and occurring below (see pp. 23, 24). These names as well as all the other synonyms of āvassaya belong to the domain of ethical, ritualistic or disciplinary matters. Our text, however, touches upon these subjects only occasionally.

Next to the enumeration of the synonyms of the āvassayam come the suyaṇ and the khaṇḍha, two of the four sections. To these we find that the same groups and sub-groups are ascribed as to the āvassayam; and an enumeration of the synonyms of each forms the conclusion. The verse containing the synonyms of the suyaṇ is as follows: [23] sua-sutta-gaṇṭha—siddhamita-sāsane āṇāvayaṇa uvaese | pannavaṇa āgane a egaṭṭhi payyavā sutte450 //, that containing the

448 There is unfortunately no enumeration of the aṅgabāhira texts in An.

449 = Viṣeś, I, 871 f. I call attention to the following from the scholiast:—sāmāyikādī-saṅghamadhyavanakalāpīmakatvād adhyayanaśaṇīvargah; tathā abhiprārthasiddham saṃyagupāyatanīya, mokṣārdhanāhetutvād ārāhdana, tathā mokṣapuraprapakatvād eva mārgah; ahorārasya madhye.

450 Between aṅg, ajña and vayana one MS. has utti which, however, throws the metre out of order; ukīrt vacanām vāgyogah scholiast; instead of sutte, sūtravīṣaye, we expect sue, ārute, which, however, does not suit the metre.
The last of these four sections designed to explain the āvassayam, refers ex professo to the ajjhayaṇam, and begins with an enumeration of these six ajjhayaṇas. A kārikā is first introduced,585 which may have found its way from here to painna 1 [24]—(see p. 433a),—, though both places may have drawn this verse from a common source. This verse states in brief compress the contents of each of the six ajjh. Then follow again the six names as in the Nandi. Next the first one, the sāmālan, is designated expressly as the one which is treated of in the An. To it are allotted four anuogadārās, sections for questions related to the subject-matter. These sections are uvakkame, nikheve, anugame, naye, and under this division the rest of the text is divided, the uvakkame taking the lion's share. In a MS, which I have before me, ms. or, fol. 762, = A, which contains 56 foll., the uvak embraces foll. 5a to 53b. That which preceded was on foll. 1b to 5a; nikheve is on three leaves, to 56b; anugame is despatched in ten lines on 56b and nae in six.

On p. 22 I called attention to the lack of harmony between the names of the six āvāṣyaka groups and the actual contents of our text which purports to discuss them. This lack of harmony, which is increased by the table of contents added for each one in particular, is so great, that I have in vain attempted a solution of the mystery as to how our text can have the face to assert that it discusses the

585 sāmālanām ( ! ) A: esām eva prastutāvāṣyakabhedanām sāmālikādinaṁ āvāṣyakabhedgesam adhyayanāṇām samudayaḥ. samudāyaṣya samiti(r) naiṁāntaryena, mīlanaṁ, ... samudāgaṁ, tena nispanno ya āvāṣyakāriṇāmādhāṁ sa bhāvakārāṁ iti labhyate.

586 āvāṣyassā naṁ ime arthāhigārā bhavanti, tam : sāvajajogavirāt iukitānam ghanavato a pājivat(k)kalāsaṁ nihānaṁ vana-tigicīca guṇadārāṇām ceva || āvāṣyassā eso pimjato vanno samāyam i etto ekkekkhāṁ puṇa ajjhayaṇam kītāiśāṁ || tam : sāmālaṁ, caunivatho, vānāntaraṁ, paṭikkanāṁ, kāva-staggāṁ paccakkāṁ; tathā paṭhamaajahayaṇāṁ sāmālaṁ, tassa naṁ ime cattārī anuogadāra, tam : uvakkame, nikheve, anugame, naye.
first of these, the sāmāiyam, or the sāvajjajogaviratī.\textsuperscript{953} A genuine
discussion is hardly touched upon, the real subject-matter being special
topics pertaining to \cite{25} matters of dogma and speculation, or to
general matters of cosmological, anthropological, linguistic or literary
interest.

Aside from this lack of harmony, another fact is in itself likely to
excite the hostility of surprise: the word sāmāiya is used as the title
of the first āvaśyaka, but in reference to the āṅgas we had learned to
employ it in quite a different signification, viz: as the title of āṅga I,
whose contents it is true, might be characterized as sāvajjajogaviratī.
The double use of one and the same word to designate two different
termīni technici is truly a matter to be wondered at. See 243 fg.,
342 fg.

The contents of the sections uvakkama, etc., is very varied and
in part extremely interesting; and the form, in which it is encased
so to speak, is highly remarkable. The statements are heterogeneously
arranged, and the connecting thread being purely external, there is no
logical consecution. Everything is divided according to the fashion
prevailing in the Siddhānta, into groups, species, sub-species, etc.
The uvakkama e.g. is divided into āṇupūvī (in A on fol. 5\textsuperscript{a} to 15\textsuperscript{b}),
nāmaṁ (to 27\textsuperscript{a}), pampaṇaṁ (to 51\textsuperscript{b}), vattavvayā (to 52\textsuperscript{a}), athāhigāra (ib.),
samāvayāra (to 53\textsuperscript{b}). And the āṇupūvī is in turn divided into
nāmaṇuṇuṇvī, ṭhavaṇā, dawā, khetṭā, kāḷ, ukkittanā, gaṇanā,
samīṭhāṇa, sāmāyāri-ā, bhāvāṇuṇuṇvī.

Without paying any greater attention to the stereotyped expressions
of the text \cite{26} than is necessary to mark the different passages where
the statement in question occurs, I give here, according to the
arrangement of the text, some of the most important data contained
in it and at the end, a \textit{resume} of the results of interest for the history
of literature. It may be prefaced that the nom. sing. masc. I decl.
ends now in o, now in e, and that in the verses, the nominative and
case forms in general are frequently represented by the theme. In the
case of feminine nouns thematic ātū are shortened,

A species of dawvāvassayam (A 2\textsuperscript{b}) is divided into loiyam, kuppāvay-
aṇiyan and louttariyan. The first is referred to the usages of the
procerēs, who appear in the usual enumeration that we have met with

\textsuperscript{953} In the athāhigāra section of the uvakkama in one MS. ! the contents of all
the six aijhayaṇas is seemingly ascribed to the sāmāiyam alone. The actual
facts of the case are different, see p. 37n.
in the angas; je ime rā́i- **sara-talavara-koḍāmbiya**954-māḍambya-ibhasetthi-senavai-satthavāhāhabhiio.955 The kuppavyaṇiyoriam describes in the following enumeration the character of those sects which do not share the Jainab belief: — *je ime*956 caraga-ciraṇa-cammakhāndiyā-bhicchaṇḍaga-pāṇḍuraṅga Goyama-govaiya-gihidhamma-dhammacim-[27] taga-aviruddha-viruddha-vuḍḍhasāvagapabhiyao pāsamadatthā, and states that these: *Imdassā va Klālandassā va Ruddassā va Sivasā va Vesamaṇassā va devassā va nāgassā va jakkhassā va bhīyassā va Mūgundassā va Ayāsē va Koṭṭakirīyā*957 va958 uvelevanā-sammayaṇa- — varisadhatvupphagamadhama-mallāyāmām davaśavayāim kareṇī. The loguttarim finally is referred to the merely external Jaina-yogin: *je ime samanaṇgatamukkā-jogi cakkāyanirupukaṁ āhā hayā iva uddāmā gayā iva nirānkusā ghatthā maṭṭhā tuūpoṭṭha958 pāṇḍuraṅgapāruṇa959 jīnāṇaṁ anāṇāe (anājāhāy) saccharīndanānī vihāriyāmīm ubhaya-kālām avassagassā vaṭṭhatthāni.

954 On talavara, see p 38 fg. 313; koḍāmbiya from kutubāna, see Ind. Streifen 1, 284. Pañcaṇḍagaac. p. 41: yasara pārīvata asannam aparāma grāmanagardikāṁ na `sti tat sarvataichinmnāyāra-vyācaraṇāṁ maḍambyam ucyate tasyā dhīpatir maḍambikaḥ.

955 ... mukhadoṣana-dāntapakkāhāna-telai-paniha-śiddhatthāya-hariyaliya-addāgā-dāhava-puppha-mallagandha-tulabolavathi-m-āyāim davaśavayāim kareṇī tao paccha rāyaṅakāṁ va devakalāṁ va sābhām va pawām (prayām ?) va āramām va uyyāmām va ngegacchenti.

956 dhātti(?)vahakā saṁtio ye bhikṣāṁ caromti te carakāḥ; rathyāpattacraarpadhānāṁ carnmaṅghaṅghaṅkāḥ; ye bhikṣāṁ eva bhunjate na tu svapagṛtthāṁ gudṛgṛhādkāṁ te bhikṣāṣāḥ, Sugaraṇasānastāḥ ity anywhere; pāṇḍuraṅgā bhaṃsthodddhālaṅgalārāḥ, vicripaḍopatanañdhīṣaśakālapayuktañvatañvatakumilāṣa dīcnicarṣvajñhatkopaṇyāḥ (?) kaṇabhiṣkṣhāṅgāhī Goutāmāḥ, cf. Kaṇabhiṣ; Kanaṭā !) gocaryānukarīno govarīkāḥ, te h “vayam api kila tiryakṣu vaśāma” iti bhavaṇāṁ bhavayāgo ghoti nīrgacchāhīṁsī sāna nīrgacchāhīṁnī sthirbhasī tīghanīṁ anāṁbhir upaviśantī bhunjāṇabhisī tathāḥ te ṭhupatrapuṇapuṇapāhādī bhunjate, tat ukhānte: gātithi samam nigamapavattanāṁśaaśāni pakarnim | bhunjāṁ āhā gātī tirirowaveś viṃ bhaṃvaṇī ( ||) ghaṭhasthadharma eva srayān iti ... gythidhamās, tathā ca tadanerāṁiṃ vacaḥ: gātihāremasam dharmo na bhūto na bhaiyayati tāṁ pālayanti ye dhāriaḥ, kīvāḥ paśaṇāṃ āśītā iti iti ( ||); Yajñavalkyaprabhīṭṣṭīṣṭaṃ dharmahamsahīṁnaḥ cātisthāni .. dharmacintākāḥ; devatā-ṣūkṣmāniṇī ṭrīyagādāṃnaṃ avirodhaṇa vinayakarāṇā vruddhadhā vaimāṅkāḥ, puṇyapaṭaṇaṇaparaṅbhavagapamarā akṛiyavādino viruddhadhāḥ, sarvasaṁsi-dhibhiḥ sāna viruddhacakrāvitiḥ, prathamam eva “dvaṣṭhārikarāṅkāle śatumpaṇnārāḥ. pravā vuḍḍhakāle dhīṣṣapatiṭṭes ca vuḍḍhās tāpāsāḥ; śravākāḥ brāhmaṇāḥ ... anya te yādhaśāvakā ity ekam eva padam brāhmaṇavacākataṃ vaṣcakṣe (Buddha is therefore not referred to here ! see “Bhag. 2, 214); and AC2 R read vuḍḍhā, BC1 alone having vuḍḍhā; paśaṇāṁ vratam, tatra tīghanīṁ “ti pāsamadasthāṁ; on Goyama fg. see Auap. § 73. See chap. 15 in Varāhamihira’s Bhājaśataka (pravījītyogādhyāya), or Laghūjāt. 9, 12). Ind. Stud. 2 287, where also yādhaśāvakā.

957 Mukunda Baladevaḥ; Āryā prāṣṭāntarāpī Durgā; sat ‘va maṅgirūḍha tat-kūṭamaparā Koṭṭakriyā; ato ‘pacārade dhāṅdrāśadanea tad-āyatam apam ucyate; the same enumeration of the gods, except Mukunda, occurs also in the Bhagavati. 3, 1, 5; see my treatise 2, 113, 1,439.

958 See p 161 on Hāla 459 Bhūv.

959 According to all appearance this speaks against the connection of the text with the Śvetāmbaras and refers it to the Digambars [cf. Bhag. 2, 187n, 321, where I have partially misunderstood the passage].
[28] In the bhāvāvassayāṁ (intellectual exercise) we read in the passage attributing a similar division to the loiyam: puvaṇhe Bhārāham, avaraṇhe Rāmāyaṇaṁ\textsuperscript{960} and as regards the kuppāvayaṇīyam, it is said of the same sects as above (caragactriya) i.e. that they ījjaṁjalihoma-japa-umburukka namukkāra-m-āiyāṁ bhāvāvassayāṁ karenītī.\textsuperscript{961} The dawasuyam is characterized\textsuperscript{962} as pattaya-pothhayahiyam and as aṁḍayaṁ, vomḍayaṁ, kīḍayaṁ, vālayaṁ, vakkayaṁ.

The works of the Brahminical literature cited by me ad Bhag, 2, 248 are quoted in the case of the loiyam no-āgamaō bhāvasuyam (see above, p. 9), where the same list is adduced from the Nandi, though in somewhat greater detail.

[29] In the enumeration of the names from āyāra to diṭṭhivā (āṅga 5 as vivāhapannattī) the duvalasamgaṁ gaṇipīḍagam takes the place of the louttariyam, etc.

In the case of the khetanupuyī, the groups of the aholoe (Rayaṇappabhā to Tamatamappabhā), tiriyaloe (Jainbuddive to Sayāṇbhuramane), udghaloe (Sohamme to Isipabhārā) are enumerated, and in the case of the kāḷānū\textsuperscript{963}, the gradations of the divisions of time from sāmāe to savvaddhā. As we learn from a second discussion of the subject in a passage later (see pp. 34, 37), we have to deal here with a

\textsuperscript{960} See Bhag, 2, 248n, my treatise on the Rāmāy, p. 34; loke hi Bharata-Rāmāyaṇayor vacanāṁ śravaṇāṁ vā purvaparāḥṣayor eva rūḍham.

\textsuperscript{961} iījaṁ yagha, athavo desibhāyaṁ ijje ti (iṣṭeti B) māra(l) tasyā namaskārvaidhau ..; umdurukka tī ti desivacanata utdu mukhaṁ, rukkaṁ vṛṣabhadisadakaram, devatādipurato vṛṣabhaṅgajitāṭakaranaṁ. B has also ṭhāmṛjī in the text; this is manifestly caused by a misunderstanding of the ligatures ṭṭ ṭv, and ṭṭ See Vol XVI. Ind. Stud. 2n; iīja, mārā is to be referred either to root yaj or to ārya.

\textsuperscript{962} pāṭ(i)rakāṇi talatāyādisāṁbhandhīnī, tattāṅgadhātanispannaṁ tu pustakās, tataś ca patrakāṇi ca pustakāś ca, tēṣu likhitam; athavā pōtam vastraṁ (see I. S. Vol. 16, p. 155) pāṭ(i)rakāṇi ca tēṣu likhitam -: aṁḍayaṁ haṁsaṁagbdhādī; haṁsaḥ patamaṅgaḥ, garbhās tu tannivartitaṅkōṅkāro ... tadutpannaṁ sūtram aṁḍajaṁ ucyate āḍiśabdhā svabhedaprakṛtyāpanaparāḥ :- vomḍayaṁ (bo R, po A) karpasa-mādi, Ind. Stud. XVI. 111; vomḍaṁ vamanīphalaṁ tasmāl jatam vomḍaṁ; phalaṁ vamani, tasyāḥ phalaṁ phalaṁ karpāsāravajaskaraparam; -ktaj jatam kīṭajam sūtram :- is fivefold: pāṭṭe pāṭṭasūtram (detailed citation from the vṛddhayakhyā, Malae Malayaviṭayotpamnam, aṁsue, Cinaṁsue Cinaṅvāṣaye, kimirāge, -lomabhyo jatam vālapaṁ; is fivefold unnīe aṛuṅikāṁ, uṭṭhe aṛuṅikāṁ, miyāloṁac, katave (ko) umduruomanispannam, kīṭjīse umṛṇāṁ yad uddhāri tām :-vakkaṇaṁ (vāyaṇa A) saṇa-mādi vakkaṇaṁ, tatrā tāṭasūtram Mālayakāḍiprasiddham. There is no direct statement in reference to the relations of these stuffs, consisting of down, cotton, silk (from Malaya and China), hair (wool, skin), plants (hemp, flax) to the sūtram, "Their use as paper, etc. for MSS. is doubtless here referred to as in the case of pattaya.\textsuperscript{963}
progression by 84's and not by 10's. Cf. Bhagav. 1,427 above, pp. 268, 411, 412. In the case of the ukkittanadhā we find an enumeration of the 24 Jinas.

Under nāmam we find all manner of linguistic, grammatical and other statements. Immediate dependence upon Sanskrit literature is here very clear; thus e.g. as examples of monosyllables are cited the following four—hrīḥ śrīḥ dhīḥ stīḥ (sic) in the Sanskrit form, manifestly because they (cf. Piṅgala’s chandas 1,12 Ind. Stud. VIII, 217, 218) are used in Sanskrit grammar as customary (mūrdhābhīṣikta) examples. The same fondness for Sanskrit may be observed in the metrical rules concerning gender, statements in reference to the finals of nouns, (ā, 1, ə, o and amh, imh, uimh), saṃdhi (āgama, lova, pagadi i.e. prakriś, and vikāra) and the five classes of words. For some of the names of these classes (e.g. nāmikam, naipātikam, ākhyātikam aupasargikam, misram) and the examples63 of others, the Sanskrit is used. The sacred author makes, ludicrously enough, [30] a wilful error of a slight character. He cites, besides, other examples of saṃdhi; vadhū หมน vadhūhate, but Sanskrit has no nominative or rather no form vadhū. The nomin. is vadhūs.

In mentioning a subspecies of Chanāme (saḥ) the twelve aṅgas are again enumerated in detail (aṅga 5 again as vivāhapannati), and the navapuvvadhara jāva coddasapuvvadhara mentioned (see Bhag. 2, 318). Under the head of all manner of aerial and heavenly phenomena the eclipses of the moon and sun are referred to.64

Under the head of Sattanāme we find a very thorough-going account of the seven svara’s65 interwoven with all sorts of gāthās: under

---

63 Thus saṃdhi : āgamaṃ... padmāni payāṃsi, lovenam... te atra te ’tra, poto atra poto ’tra payatī... aṅhit étau, paṭī imau, śāle ete, māle ime, vikāregam... daṃḍasya agraṃ daṃḍāgraṃ, sā āgata sāgata, daḍhi idam, daḍhdham, nadi ṣate nadīhe, madhu udakam madhāvatām, vadhū (!) ṣate vadhūhate—then, after mentioning the five classes of words, the examples to illustrate them are given in Sanskrit :- aṅva iti nāmikam, khaiv iti naip. dhavarī ‘tyaṅkhy, pari ‘tya aup., saṃyata iti misram.

64 abhī ya abharukkhā saṁhā gaṇḍhavanagārā ya ukkhā yāya disādāḥ viṣā gujjāmā nigh&aacute;ya jūvā, jakkhāltī (yatadvipaṭkānti, nabhodiyamāṇaṃipitācāh) dhūmā mahā (dhūmikā mahākā) raugghāya (raja-udghātā, rajasvāla dīghā) camdvāvāṣa surovārāga camdapaṃśvamānavā rūrapā paḍicamāṇḍvā paḍisūrayā, imādhanāv, udagamachhā (matsyaḥ, indradhanuḥkaṃḍāṃ) kavihastā (kapitāsānty akasmāṃ nabhastī jvaladhanuḥrā[n]gūrṇāṃ) anāhā (amoghaḥ sūryaṁbhād adhaḥ kaḍācid upalabhyananāsakāoddhismitāṣaṣyamādarekāḥ) vāsa ... The same enumeration is also found Bhagav, Ed.p. 224 and in aṅga 3, 10 according to Leumann.

65 See my treatise on the Pratīṣṭhāt따ram, pp. 109, 110.
atthaname a similar account of the eight cases (vibhatti), under navanāme of the nine poetical (kavra-) rāsas. Each of the latter is illustrated by a corresponding gāthā. See Ind. Stud. XVI, 154-58.

The following countries are enumerated under the head of a subspecies of dasanāme, the khettasanijoga :- Mōgahae, Mālavae, Soraṭṭhae Marahaṭṭhae, Kumkaṇae, Kosalae. If the first two of these names recall [31] the pre-eminent position occupied by Magadha and Mālava at one time in India - see Ind. Streifen 1, 309, 344,—the two following names refer par excellence to Jainism. That the list is limited to these six names, whereas in āṅga 5 it embraced 16 and 25½ in upāṅga 4, is a feature of significance which is probably based upon genuine knowledge of the facts. The list in āṅga 5 and in upāṅga 4 has no secular interpretation that that of a stereotyped literary tradition.

In another of these subdivisions, the ṭhavanāpamāṇe, which contains a discussion of the seven kinds of formation of names, we find an enumeration of the 28 nakkhattas, still beginning with kṛittiḥ, though with their secondary titles (pussa, jeṭṭhā, mūla, savaṇa, dhaniṭṭhā, bhaddavaya). Cf. Ind. Stud. X 285, 16, 268, 415. The patronymic formation of eight different names, one for each born under a definite nakṣatra, is here specially treated of and also the names, in : dinna, dhampa, samma, (sarman), deva, dāsa, sena, rakhia, thus, e.g., kattia, kattidīna (kittiḥ), kattithamma, kattisamma etc. Furthermore the patronyms from the names of each of their 28 divinities; thus aggīe, aggidīnne, aggidhamme etc. All this proves eo ipso that this kind of names was very popular at the date of the composition of the text itself, or rather at the date of its sources.

This is for the latter a [32] factor of synchronistical importance (see p. 40) since these nakṣatras names appear to have been exceedingly popular at the period of the grhyasūtra, and even of Pāṇini. See my treatise on the nakṣatra 2,317 fg. As examples of patronymic kula-names Ikkhāge (Aikśvāka), Nāye (the kulam of Mahāvīra) and Korawve are cited. The following appear as pāṇḍa in the same connection :- samane pāṇḍarānige, bhikkū kävālie, tāvase and parivvāye, s, Bhag. 2, 213⁹. The scholiast explains bhikkhū by Buddhadasanāśritaḥ and on

97 The names in "bhūti cf. līlā", Aggi,° Vāyu", are omitted strangely enough.
968 ahībudhvya appears here as āvādḍhi (!), cf. vividdhi in āṅga 3 (p. 268); both are forms which are much more corrupted than the abhivadḍhi (vuddhi) of the Suryaprajñāpī, see Ind. Stud. 10, 295.
the other hand asserts that there is a five-fold division of *samaṇa* and *nigaṇṭha*-Sakka, Śākya)-tāvāsa-geruva ājīva with which Abbayadeva too is acquainted (see p. 281). He connects the *pāṇḍurāṅga* with the *nāyādyika*, (But cf. above, p. 26).

Under the head of *bhāvapamāṇa*, as a species of *pamāṇanāma*, the composition of words is first treated of. There are seven forms of this, the examples of the first form being given (see pp. 29, 30) in Sanskrit, viz. :— I. *daṇḍa*, examples : *daṁtaś ca oṣṭham ca, daṁtośṭhau, stanau ca udāram ca stanodaram... vastrapātraṁ asvamahīsau... ahiṅakulam, 2, bahuuvhi, 3. kammadhrāya, 4. digu, 5. tappurisa, 6. avvayībhāva, and—7. ekasesa, the plural as a collection of several units (there is no dual). The eight-fold *taddhitas* follow the compounds : *kammapaḥ 1 sippa 2 sīlo 3 saṁjñaya 4 saṁvā 5 a saṁjñihe 6/ issariā 7 ‘vaccena 8 ya taddhitanaṁ tu atṛṭvaḥ*.

It is peculiar that among these examples there are almost as many of primary as of secondary formation and in fact [33] even compounds. The commentary explains this peculiarity, which is to be ascribed to actual ignorance (cf. the wilful blunder, p. 30) as follows : *iha taddhitasabdena taddhitaprāpṭihetubhūto ‘rtho gṛhyate, tato yatrat’pi tumāte tāntuvaḥ ity-adau taddhitapratayyo na dṛṣyate tatrat ’pi taddhitubhūṭāṁhyasya vidyamānatvāt taddhitajatvam (perhaps merely taddhitatvam) siddham bhavati*.

It is especially interesting that here *saṁjñīha, saṁhyīha* are explained by the scholiast as *granṭharacanā*, so that the examples cited in the text are to be regarded as titles of literary compositions :— Taramgavati, Malayavati, Sattamusaṭṭhi (attā) and Biddu are such names! dhātue is said by the text to be the third group of *bhāvapamāṇa*. It is explained in Sanskrit in the following most singular fashion :— *bhū sattāyāṁ parasmaibhāṣa, edha vṛddhau, spardha saṁhare, gāḍhṛ pratiṣṭhālipṣyar granṭhe ca, bāḍhṛ loḍane, sēṭṭaṁ dhātue. This is nothing more than the beginning of Pāṇini’s *dhātupāṭha*; see Westergaard Radices, p. 344. The fourth group, niruttte, enumerates in Sanskrit a large number of very peculiar etymologies; *maḥyām ēte mahiṣāh,*

On 1 *tanaḥkāra* etc., — on 2 *vatthie, tumāne tāntuvaḥ etc., — on 3 *samaṇe, māheṇe, — on 4 *ranno susarce sālāce, — on 5 *girissa saṁvīva nagaraṁ girinagaraṁ. Vidisaś ś. n. Vedisaṁ — on 6 *Taramgavakāre* (in BR invariably kārae), Malayavarti (paṭi BR) kāre, satā (attā BR)usatthikāre, bimdukāre (cf. dharmabhindu lokabimdu, p. 457) — on 7 *sare talavare māḍambie ... on 8 *arohaṁtamāya, cakkavaṭṭimāyā, Baladevamāyā, Vāsudevamāyā.*
bhramati ca rauti ca bhramaraḥ. [34] muhur muhur lasati musalam. kapir 
iva lamvate thac (v. 1. are ghatti, beti, ṣetṭi) ca karoti (paṭatī ca is 
added by BC; kapittham, cid iti karoti khalam ca bhavati cikkalam, 
ūrdhvakarṇa970 ulūkah khasya mālā mehkalā.

Under the head of pamāna, that is divided into davva, khetta, 
kāla, and bhīva, the measures of space, length of liquids, time and 
dry measures are treated of in extenso. There are frequent citations 
of lengthy passages of antique colouring, which deal in the form of a 
dialogue with the instruction of Goyama (by Mahāvīra) on this point. 
A very minute doctrine of atomos is also found here, see Bhagav. 2,256.971 
The enumeration of the measures of time is similar to that in the 
kālāṇupuṇvi, above page 29, the progression by 84's beginning three 
gradations after the quinquennial yuga. In the discussion on paliopama 
(palyopama) we find inserted a lengthy passage from the Pannavaṇṇa 
(ṭhiipan) in reference to the duration of the continuance of creatures 
in their different gradations. This insertion is given in full in some 
MSS., in others the beginning and conclusion above are given, it 
being stated that it is a citation from the Pann. Not much farther on a 
question is introduced in the following fashion which does not seem 
original972 :— tattha nam codae (codakah), prerakah, prčakah) pannavaṇṇyam 
(acāryam) evam vayāst, and then follow questions and answers in the 
usual way introduced by atthi nam . . , and haṁtā! aththi. Later on [35] 
comes the dialogue between Goyama (and Mahāvīra), clad in an old 
form which is probably caused by citations.

Under the head of Gaṇappamāṇa, the first group of the bhāvappam, 
the nāpaguṇap. is said to be four-fold:— paccakkhe, aṇumāne, ugamāne, 
and āgama. The last is divided into loiye and louttari. To the loiya 
is ascribed everything that is annāṭhiṁ micchādiṭṭhiheṁ saccāndabu-
dhimaṭtvigappiyam:— tam jahā : Bhārahmaṇ Rāmāyaṇam jāva (BCR, 
evam A) cattāri a vedā saṅgovanāgū. Here we have a reference to an 
elier enumeration. See above, pp. 9,28. We find that jam imaṁ 
arakaiṭheṁ bhagavanteḥeṁ savvadariṣṭheṁ paṇṭaṁ duvālasaṅgaṁ gaṇipī- 
daṁ, tam : āyāre jāva diṭṭhiṁe is considered to be loguttarie. There 
are, however, other divisions of the āgama; thus, those into sutta973,
aṭṭha° and tadabhaya°, or into aṭṭha aṇāṃtarā°, and paraṃpara° original doctrine, doctrine that has been directly received, and traditional doctrine (see p. 216). The carittagunaṇapāṇaे is said to be five-fold, sāmāicar, chedovaṭṭhavānicar. (AC, merely ʹṭṭhāva BR) etc., and the sāmāicar two-fold: ititarie and avakahie; s. Aupap. pp. 38, 41, and Leumann in the Gloss. According to Leumann’s communication this division goes back as far as Bhagav. 8.2,25,7. Is this the reason of the name of the chedasuttas? Under nayapamāṇe three dīṭṭhamatas, examples, are discussed in detail; in these an “avisuddho negamo” is carried on from the general to the particular, or to the visuddhataro etc., and finally an advance made to the visuddha. In this section Pādaliputta appears as the residence of the person who is questioned (Devadatta, Skr., not °dīna !), [36] and as situated in the dāhiṇadīha of the Bharaha khettap° Under the head of parimāpasāṅkh(y)ā— the kāliasuaparam, i.e. manifestly the first 11 āngas,°contrast with the dīṭṭhivā. The point treated of is their mutual division into,° and enumeration of pavyava, akkhara, samghāya, pada, pāda, gāhā, siloga, vedha, nijjutti, anuogadāra, and from here on the enumeration of the uddasaga, ajjhayaṇa, sukkhaṃdha, aniga in the kāliasu, and of the pāhuḍa pāhuḍia, pāhuḍapāhuḍia, vatthu in the dīṭṭhivāa.

According to the fourth ānga and Nandt (see p. 354 fg. 631), the latter method of division does not belong to the entire dīṭṭhivāa, but merely to the puvas contained in it; [37] and the evidence of occasional citations made from the puvas (and found in other works) prove that they were actually so divided. See ibid.

973 I notice in passing that the example given on Hem. 2, 150, i.e. Mahura vva Pādaliuttte pāsāa is in agreement with the examples in question found in the Mahābhāṣya. See Ind. 13, 380. Is this a case of direct borrowing? See above p. 33. Mathurā does not play any great part among the Jains, but see the special statements in the beginning of the Vicārāṅaṭṭasāṅgara in reference to a Mathuri vacana (Scandīcāryāyam abhimata).

974 Likewise in Āvaiy. 8, 40 (below p. 64); i.e. quite another terminology than that in N. (p. 11) and in the beginning of the An. itself (p. 21), where kālīya is a subdivision of anāngapaviṭṭha, or anāgabāhira.

975 vedha, veṣṭa, perhaps a group of verses? nijjutti an explanatory section? anuogadāra a paragraph tatra paryavā paryaya dharmā iti yayat, tadurupā sāṃkhya paryava-sāṃkhya (the meaning of paryava here as a preliminary stage of akkhara is obscure; per se it doubtless denotes the different groups of alphabet, sa ca kālikāsute anamāparapāyāmithikā draṣṭāvaya, ekaikasya 'py akāraṇyakarasayo tadbhādhe-yasya ca jivādiveṣṭunāh pratyeke anamāparapāyatvā; evam anyārā 'pi bhavaṇa kārya; navaratā () sāṃkhmeyeṇy akāraṇyakaraṇaḥ; dhyāyakaraṇaṃśadhvah sāṃkhmeyeṇa samghāḥ; suptihantāni samaya (?) prasiddhātā vā sāṃkhmeyeṇā padādhā gāthādāturchādāroṣṭurupāḥ sāṃkhmeyeṇā pādaḥ;... sāṃkhmeyeṇā veṣṭukāḥ; nīkṣetaniruytuky upodbhātaniruytuky uttrasparsikanyuytikalakṣṇā trividānavir-yuktir (see p. 38); vāyukhyopāyabhūtāni tatrāpaṇāpataḥātāni (?) upakramātāni vā sāṃkhmeyeṇā anuyogadārātō. —The division into granthas, or at least this name for the division is not mentioned here. It is really identical with siloga.
Vattavayā is then divided into sasamayav. (svā) parasamayav. and sasamayaparasamayav. The scholiast cites as an example of the second a passage from Aṅga 2; the source of the one for the third is not stated.976 Thus the negamavavahāro, but the ujjusua, explained by ṛjusūtra (śruta !), i.e. the orthodox believer, recognizes only the first two vatt., and of these two the first alone as entitled to authoritativeness.

The attāḥśigāra section consists977 merely of the gāthā : sāvajjajoga,9 which states the contents (attthath) of each of the 6 ajjhayananas of the āvassaya. See p. 24.

Under the head of samoyāre, samavatāra we find for the third time an enumeration of periods of time from āvaliyā to sawaddhā. See pp. 29, 84. In the second dāra, nikkheva,978 the author returns to the sāmālam and describes in several verses the nature of the samaqpa [38] who possesses the sāmālam.979 Two of these verses recur in the sāmālyajñhay, of the Āvāṣy niij, 8, 109, 110. See pp. 67, 68. The last section of the nikkheva, the suttālawavanhīpphanna, is not given in full980 by the author "for brevity's sake," laṅhavattham, since its contents is, he says, contained in the third dāra, the aṅgūma, which follows thereupon.

This deals particularly with the suttānugāma and the niijutti-ānug, which latter is divided into nikkhevaniji,9 uvagghāyaniji9 and suttaphāsiniij (śūtrasārśika)9 — see p. 36, 369. Of the gāthās cited in it one in part recurs981 in Āvāṣy. niij, 9, 69.

976 The latter passage reads : āgāram āvascchātā vā āramā vā povaiyā idem dorisāpaṁ āvānā savavadekka vimechamhit tiyād; o.n this the scholiast says : gysthitāh, āravā vā tāpasaśāya, pravarajitā ca Śakyādayoḥ idem asmadayām matam āpanna āspitāḥ sarvadoṣahebhyo vimecañānta ity evam yadā Śaṁkhyaśāyaḥ pratipādāyamita tad evam parasamayavaktvayatā, yadd tu Jainātī tadā svasamayavaktvayatā, tato cā sau svasamay-parasamayavaktvayato 'cyate.

977 It reads : se kītām atti re? jo jassā aijhayaassā aittā ro. In R, instead of ram we have sāmyayassā attiīro, and this is doubtless merely an example of how the verse is to be understood; sāvajjajogiavaiśa sāstothū ukkittāpā cauvatsaṭṭha so aittī etc.; i.e according to the scholiast : "arthadhikaro "dhayayane" adipaddād arabhya sarvapadeśyanuvartate.

978 Is threefold : ohanippanne nāmaṇi9 suttālawani; ohanī is fourfold : aijhaya-nom, aijhīne (akṣina), oō (avah), jhavaṇa (kṣopana), names which are also : sāmāyikacaturvivēṣṭatadāvivātīnantām sāmāyani.

979 See Bhagav. 2, 186.

980 He has probably lost his breath! The following sections are treated in a very fragmentary fashion.

981 kīt kaiśihaṁ kassa kaiśīn kesu kaiśīn kec̄raṁ (kaiśi) havai kaiśīn kaiśīn samitaraṁ avirahatam bhavā" garisa phāsa-nı-surutti // sāmālam is to be supplied according to the scholiast. The verse recalls the quis? quis? cur? contra, similis, paradigmata, testes applied in German schools to the analysis of proverbs, etc.
Under the head of *suttaphāsia* the correct pronunciation of the *suttas* is treated of. According to the scholiast there are 32 *dosas* and 8 (or 6) *gugas*, which he discusses at length.\(^{98}\) The six different means\(^{983}\) of making oneself certain of the correct understanding of the text are also mentioned; they are: *samhitā*-form of the text, *pada*-form, sense of the words, division of the words into component parts, consideration (of objections) and determination (rejection of the objections): *samhiyā* ya *payān* ceva *payattho* *payaviggaho* / *cālanā* ya *pasiddhi* ya *chavviham* *viddhī* *lakṣhāṇam*.

[39] The fourth *dāram*, nāe, consists of 6 *gāthās*, of which the first four treat of the seven different forms of *naya* i.e. method of conception, exegesis; they are: *negame*, *sanigahe*, *vavāhāre*, *ujjusue*; *sadde*, *samabhirujhe*, *evambhūre*. The scholiast says that they are named thus in reference to their connection which the *sāmāyikādhyayanam* as the background of the entire work. Verse 5 gives a general definition of the word *naya*. Verse 6 makes known the fact that the *sāhu*, *sādhu*, must hear all its forms with their manifold methods of representation, be purified by this means, and thus remain constant in his (correct) course of action. This concluding verse too thus refers directly to the *sāmāyikam*, even if it does not mention it by name. It was quite necessary that here at the close some regard be had for the *sāmālam*; the remaining part of the work refers to it but little.

I have collected on *Bhag. 1*, 373, fg. some of the data regarding its age that can be extracted from the contests of the *Anuyogadya*. To the arguments that have been mentioned others may be added. In the forefront is the direct connection of the work with the grammatical Sanskrit literature, especially the citation of the beginning of Pāṇini’s *Dhātupātha*. Next the information of a definite nature concerning the other literatures, Brahminical, etc. of that period. The nine *kavarasas* point to a highly developed system of rhetoric, and the *g-hās* cited therein demonstrate the existence of a rich Prakrit poetry after the fashion of the verses in Hāla’s *Saptasatakam*. The names cited in the formation of *taddhitas* are perhaps to be regarded as titles of dramas (cf. *nādagādi* at the end of the *loiya* works) or [40] of romances. See p. 386. *Bhāratam* (but not *Mahābhārata*) and *Rāmāyaṇam*.

---

98 See on this, Haribh on *Āvāy. 10*, 1 etc.; in an *avacūrī* on the *oghantiryuktī* we read: *askhatātapatodoccharaṇam samhitā*; *padoryāghah padāni; padānam arthaḥ padārhaḥ*; *padoryākastī samākshabhūjī padāni; cālanā purvapakṣa- saṁkā; pratīyavasthānam nirākaraṇena svapakṣasthāpānam.*
are mentioned three times in conjunction and undoubtedly were held in high esteem at that period. See my treatise on the Ram p. 34. The contrast instituted between kālīm suam and dītthivāa is of importance to Jaina literature. At the date of this work and at that of the Nandi, see above, p. 11, there existed a work, consisting of six aijhayanas, on the six āvasyakas, the first of which is said to form the foundation of the Anuṣ., though no evidence can be drawn from the Anuṣ. itself to prove this assertion. Another fact that savours of antiquity is the special emphasis laid on the formation of the names of persons by means of the names of the nakṣatras or of their divinities. The first nakṣatra names appear in the old kṛttikā series, though no longer in their ancient form; and the names of the divinities are very much corrupted. The significance of the names Cīnā, Soraṭṭha and Maracroṭṭha, and those of the different pāsaṇḍas, or of each of the divinities honoured by them, must not be overlooked.

There is a commentary by Hemacandraśūri, scholar of Abhayadevasūri.  

[41] The conclusion is formed by  

G.—The four mūlasūtras.  

I have as yet not been able to make out the significance of this title, which has come to light only in quite modern times in connection with these texts. In the second mūlasūtra the expression mūlasūtra-gāthā (see p 54) occurs (see scholiast on Āvasy. nijj. 11,61) though it is there probably used in contrast to the gāthās of the nijjutti; so that mūlasūtra would mean nothing more than sūtra (see ibid. on 11, 39), i.e. the original to which the nijjutti belongs.

The three texts bearing the name mūlasūtra which I have before me (the fourth I do not possess) have in reality no sūtra form at

---

984 As a matter of fact such names are not often found in the Siddhānta. The following examples, however, belong here: - Aṣātha, Aggidatta, Somadatta, Pīsamitta, Tisagutta, Tisabhadda; cf. also Revai-nakkhatta (above p. 7). It is surprising that the form in “bhūti is omitted, a form which is specially attested as occurring in Mahāvīra’s time. Cf. also Pussabhūti, Śiva’. See Mahābh. on Pan. 8, 2, 107 (Ind. Stud. 4, 381) on the common name of Agni bhūti.

985 Other predecessors are Munisudarasūri, Vīrādeva and Jayasīṁhasūri; the gaccha is Śrī-Harsapuriya, the kulam that of Śrī Praśnavohna. The well-known Hemacandra is, therefore, not referred to, and the above mentioned Abhayadeva is doubtless not the navāṅgūti-kṣāry. Cf. pp. 276-7.

986 Does it perhaps refer to the 5 mūlagunas (Āvasy. 20, 6-8)
all, but are almost entirely in metre; mūlas. 1 and 3 in the ancient style (see p. 238, 239), especially in ślokas; the nījj. on 2 is in gāthās.

They make the impression of being analogous to pariśiṣṭas rather than sūtras. The mūlas., which is No. 2 in Bühler’s list has not been preserved in its sūtra form at all, only its nījuttis being extant. The title of the fourth mūlas. expressly declares it to be a nījj.; and since both the others have essentially the same form, it is not an improbable conjecture to regard these too as nījuttis to a sūtram of like name. On the other hand, however, special nījuttis on each are cited by the scholiast, and these nījj. appear to be still extant. Of this kind are probably the two texts which the author of the Āvaśy. [42] nījj. 2,5 declares that he composed on dasakālia and uttarajjh.

The prose portions found here have in places the old introductory formula: suyam me āsam...; and the concluding formula of each of the aṭṭha. (and uddes.) of mūlas. 1 and 3 ti hemi gives us an impression of their antiquity. Furthermore, the titles of all the 36 chapters of the first mūlas are enumerated in the fourth aṅga § 36—hence this mūlas. with essentially the same contents must have existed at the date of aṅga 4. It appears to be cited also in the Kalpasūtra. In N. (above p. 11 fg.) we find only the three titles of the mūlasūtas I have before me; the name of the fourth is omitted, and the title of the second plays there, as in the Amuyogadv. (above pp. 11, 22 fg.), a very prominent part.

A very ancient author is quoted for the third mūlasūtram; and a single chapter (14) of the An. nījj. is ascribed to a definite author, although the author of the Āv. nījj. himself says, in the beginning of chap. 2, that he is author of a large number of nījuttis on the most different parts of the Siddhānta, especially on several chedasūtras, and, as already mentioned, on mūlas. 1 and 3. The Āvaśy nījj. contains, therefore, a large amount of authoritative data in reference to the date of its composition.

The contents of all three texts belong to the sphere of the vinayapitaka. The Nom. sgI. Masc. of the I Decl. ends generally in o, but chiefly in e in the few prose sections; but both forms are found together occasionally, and in fact even in the same verse.

[43] The extent of mūlas. 1 is stated to be 2 095 gr. that of 2 or its nījj. 2550, that of 3,700 gr. The author of the commentary on 2 is said to have died Vīra 1055.
XLIII, First mūlasūtram, the uttarajjhayaṇāṁ, in 36 aijhayaṇas. The names of these aijh., which are cited (see page 280) in aṅga 4, § 36, are identical with those in the MSS. with but a few exceptions. By the chattiṣaṁ ca aputṭhavāyayanāṁ, mentioned in the Kalpas, Jinae. § 147, we must understand the Uttarajjh, according to the scholiast (Kalpalatā). See Jacobi, p. 114. The correctness of this number (36) is corroborated by the concluding verse of the work itself. Haribhadra, on Avasay, 8, 54, explains the isibhāsīāṁ mentioned there by Uttarajjhayaṇādīṇī;987 and ibid 2, 5 both isibhās and uttarajjh appear in conjunction in the text. The scholiast on Nandī explains (see p. 13n) the name uttar by the sarveṣāṁ adhyayanānāṁ pradhānatvam which belongs to this work. The author of the Āvaśyakaniṣṭ, states (2,5) that he is also author of a nījī on the Uttarajjh,

With the exception of chap. 29 and the beginning of 2 and 16 which three chapters commence with the formula :- suyāṁ me āsāṁ tenāṁ bhagavayā evaṁ akkhāyaṁ (or t. bh. Mahāvīreṇāṁ Kāśaṇeṇaṁ e.a.), the text is composed in metre and principally ślokas, though there is an admixture of gāthās, triśūlabh, etc.988 The contents consist of direct ordinances in reference to a correct course of life, especially of the clergy, [44] and of recitals and parables illustrative of this life. Much of the contents makes upon us the impression of great antiquity and recalls similar Buddhistic texts and especially aṅga. 2.

On this mūlas. we have a very detailed commentary, stīyahitā, by Śāntisūtra (Śāntyacārya) in which frequent reference is paid to a nijjuti belonging to the text.989 See pp. 41, 43.

1. viṇayasuyajjhayaṇāṁ, 48 vv. begins : sanījogavippamukkassa anagārassā bhikkhuṇo / viṇayam pāukkarissāmi / vānuṇapuvinī suheṣa me / . The word buddha appears to be here and frequently elsewhere in the work, an honorific title of the teacher’s (vv. 7,8); cf. p. 263 (aṅga 2).

2. partisahajjh., 46 vv. with a prose beginning, which enumerates how the 22 parisahas : samaṇeṇāṁ bhagavayā Mahāvīreṇāṁ Kāśaṇeṇāṁ

987 So also the anye in the Vīdhiprapā; see pp. 429, 430,

988 The metre is often very much out of order, as in almost all metrical parts of the Śādhanaḥ.

989 In a palm-leaf MS., dating itself 1037 (A.D. 1251) the 3 appears to me to be for an original 5; in which case the date would be 1507 (A.D. 1451). According to Jacobi p. 9, the commentary of Devendragaṇī, which was composed Śāṃv. 1179 (A.D. 1123), is based upon that of Śāntisūtra,
paveiyā. In the metrical portion the first person is used: parisahānam pavibhatī / Kāsaveṇām paveya / tam bhe udāharissāmi / dānapuvivin suṇeha me //1//

3. cauraṁgaṁ, "giyam in S, cāu(ram)gijjam V,20 vv.; of the māṇuṣatvādi. In the commentary on v. 9 we find particular statements in reference to the seven schisms.

4. asaṁkhyaṁ, asaṁskṛtam, pamāyappamāyaṁ vā V, 13 vv. Of pramādāpramādau (cf. No. 10 in the anaṅgapavittiha list of N., above p. 11), and of the apramāda, maraṇakale ‘pi.

[45] 5. akāmamaraṇijjam, 19 vv.; of the paniḍitamaraṇaṁ.

6. khudāga-niyamathijjam (cf. chap, 20), purisaviyyaṁ S,18 vv. Of the vidyāca-raṇavikalpas of the virata. Its appellation in S is very different though the name there suits the present contents very well,

7. elaijjam (so also V; of edaka); ura(b)bhiyaṁ S and urabbhi also here in C, in an enumeration of the chapters which is added to the close of this MS. only : 30 vv.; urabhrādi-driṣṭāṁtaḥ resp. rasagṛddhityāgaṁ,

8. Kāvityam lijjam S.V.; 20 vv. Of the nirlobhatvam. It closes : ii esa dhammo akkh.le / Kavileṇaṁ visuddhapanneṇaṁ / . . itti bemī //20//


10. dumapattayaṁ drumapattrakam, 37 vv.; apramādārtham upamādvāreṇā 'nuṣāsanaṁ. Instruction addressed to Goyama. It closes thus :- buddhassa nisamma bhāsiyaṁ | sukahiam atthapahopasohiyam | rāgāṁ dosāṁ ca chinādiyā | siddhigayaṁ gāe Goama tti bemī //37//.

11. bahussuyapujjam (‘puvjam V), bahuśrutapujjā, 32 vv.—In v. 1 the refrain of 1,1 2,1 : pāukariṣāmi, dānapuvivin suṇeha me.

990 S=Samavāya (ahga 4); V=Vidhiprapā, where the names are enumerated in detail.
12. Harikesiajja (Harieti V) 47 vvs. Of the tapahsamūdhā of Hariesabala. The stories belonging here and also to the following chapters are related in detail in the commentary.

13. Cittasambhūtijja, Citrasambhūtij, 35 vvs.; nidānam tyājyam nidānadoṣa | Kampillasambhūo Chitto.

14. Usūrījjja, Isukāriyam, 55 vvs.; of the nirnidanatāguṇa; pure purāṇe Isugāra nāme (i.e., not as Ind. St. 2,843).


16. bāṃbhacerasamāḥṭhānaṁ, bāṃbhagutti C, samāhiṭṭhānaṁ S. First an enumeration of the ten bāṃbhaceras of the bhikkhu in prose, then 17 silogas. Of the brahmahacaragyapti.

17. pāvasamanījjjan, pāpasramaṇiyam, 21 vvs. Of the pāpasramaṇa-svarūpam, and of the pāpavarjanam. Verses 3 to 19 close with the refrain: pāvasamani tītī vuccai.


19. Miyāputtiyam, Mā pojja V, Miyacaritta (or Miyācārita) S, 97 vvs. Of the niḥpratikarmā, and of Miyāputta, son of King Balabhadda and of Miyā; Suttive nayare.

20. mahāniyaṁthinījaṁ (cf. chap. 6), mahānirgrahāntīyaṁ; anāhapavavaya S; 60 vvs. Of the anāthatvanam; Seño Magahāhivo v. 2. The title found in S agrees with the contents (as was the case with 6 and 7).

21. samuddapālījjaṁ (śejo V), samudrapālīyam, 24 vvs. Of the viviktacaryā. Begins: Cānpāe Pālie nāma / sāvāe āsi vāpi / Mahā-virassa bhagavao / stito so u mahappano ||

991 This might be per se for samyattiyam; since the pāpavarjanam is: samyatasya va, sa ca bhogarddhityāgata eva.
22. rahanemijaṁ, 49 vv. Of the anorathanemivac caranaṁ; utpannavasuśrotasikenā 'pi dhyāti kāryā. Begins: [47] Soriyapurammi nayare / āsi rāya mahiḍhiṇe / Vasudeva' tti nāmeṇam / rāyalakkaṇhasanāyhe ||1|| tassa bhajjā duve āsi / Rohiṇi Devaḥ tahā / tāsiṁ duṇhaṁ pi do putā / itthā Rāmagovā ||2||. v. 1<sup>a</sup> / Samuddavijāye nāmaṁ / v. 1<sup>d</sup> ||3|| tassa bhajjā Sivā nāma / tise putte mahiṣyase / bhagavaṁ Ariṭṭhaneṇi tti / loganāhe damisare ||4||...


24. samitu samitto S, pavayaṇamāyarā (!) C; 27 vv. Of the pravaeṣaḥsvarūpaṁ, i.e. the 5 samiti and 3 gupti, which are together also called atthā samito: iriyā-bhāse- 'saṇā dāne uccāre samit iya / mano-guttu vayaguttu kāya gutti ya atthamā ||2||. These are regarded as the mothers as regards the duvulasāmāṇa Jīnakkhāyaṁ pavayapaṁ. See Ind. Streifen, 1,133, 209, 2,047, in reference to the ethical three-fold division into maṇo, vaya, kāya.


26. sāmaṇārā, dasasaṁ, 53 vv. Only he who is in possession of the brahmaṇa (chap. 25) is a yati tena cāvaśyaṁ sāmaṇāri vidheyā: This is ten-fold<sup>992</sup>: [48] āvassiyā, nisīhyā,<sup>993</sup> ṣūpuchhā, paḍipuchchā, ḍhamḍana, iḍchākāro, micchākāro, tahakkāro, abhuṭṭhāṇaṁ, uvasanpayā. The similar enumeration in Āvaśy, nijj. 7,12, where there is, however, a different arrangement (the same as in anga 3, 10, and Bhag. 25, 7 according to L.): — iṭchākāro, micchā, tahakkāro (6-8), āvaḥ... ḍhamḍana (1-5), utmanāta (instead of 9), uvasanpaya (10) — Haribhadra on Āvaśy, nijj. 6,88, says<sup>994</sup> that there are three kinds of sāmaṇārā, 1. the

<sup>992</sup> The word sāmaṇārā recalls especially the sāmaṇācarikasūtra of the Brahmins, with which the significance and contents of these texts is in agreement. From this I am led to conclude that sāmaṇārā is an intentional deformation of sāmaṇācāri: see pp. 223, 238, 243 sg.

<sup>993</sup> niṣedhikī, see pp. 452, 257.

<sup>994</sup> See pp. 357, 449.
oghasāmācārti, represented by the oghaniryukti, on the 20th prabhṛtaṁ (oghapra) of the 3. vastu (dvārabhidhāna) pūrva 9,2. the daśavidhāsāmācārti, for which our chapter and Āv. nijj. 7 is authoritative, and 3, the padavibhāgaśāmācārti, which too is represented by chedasūtra-lakṣaṇān navamāt pūrva-deva nirvyūḍha, or by kalpavyakahārau.\footnote{The three sāmyārti texts which I have before me—see pp. 223, 369 ff.—contain another division than that stated above. Their contents is, however, connected, and they agree in the main with each other.}—Begins: sāmāyārti pavakkāhō savadukkhavimukkhaṁ | jajā carittāṇa niggārīthā | tīṁṇā saṁsārasāgaraṁ  || 1  ||

27. khalumkijjam, kuhuće V, 15 v v. Of the saṭhatā; the aṣṭhatā is the antecedent condition for the sāmācārt. It begins: there gāṇahare Gagge (Gūrgyāh) muñi āsi visārāe | ainne gañibhāvammi samāhīṁ paṭi- samudhāe  || 1  || The name comes from v. 3: khalumke jo u joei khalumkān galivṛṣabhān (s. Hem. 1263) yo yojayaṭ.


29. sammataparakkamaṁ, samyaṅkta; appamāo S. In prose; anam- taraṁ (in chap. 28) jñānādīna muktimārgatvenaṅktāni, tāni ca sarvagā- dimūlānī akarmatavasānāṁ; [49] yadvā mokṣamārāgagat apramādā eva (on this then is based the title in S) pradhānaṁ. Enumeration of the 73 sarvagādīṇi, means of deliverance (cf. Leumann, Gloss. Aup. p. 155, s. v. saṁvejo) : saṁvejo 1, nīvve 2, dharmasaddā 3, gurusāhammiyasa- susūṣanayā 4, aḷoṇāya 5, niṇḍanayā 6, garitaḥayā 7, sāmāie and the remaining 5 āvassaya 8-13, etc. to akammayā 73 (cf. the 48 sarvagādīṇi, Bhagav, 16, 3 and 27 saṁv, in āṅga 4, 27 Leum). As in the beginning (see p. 43) so in the end there is a direct reference to Mahāvīra: esa khalu sammataparakkamaṁ ajjhayaṁ asa samāneṇaṁ bhagavaya Mahāvīream agghavie pannaṅve parivie danśie nidaṁśie uvaḍaṁśie tti bemi.

30. tavamaggijjam, ogo S, oṁmaijjam V, 37 v v., tapomārgagati. Begins: jahā u pāvaṅaṁ kammāṁ rāgadosasaṁmaṇḍīyaṁ | khāve tavaṁ bhikkhu tām egagamaṅo suṇa  || 1  ||

31. caraṇavihi, 21 v v.; caraṇavidhi.

32. paṇḍayatthānaṁ, 111 v v.; pramādasthānaṁ Begins: accaṁtakālassa samūlayassa | savassa dukkhasa u jo pamakkho | tām bhāsas me paḍi- punnacittā | suṇeha egamantānyām hiyatīham.
33. kammapayaḍi, karmaprakṛtiḥ, 25 vv. Begins: attha kammāṁ (cf. Bhag. 2, 166) vucchāmi | ṣṇūpuvāṁ jahakkamaṁ | jehiṁ baddhe ayaṁ jive | saṁśāre parivattāṁ // 1 // nāṇassā "varaṇijjaṁ | daṁsaṅgavaraṇaṁ tāhā | veṣayaṁ | tāhā moham | āukmmaṁ taheva ya // || nāmakaṁyaṁ ca goyaṁ ca | aṁtārayaṁ taheva ya. Closes: eesīṁ saṁwāre ceva | khavaṇe ya jāe (yatetā) buhe tti bemi // || The nāṇam e.g. is (see N. Anūy. Āvaśy. Aupap. p. 41) five-fold suyaṁ, abhinibohiyaṁ, ohīṇaṁ, maṇaṇaṁ, kevalaṁ.


35. ṛṇagāramaggaṁ, ṛgge S, ṛggo V; 21 vv.; hiṁsāparivarjanādayo bhikkhugunāḥ. Begins: suṇeha me egamaṇā maggaṁ Savannudesiyāṁ | jam āyarānto bhikkhū | dukkhāna ṛntakaro bhave // 1 // Closes: nimmamo niraharīkāro viyarāgo anāsavo | sampaṭto kevalaṁ nāṇam sāsayaṁ parinivvuda tti bemi // 31 //.

36. jivājiṇavibhatti, 268 vv. Begins: jivājiṇavibhattiṁ | suṇeha me egamaṇaḥ ēo | jām jaṁpiṇaḥ bhikkhū | sammaṁ jawai saṅjane //1//. Closes: ii pāukāre būḍde | nāyāe parinivvue | chaṭṭsasam uttarajjhāe | bhavasiddha sammai (saṅvuḍe A) tti bemi // 268 //.

At the end in some MSS. of the text and in the scholiast there are added some variant verses of the niruytkikāra in praise of the work: je kira bhavasidhiṁ | parittasaṁsāriṁ a je bhavā | te kira pañhaṁti ee | chaṭṭsasam uttarajjhāe // 1 ||...
to contain a discussion of the first of these 6 āvāsyakas (the sāmāiyam), but that this claim is antagonistic to that limitation of the sāmālam to the sāvajjajogaviratiṁ which frequently secures the Anny. By this limitation an ethical character is ascribed to the work, the contents of which is, furthermore, at variance with the claim made by the Anuy.

The āvāsyakasūtram is a work which deals with all the six āvāsyakas in the order,996 which is followed in the Nandī and Anuyogadvāra, and discusses the sāmālam actually, not merely nominally as the Anuyog, does. Unfortunately we possess, not the text of the āvāsy., but merely the commentary, called śisyahita, of an Haribhadra,997 which is as detailed as that on mūlas.

1. Of this commentary there is but one MS., which, though written regularly enough, is very incorrect and fails in every way to afford the reader any means of taking a survey of its contents by the computation of the verses, etc. It labours under the defect of such manuscript commentaries in citing998 the text with the pratikas only and not in full, with the exception of foll.73b to 153999 and some other special passages. The text is divided according to the commentary into [52] the six ajjhayaṇas, with which we are already acquainted:—1, the sāmālam, the sāvajjajogavirai, which extends to fol. 196b, 2. the caivīvaihāvā or praise of the 24 Jinas, extending to 204b, 3. vaṇḍaṇayām or honour paid to the teachers, reaching to 221a, 4. paḍikkamāyaṃ, confession and renunciation (to 298b), 5. kāussaṅga, expiation to (315a), and 6. pacca-kkāṇaṁ, acceptance of the twelve vratas (to 342a).

By sāmālam much more than the sāvajjajogavirati is meant. It is etymologically explained by samāṇinām Jñānadarśanacālātrāvāṃ ayāḥ (35b). It treats not merely of the doctrine of Mahāvīra on this point, but also of the history of the doctrine itself, i.e. of the predecessors of Mahāv., of himself, of his eleven gaṇaharas and of his opponents, the

996 See p. 434 on this arrangement.
997 At the close he is called a pupil of Jinaṇatta from the Vidyādharakula, or an adherent of Sitaḥbaracārya Jinaḥa ṭa : samāptā ce vah śisyahita nāma "vaṇḍayakṣa kṛtiḥ Sitaḥbaracārya Jinaḥaṇangadānāsārino Vidyādharakula-tākacārya Jinaḥaṇaśikhyasya dharmaro jotī (yaṃkirti) mahāśaḥramanār- alpaṃharaḥ(?) cārā Haribhadraḥsa. The Ganaḥdarāśādātata is here referred to (cf. v. 52 fg) and the great Haribhadra (+ Vīra 1055) : see p. 371, 372 456 fg. In Peterson's Detailed Report (1883) we find cited (pp. 6-9) under No. 12 a vṛtti of a Śrī-Tilakacārya, scholar of Šivaprabha, composed Saṃvat 1296.
998 342 foll. Each page has 17 lines of 58-62 akṣ. each.
999 Nījj 3, 315—9, 3.
different schisms (ninaghas, nihnavas) which gradually gained a foothold in his teachings. The latter are chronologically fixed. Haribhadra quotes very detailed legends (kathanakas) in Prakrit prose (sometimes in metre) in this connection and also in connection with the diṣṭhamta and udāharaṇa which are frequently mentioned in the text. These legends have doubtless been borrowed from one of his predecessors whose commentary was composed in Prakrit. The remarks of this predecessor, cited elsewhere either directly as those of the Bhāṣyakāra (see on Nījj. 10, 47), or without further comment or mention of his name, he has incorporated into his own commentary. This too was here and there composed in Prakrit. Occasional reference is made to a mūlāṭīka (see on Nījj. 19, 132), which in turn appears to have been the foundation of the Bhāṣyakāra.

[53] Even if we do not possess the text of the sadāvāṣyakasūtram with its six ajjhayoṇas which was commented upon by Haribhadra, our loss is to a great degree compensated by a metrical Nījjutti. This is even called avasyakasūtram at the close in the MSS., and is probably the only āvaśya, text which is extant. At least Haribhadra regarded it as an integral portion of his text. He has incorporated it, with but a few omissions, into his commentary, and commented upon it verse for verse. He cites its author not merely as Niruyuktikṛt, "kāra, (e.g. on chap. 16, 17) as Saṅgrahaṇikāra, as Mūlabhāṣyakṛt (e.g. 2,135) or even merely as Bhāṣyakāra (e.g. on 2,70,142, i.e. just as the author of the above-mentioned commentary in Prakrit prose) but also occasionally as grāṇṭhakāra, "kṛt (see for example Nījj. 8, 84, 10, 95) and even as sūrakāra, "kṛt (e.g. Nījj. 1, 76′, 16, 80). The verses of the Nījj. are occasionally called sūtras by him! From a consideration of these facts we are led to the conclusion that the sole difference between the text commented on by Har. and the Nījj. lies in the different division—the text being divided into 6, the Nījj. into 20 ajjhayoṇas. See below. The fact that Har. does not cite at all some sections of the Nījjutti (for example the Therāvali at the very start) may, however, be held to militate against the above conclusion. His text too contains besides the Nījj. several other parts, chiefly in prose, [54] which he calls sūtras or words of the sūrakāra (see Nījj. 13, 53), e.g. especially a pratikram-āṇasūtram given in extenso. He furthermore occasionally contrasts

1000 Cf., however, the avasyakāṣṭuraskandha in Kielhorn's Report, 1881, p. 92, and the sadāvāṣyakasūtram in Bühler's paper in the Journal of the Vienna Acad, 1881, p. 574.

1001 e.g. tathā ce 'ho 'padeśikain gāthāsūtram āha Niruyuktikāraḥ : saṁśāra' (2, 19).
the süṭrāgāthā or mūlasüṭrāgāthā with the gāthās of Niryuktikāra. See on Niry. 11, 39-61.1002

With this the following fact is in agreement:—several times in the MSS. of the Nījj. there are inserted in the text short remarks in Sanskrit which refer to the proper sūtram. This sūtra has, however, not been admitted into the text, e.g. Nījj. 10, 12, 176. In one case, chap. 20, this sūtra portion (in prose) has actually been incorporated into the Nījj.

It is, furthermore, noteworthy that in the Nījjuttī, too, Haribhadra distinguishes different constituent parts and different authors (see p. 53). He refers its verses at one time to the niryukti(kāra), mūlabhāṣyakāra,1003 and at another to the saṅgrahānikāra, or even sūtrakṛt (!). He thus brings these verses into direct contrast with each other1004 and subjects them to different treatment, by citing some, perhaps those of more recent date, in full, [55] either word for word or without commentary; while the remainder he cites as a rule merely by their pratikas and then explains, first by a gamanikā, or aksaragam, i.e. a translation of each word, and finally by expository remarks called out by the nature of the subject.1005

Haribhadra too appears to have found a special defect existing in his sūtra text. Between chapters 8 and 9 of the Nījj. we ought to find sūtrasparśint nījjuttī according to his statement; but: no'cyate, yasmād asati sūtre (!) kasyā 'sāv iti. Haribhadra devotes a long discussion to sūtras in general, which recurs Nījj. 10, 12, 89, 11, 7 (sūtra and niryukti), 12, 17, 13, 55.

1002 In other passages, however, he says that the verses even of the Nījj. are sūtras! See p. 53, note 2.

1003 e.g. 4, 3, iyaṁ niryuktigātha, etās tu mūlabhāṣyakāragāthāḥ bhīmaṁtha” (4, 4-6).

1004 The sūtrakṛt appears here as later than the saṅgrahānikāra, fol. 260a:—tān abhidhiturs uha saṅgrahani-kāraḥ: ambe (Nījj. 16, 48) gāhā; asi° (49) gāhā: idom gāthādvaśam sūtrakṛt-niryuktigāthāhīr eva prakāśārthābhīr vyākhyāyate (sūtrakṛtā… vyākhyāyate or sūtrakṛt nīryu vyākhyāti would be better); dhāḍaṁti padhālam iti; then follows the text of Nījj. 16, 50-64 in full but without commentary. Here it is to be noticed that one of the MSS. of the Nījj. in my possession omits these 15 verses from the text. See p. 59 in regard to the assumption that the Nījj. is the work of several authors.

1005 An occasional reference to other methods of treating the subject is found, e.g. 2, 61, itī samāśārthah, vyāśārthaḥ tu viśeṣaviyarānād avagamitavyah. Or on 10, 19, itī gāthāśārthah, bhāvārthah tu bhāṣyāgāthabhivyoseyāh, taś ce māḥ (in Prakrit, but not from the Nījj.).
Using due caution in reference to an explanation of the mutual relation which exists in our text between Sutta and Nijjutti, and in reference to the form of the text of the Āvaśyakam which existed in the time of Haribhadra, I subjoin a review of the 20 aṭṭhayanās of the existing Nijj. The two MSS. which I possess (the second I call B) show many divergences from one another, some of which are explainable on the score of inexact computation of the verses. Other MSS. contain much greater variations. The passages cited in Jacobi, Kalpas p. 100(104) as 2,97 and p. 101 as 2,332 are e.g. here 3, 281 (291), 332 (342). Very great divergences come to light in the two MSS. in Peterson’s [56] Detailed Report (1883), pp. 124 and 127. These MSS. are numbered Nos. 273 (=P) and 306 (=π, with a break in the beginning; and chapters 1, 2, and 6 are lost). The text is composed exclusively in gāthās. One of its special peculiarities is formed by the frequent dāragāthās, i.e. verses which state briefly the contents of what follows, principally by the enumeration of the catch-words or titles of paragraphs. Unfortunately the use or denotation of these verses is not regular; from which fact the benefit to be derived from this otherwise excellent method of division is materially reduced. The Nom. Sg. Masc. 1. Decl. ends, with but very few exceptions, in o.

It must be prefaced that Haribhadra treats chap. 1-10 under aṭṭhaya 1, 11-12 under aṭṭh. 2 and 3 respectively, 13-18 under aṭṭh. 4, and the last two chapters under aṭṭh. 5 and 6 respectively. This is done, however, without specially marking off the conclusions of the chapters of the Nijj. Only the conclusions of the six aṭṭhayanās are distinguished from the others.

1. Peḍhiā, ptiṭhikā, 131 vv. (in P the thirāvali has nominally 125 and peḍhiyā 81 gātā). It begins with the same Therāvali (50 vv.) that occurs in the beginning of the Nandi, and treats, from v. 51 on, of the different kinds of nāṇa (cf. Nandi and Anuyogadv.) Haribhadra does not explain the Therāvali at all and begins his commentary (fol. 3) at v. 51: ubhinihionāṇanāṁ/suanāṇanāṁ cēva okināṇanāṁ ca/taha manapajjavanāṇāṁ/kevalanāṇāṁ ca pañcamayanāṁ ///51///.

[57] 2. paḍhamā varacarī, 173 (178 P, 179 B) vv., treats, from v. 69 on, of the circumstances of the lives, etc. of the 24 Jinas, especially of

---

1 Chapter 8 forms an exception, though at the end at least it says: samāptā ce' yam upopghātaniyuktir iti, but in such a way that it is not mentioned as the “eighth chapter”; nor is the statement made that it is concluded.
Usabha, the first of their number. In the introduction it is of extreme
interest to notice the statements of the author in reference to his own
literary activity. It is as follows:

tithayare bhagavanте / anuttaraparakkame amianâni /
tinne sugaigaigae / sidhipahapâesaе varâde [[1]]
vaṁdâni mahâbhâgam / mahâmuṇīni mahâyasam Mahâyânaṁ /
amarararâyamahim / tithayaram imassa tithassa [[2]]
ikkârâsa vi gaṇâhare / pavâyâe pavavaṇâassa vaṁdâni /
savvanâ gaṇaharavaṃsam / vâyagavamsam pavavaṇâm ca [[3]]
te vaṁdiũna siraśâ / atthapuhuttassa1007 tehiṁ kahiassa /
svanânassa bhâgavo / niyyyuttim1008 kituaissâni [[4]]
âvassagassa dasakâ / liassa tâha uttarajjha-m-âyâre1009 /
suagade niyyuttim / buccâmi tâha dasânâm ca [[5]]
kappassa ya niyyuttim / vavahârassē 'va paramaniṇna /
sûripannattte / buçchâmi isibhäsiṇânaṁ1010 ca [[6]]
eeśim niyyuttim / buçchâmi aham jinovâeseṇam /
âharâraheuâraṇâ / payânivâham inâm samâseṇam [[7]]
sâmâiâniyuttim / buçchâm uvâesiâm gurujeṇeṇam /
âyariaparaśpareṇa / âgayam âñupuvto [[8]]
niyyutâ to athâ / jaṁ badhdâ teṇa hoi niyyutâ /
tâha vi ai echâvei / vibhâsiūni suttaparivâdi [[9]]

There is no doubt that we have here the beginning of a work, [58]
and that chapter 1 (which is itself called pîthiṅd, support, complement)
did not yet precede these verses at the period of their origin.1011
From vv. 5 and 8 we learn that the author does not intend to write
an introduction merely for this second chapter, but that his work is
designed for all the âvaśyaka matter and especially the sâmâlam. The
separate statements of his account show that he intended to carry his
investigations into the first two aṅgas too, the fifth upâṅgam, three

1007 Arthapûthutvam.
1008 sûrârthayoh parasparaṁ niryojanam niryuktih; - kiṁ aṅgasya śrutajñânasya?
    no, kiṁ tarhi ? śrutâvâiseṇâm âvâyakâdâniṁ ity aha evâ 'ha: âvassaö; - niryukti
    is perhaps an intentional variation of nirukti.
1009 saumûdâyabâdânâm avâvaye vityidâraṇaṇâ, yathâ Bhûmasena Sena iti, uttarâdhya
    ity uttarâdhyayanam avâyeyam.
1010 deveṃdrastâvâdânâm.
1011 They are placed thus in a palmleaf MS, No. 23, in Peterson's Det. Report
    (1883) (only 1, 51 abhînibho... see p. 56, precedes) at the beginning of a text
    entitled "niyyuktayâka," which contains at least several, if not all, of the above
    10 nîry.
chedasūtras, two more mūlasūtras,¹⁰¹² and, if Haribhadra’s explanation of isibhāṣāī is correct,¹⁰¹³ to painna 7 fgg.

If we compare these statements with those in the commentary of Rṣimaṇḍalasūtra in Jacobi, Kalpas, p. 12, in reference to the ten niryuktiś composed by Bhadrabāhu, it is manifest that they are identical (instead of kalakasya in the passage in Jacobi we must read kalpakasya), and that Bhadrabāhu must be regarded as the one who in our passage speaks in the first person. This conclusion, however, is not supported by the Therāvali in chap. 1, which, as we have seen, p. 7, is much later than Bhadrabāhu. Nevertheless, we have just above formed the opinion that this contradiction is immaterial, since this piṭhikā is to be regarded as not extant at the time of the composition of chap. 2. [59]. The greater is, however, the contradiction which is disclosed by other parts of the text, notably the first verse of the oghaniryukti cited as 6,89, and chapter 8, etc. The statements made there refer to a period much later than that of Bhadrabāhu, the old bearer of this name, and who is assumed to be the last cauddasapuvi ( + Vira 170). All these statements must either be regarded as alien to the original text, or the person in question may be one of the later bearers of the name of Bhadrabāhu, to whom these ten Niryuktiś might be referred. The further course of the account would then determine to what and to how late a period this Bhadr. belonged. All this is, however, on the supposition that we should have to assume that all the other chapters of the Nījűtī were the work of but one hand! In this connection the distinction is of significance which Haribhadra—see above pp. 54, 55—draws in reference to the separate constituent parts of the Nījī. The fourteenth chapter is expressly stated by him to have been composed by another author, viz. Jīṣabhadda. See my remarks on pp. 61, 62 in reference to the incorporation of the oghanijūtī. The result is that chap. 14 and several other chapters (9, 11, 12, 20) exist in a detached form in the MSS., without any connection with āv. nīj. At any rate the statements made in the text remain of extreme interest since they show the interconnection of the ten niryuktiś mentioned in the text, and their relation to one author. A good part of these niry. appears to be still extant. [60] As regards the MS. of the niryuktayah, mentioned above p. 58⁴, we must confess that Peterson’s account does not make it clear in which of the above ten texts it is contained. On the adhraniruykttī see p. 258, Peterson, Palm-leaf 62, Kielhorn’s

¹⁰¹² dasovealīam is undoubtedly referred to under dasakālīam. See the same denotation in v. 1 of the four gāthās added there at the close. For the abbreviation see note 3 on p. 57 in reference to uttarajjha.
¹⁰¹³ This is, however, extremely doubtful as regards the existing painnam called deveimdrastava. See pp. 442, 259, 272, 280, 281, 402, 429, 431, 43.
Report (1881) p. 10; on a suvagādanijj. see Pet. Palm-leaf, 59, a dasavālitānijj, ib. 167. We have also citations from the nijj. in up. 5 and mūlas, 1.

What follows is very interesting:—

att̐ham bhūsat arahā | suttaṁ gaṇthanijji gaṇahāra niṇṇam | sāsaṇassa (ṇasa !) hi aṭṭhāe | tao suttaṁ pavuttaɪ ||13||

sāmāia-m-anī | sūnaṇavān jāva bīhindusārño | tassa vi sāro caraṇāñ | sāro caraṇassa nivānaṁ ||14||.

Here the contents of the doctrine is referred back to Arahān, but the composition of its textual form is ascribed to the gaṇahāras See pp. 216, 345, above p. 35 and p. 80. The word sāmāiañ, which we have found in v. 8 used as the title of the first āvasyaka, is now used in its other signification, i.e. as the title of ān̐ga 1: for bīhindusāra is the title of the title of the first pūrva book in the diṭṭhivāa, ān̐ga 12. See above pp. 243, 244.

3. biā varacariā, 349 (also P, 359 B) vv., of like contents.1014 It begins Viṭṭha Aṇḍhaṣemim Pāsaṁ Mallim ca Viśupijjam ca / ee muttina Jine avasesā āsi rāyāno ||... Despite its seeming exactness, its statements give the impression of being apocryphal. Verses 287 (297) fg. treat of Siddhattha and Tisalā,1015 the fourteen dreams of Tis, etc.

[61] 4. uvasaggā, 69(70 P) vv., treats especially of Viṭṭha.1016 The statements made here in chapter 4 take almost no notice at all of the facts in reference to the life of Viṭṭha that are found here and there in the āṅgas: nor does the Kalpasūtram (see p. 474) devote a greater amount of attention to this subject.

5. samavasaṇān, 69(64 P) vv., as above.

6. gaṇahārovaço, 88(33 P, 90B) vv. (is wanting in P); the history of the 11 pupils of Viṭṭha: Imdabhū 1, Aggibhū 2, Vāubhū 3, Viṭṭha 4, Suhamma 5, Māṇḍī 6, Moriṇputta 7, Akaṃpia 8, Ayalabhāyā 9,

1014 Jina 6 is called Paumābha (v. 23), Jina 8 Sasippaha (v. 24), Jina 19 Malli appears as a masc. (Mallissa v. 30)
1015 On Devānaṁda see v. 279 (289); but Usabhadatta is not mentioned. We read Somilabhidhāno in the scholiast.
1016 Gosāla v. 15 fg.
Meaîja 10, Pabhîsa 11 (see Hemac, vv. 31, 32); titthaḥ ca Suhammad, niravaccā gāṇaharā sesā (v. 5). The contents is as above, and almost no reference is paid to the account in the aṅgas. It concludes with the statement (above p. 48): sāmāyāri tivihā: ohe dasahā padavibhāge //88//; in B there follows, as if belonging to this chapter, as v. 89 the beginning verse of the oghaniryukti, and thereupon the statement itthaṁtare oha-nijjutti bhāṇiyavā. In A v. 89 appears as v. 1 at the beginning of chap. 7 and then follows in partial Sanskrit: attaḥ1017 'ghaniryuktir vaktavyā; after this verse 1 of chap. 7 according to the new computation. There is probably an interpolation here. Since chap 7 treats of the second of the three sāmācāris enumerated in 6,88, and the first receives no mention, it was necessary to remedy this defect. The third sāmācāri is, according to the statements of the scholiast here and elsewhere, pp. 357, 449, represented by the two chedasūtras: kalpa and vyavahāra. It is very probable that the interpolation is not merely one of secondary origin, but an interpolation inserted by the author himself. [62] If this is so, he deemed the ohanijjutti which he had before him (perhaps his own production) to be the best expression of the first form of the 3 sāmācāris, and consequently, not taking the trouble to compose a new one, incorporated1018 brevi manu this ohanijj, (cf. above p. 59), or rather referred to it merely by the citation of its introductory verse. A complete incorporation brought with it no little difficulty, because of the extent of the text in question.1019 The economy of the whole work would have lost considerably if the entire text had been inserted. The text which we possess under this name and of which the first verse alone is cited here, consists of 1160 Prakrit gāthās,1020 I shall refer to it later on, and call attention for the present to what I have said on p. 378: —that the first verse cited here from it, in that it mentions the dasapuṇvi, excludes any possibility of that Bhadrabāhusvāmin, whom tradition calls the author of the oghaniryukti, having been the first bearer of this name, who is stated to have been the last caūḍdasapuṇvi. The same, of course, holds good à fortiori of the author of our text, in which this verse is quoted,

1017 attaḥ instead of atra.
1018 In the Vīḍhiprapā ( in v. 7 des jogavīhāna ) the ohanijjutti is said to be “omnā,” avartṛṇā into the avassayam.
1019 Haribh. says: sāmpratam oghaniryuktir vācyā, sā ca prapāñcitavāt (perhaps on account of its fulness) na viivyāte and likewise at the end: idānīṁ padavibhāgasāmācāryāḥ prastāvah, sā ca kalpavyavahārarūpa bahuvistarāsvasthānād avaseya; ity uktaḥ sāmācāryupakramakālaḥ.
1020 The oghaniryukti, which in PŚ is actually incorporated with the text, has but 58 (or 79Ś) verses. See below. p. 82.
7. dasavihasāmāyārī, 64(P, 65B) vv.; cf. uttarajjh 26; the enumeration here in chapter 7 is as follows (see above p. 48): icchā, micchā, tahakkāro, āvassā nisihā | āpuceḫanā ya[63] paṭipučchā chaṅdaṇā ya nimaṁtaṇā ||[1|| usasāpayd ya kāle sāmāyārī bhava dasavihā ur eesīṁ tu payaṇuṁ patte paruvaṇaṁ buceḥaṁ ||[2||

8. Uvagghāyanijjutī, 211(214.B, 216.P, 218.P) vv. In vv. 40-50 glorification of Ajjā Vayara (plur. maj.), Vairā, Vajrāsvamin, who extracted1021 the āgāsagamā vijjā from the mahāpaṭinā (see p. 251) and made ample use of the latter. In his time there still existed (p. 247) apuṭṭhe kālāṅguoassa, aprthaktvaṁ kālikāmyogasya, but after him (tenaṛena, tata ārataḥ, Haribh.), i.e. perhaps through him there came into existence puhattam kāliyasu diṭṭhivāe1022 a, prthaktvaṁ kāliksaṁte drṣṭivāde ca (v. 40). Tuṁbāvaṇa, Ujjeynt, Dasapura, nayaraṁ Kusumānāme (Paṭaliputra) appear in regular order as exercising an important influence upon his life. In vv. 50-53 glorification of his successor Rakkhiajjā (plur. maj.), Rakkhiakhanaṇā, i.e. of Ārya Rakṣitasvāmin, son of Somadeva and Ruddasomā, (elder) brother of Phaggarakṣha and pupil of Tosaliputta. These two names: Vajrāsvāmin and Āryarakṣita (cf. Hemacandra's Pariśīṣṭap. chaps 12, 13), especially as they are regarded here as persons deserving of great honour, bring us to a period much later than the old Bhadrabāhusvāmin. According to the statements of the modern Theravālī (see Klatt, I, c. pp. 246b, 247a) 252a his death is placed Vira 170, but that of Vajra, 400 years later, Vira.584 1023 We will find below that [64] there is mentioned here another date later by several years. Hem. v. 34 too says that Vajra is the last "daśapārvin," one who still has knowledge of 10 of the 14 pūrvas, and in general that he is regarded as deserving great honour as regards the transmission of the sacred texts. See the account of Dharmaghoṣa on the Kupakṣakaṭikī, Kup. p. 21(811). The two-fold division into kāliyasu and diṭṭhivā (also in the Anuyogadv. above, pp. 36, 40), dating back as far as Vajra according to v. 40, is in contrast to a no less peculiar division into four parts, referred back in v. 54 fg. to Ārya Rakṣita: kāliyasuṁ ca isibhaśiyāṁ tāto a sūrapannaṁ || savo a diṭṭhivā cauitthao hoī anuṛgo ||[54|| jaṁ ca mahākappasuṁ jāṇi a sesāni cheaṭuṭtāni | caraṇaṭkaraṇṇuogaciti kāliyaṭthe uvaṭṭyaṁ ||[55|| Here then the isibhaśiyāṁ (which Har. explains here by uttarādhyayanāṁti! see above pp. 43, 58)

1021 But according to the Gaṇadharaśārdhāṣṭa, v. 29, it was taken from the sumahāpaimnūppuṇvā! see p. 479.

1022 In v. 36 there was mention of 700 (1) or 500 navas, eehin (v. 37) diṭṭhivāe paruvaṇaṁ sutta aṭṭha kahaṇaṁ ya; each of the 7 etc. navas —see p. 350 ff. and p. 39 — tathāvīdhaḥ.

1023 See also Kupakṣak, p. 21 (811)n.
and upānga 5 are enumerated as members holding equal rank\textsuperscript{1024} with the kālīsaum i.e. āṅgas 1-11, and the dīthivā, i.e. ānga 12. Although the “mahākappasuam” and “the other chedasūtras” (kalpātṛkiṇi, scholiasts) are said to have been borrowed from ānga 12, they are akin (or riśihāṣita) to the kālīsaum, i.e. āṅgas 1 to 11. Such is apparently Haribh’s conception of the passage.\textsuperscript{1025}

[65] In this text we notice that the different sections are frequently joined together without any break; and such is the case here. In vv. 56 to 96 we find very detailed statements in reference to the seven niṅhagas, niṅnavas, schisms,\textsuperscript{1026} After an enumeration (v. 56) of the names there follows a list of their founders, the place of their origin (v. 59), the date of their foundation (vv. 60, 61), and then a more exact list of all in regular order, though in a most brief and hence obscure fashion, the catch-words alone being cited. The kathānakas etc. adduced in the scholiast, help us but little to clear up this obscurity. The first two schisms occurred during the life of Vīra, the first (vv. 62, 63), the Bahuraya, bahuṛata, under Jamāli in Sāvatthī in the fourteenth year after he obtained knowledge (Jinēka uppaḍīsassa nānassa), —the second (vv. 64, 65), the Jīvapheiya, under Tisaṭutta (cāitāsadapuvi) in Usabhapura in the sixteenth year thereafter. The third schism (vv. 66, 67), the Aavattaka, ayyataka under Āsāṭha in Seabī (Śvetavikā), in the 214th year after the end of Vīra’s death (siddhiṃ gayaṣsa Viṃassā). They were “brought back to the right faith” (Jacobi, Kalpas p. 9) by the Muria (Maurya) Balabhadda in Rāyagīha. The fourth schism (vv. 68, 69), the Sāmucechea or “echela” under Āsamutta (Aśva) in Mihlapura (Mithilā) is placed in the year 220 after Vīra.\textsuperscript{1027} The fifth (vv. 70, 71), [66] the Dokirīya, under Gaṃga in Ullumāṭīra (? A, Ullaga B, Ulluga scholiast, Ullukā in Skr.) in the year 228. The sixth, the Terāśa, trairāśika, under Chaluga in Aṃtaaramījā, in the year 544, is treated of at greater length (vv. 72—87),

\textit{(To be continued)}
The Jaina Theory of Karma and the Self

Yuvacharya Dr Shiv Muni

There is an objection, how the immaterial nature of self can attract material particles of KARMA. The answer to the above objection is that just as the power of consciousness although immaterial is obscured by taking intoxicating drugs and drinking alcohol, so the immaterial self can be attracted or obscured by material KARMA. Moreover worldly selves are always associated with material KARMAS, since they are not perfectly immaterial.

What is the basis of the belief in the material nature of KARMA? Karma produces pleasure, pain and sorrow etc. and that is why it is material in nature. It is possessed of material form and the effect of KARMA is material in nature, i.e. body etc. Moreover KARMA is only an instrumental cause, while the principal cause of all our actions is the self. Truly speaking, KARMA is nothing, if it is not associated with the self. Hence KARMA is material in nature.

A question may be asked how the most minute infinite number of indivisible atoms (paramāṇu) unite with the self. KARMA is that finest matter which an individual being attracts to itself by reason of certain implement forces which are in the individual. It not only attracts, but also assimilates and changes the core of individuality. The self has the magnetic powers to attract the KARMIC particles. Just as a magnet attracts the pieces of iron fillings and the earth, so also an individual being (self) attracts the KARMIC particles. Therefore there is a kind of magnetism in the self which attracts and assimilates the KARMIC particles. The self produces various kinds of effects when the particles of KARMA have once entered into it.

Jaina thinkers hold that the association of KARMA with the self is from time immemorial. They hold that both avidyā and KARMA are beginningless. Though the self is pure, completely free and potentially divine, it becomes subject to limitation by the power of KARMA. So long as the self is not liberated, it is gathering new KARMA at every moment. It is said in the KARMAGRANTHA:
"As heat can unite with iron and water with milk, so KARMA unites with the self."¹

In the TATTVĀRTHASĀRA it is also stated that the mundane self is obscured by KARMIC matter from the beginningless time, and on account of its bondage with the KARMAS, the self is united like the gold and silver when melted together, to become one mixture². According to Glasenapp, "through the vibration of the particles ... the PUDGALAS are attracted and are ... united themselves to it, they become KARMA and enter into union with a JIVA more intimate than that between milk and water, than between fire and iron ball"³

But it is more appropriate when we say KARMIC matter veils the omniscience of the self as a dense veil of clouds obstructs the light of the sun. The self has indivisible PRADĒŚAS, known as ĀTMAPRADESAS, so the KARMA does not mix with the self as milk mixes with water or fire with an iron-ball owing to their divisible parts. The KARMA covers the essential qualities of the self as the cloud covers the light of the sun.

CLASSIFICATION OF KARMAS

Broadly speaking, there are two types of KARMA, physical KARMA (DRAVYA-KARMA) and psychical KARMA (BHĀVA-KARMA). Jaina thinkers differentiated between the two. Physical KARMA is nothing but the particles of KARMIC matter. It is material in nature and enters into the self. The psychical KARMA is mostly the thought activity of mind. The psychical effects and states produced by the association of physical KARMA are known as psychical. The physical and psychical KARMAS are mutually related to each other as cause and effect.⁴

According to the nature of fruition (PRAKRTI), duration of fruition (STHITI), intensity of fruition (ANUBHĀGA or rasa) and number of space-points (PRADĒŚAS), the KARMAS are classified into eight major types and one hundred and forty eight sub-types.⁵

¹ KARMAGHANTHA, Vol. 1, p. 2
² AMRṬACANDRA'S TATTVĀRTHASĀRA, 16—18.
³ H.V. GLASENNAP, The Doctrine of KARMA in Jain Philosophy, p. 3
⁴ AŚṬASĀHASRĪ, p. 51 (com. on ĀPTAMIMĀMSĀ).
⁵ KARMAGRANTHA, 1. 2.
A. NATURE OF KARMA (PRAKR̄TI)

The eight chief types of KARMA are:

1. Knowledge obscuring KARMA (Jñānāvaraṇīya-Karma)
2. Perception obscuring KARMA (Darśanāvaraṇīya-Karma)
3. Feeling producing KARMA (Vedanīya-Karma)
4. Deluding KARMA (Mohaniya Karma)
5. Age determining KARMA (Āyus-Karma)
6. Physique making KARMA (Nāma-Karma)
7. Status determining KARMA (Gotra-Karma)
8. Power obscuring KARMA (Antarāya-Karma)

Each of the main eight types of KARMA (Mūla-Prakr̄tis) can be divided further into a number of sub-types (Uttaraprakr̄tis). There can be further sub-divisions on the basis of sub-types, so there would be exceedingly a large number of KARMAS. But for the present we are considering the main eight types with their sub-varieties:

I. Jñānāvaraṇīya-Karma: It is divided into five sub-types, viz.

1. Matijñānāvaraṇīya which veils the knowledge attained through senses plus something else.
2. Śrutajñānāvaraṇīya which obstructs the knowledge acquired through reading scriptures, studying symbols and signs.
3. Avadhiñānāvaraṇīya which hinders transcendental knowledge of material things.
4. Manahparyāyañānāvaraṇīya which conceals the mind knowing knowledge of others.
5. Kevalajñānāvaraṇīya which obscures the omniscience which has no limitation of space, time or subject.

II. Darśanāvaraṇīya-Karma: It is divided into nine types corresponding to the four types of perception and five kinds of sleep, viz.

1. Cakṣudarśanāvaraṇīya which covers the eye perception.
2. Acakṣudarśanāvaraṇīya which veils non-eye intuition.
3. Avadhīdarśanāvaraṇīya which produces the hindrance of transcendental undifferentiated cognition of material things.
4. Kevaladarśanāvaraṇīya which covers the pure and perfect intuition.
5. Nidrā produces light and easy sleep.

6 Ibid., 1. 3; TATTVĀRTHASTŪRA, VIII 4.
6. Nidrā-Nidrā creates deep slumber with difficult rising.
7. Pracalā causes a sound sleep while sitting or standing.
8. Pracalā-Pracalā gives intensive sleep white walking.
9. Styūnarddi induces deep sleep while walking and doing some superhuman deeds.

III. Vedāntya Karma: It is of two kinds creating pleasant and sorrowful feelings, viz
1. Sātāvedaniya which produces healthy, glorious and pleasant feelings.
2. Asātāvedantya which creates unhealthy sensations like pain and suffering (Dukkha)

IV. Mohantya Karma: It overpowers right faith and conduct. It has two main divisions: (a) Darśana Mohantya (faith obscuring) and (b) Cāritra Mohantya (conduct deluding).

(a) Darśana-Mohantya is further sub-divided into:
(1) Mithyāta Mohantya (wrong belief)
(2) Samyaktva Mohantya (right belief)
(3) Miśra Mohantya (mixed belief)

(b) Cāritra Mohantya is further divided into sixteen passions (Kasāya) six quasi-passions (no-Kasāya) and three sexes (Veda), totalling the number to twenty-five which are—

1. Intense anger
2. Less intense anger
3. Mild anger
4. Still milder anger
5. Intense pride
6. Less intense pride
7. Mild pride
8. Still milder pride
9. Intense deceit
10. Less intense deceit
11. Mild deceit
12. Still milder deceit
13. Intense greed
14. Less intense greed
15. Mild greed
16. Still milder greed
17. Laughing and joking
18. Prejudicial liking
19. Prejudicial disliking
20. Sorrow (Śoka)
21. Fear (Bhaya)
22. Disgust (Jugupsa)
23. The male sex desire (Puruṣu-Veda)
24. The female sex desire (Śrīt-Veda)
25. The neuter sex desire (Napuṁsaka-Veda)

V. Āyuskarma: Jainism recognizes four kinds of existence according to the age determining Karmas. They are as follows:
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1. The celestial age.
2. The age of human beings.
3. The age of plants and animals.
4. The age of hellish beings.

VI. Nāma-Karma: It is divided into four groups comprising ninety-three sub-types. It is responsible for the diversity of worldly beings and the theory of rebirth. The number of division into four groups is as follows:

1. Collective types.
   (with its sixty-five varieties)
2. Individual types
3. Self-movable bodies
4. Immovable bodies

According to Jainism all the worldly beings can be divided into four states of existence which are:

1. The existence of gods (Devagati)
2. The existence of human beings (Manuṣyagati)
3. The destiny of animals and plants (Tiryag-gati)
4. The state of infernal beings (Narakagati)

FIVE CLASSES OF BEINGS

1. The beings with one sense like earth, water, etc.
2. The beings with two senses like shell, etc.
3. The beings with three senses like ants etc.
4. The beings with four senses like mosquitos, flies, etc.
5. The beings with five senses like plants, animals & human beings.

FIVE TYPES OF BODIES.

1. Physical body attributed to human and animal beings.
2. Transformed body possessed by superhuman power, gods, infernal beings etc.
3. Translocation body. It is created only by the highly spiritual ascetic in order to get information from the omniscient being while his physical body remains there.
4. Fiery body. It is also used by the ascetics in order to burn some one and this body digests food in the stomach.
5. Karma body. This body always possesses Karmic matter, and is mixed with the self and is always changeable.

The human beings always possess three types of body, namely physical, fiery and KARMANA body.

8 Ibid, 1, 23
THREE PARTS OF BODIES

Three parts of body concerning physical, transformable, and translocation are mentioned above; fiery and karmic bodies have no sub-parts.

FIVE TYPES OF BINDINGS.

The five types of bindings are categorized according to the five types of bodies.

FIVE TYPES OF UNIFICATION

These are also divided according to the five types of bodies mentioned above.

SIX TYPES OF STATURE DETERMINING BODIES

They are perfectly symmetrical, round, of animal frame, with hunch back, dwarf, and HUNDAKA (entire body unsymmetrical).

SIX TYPES OF FIRMNESS OF JOINTS

They are like adamant, like stone, unbreakable, semi-unbreakable, riveted, and crystal like.

FIVE COLOURS

Black, Green, Yellow, Red and White.

TWO ODOURS

Pleasant and unpleasant.

FIVE TASTES

Pungent, bitter, saline, sour and sweet.

EIGHT TOUCHES

Light, heavy, soft, hard, cough, smooth, cold and hot.

FOUR MIGRATORY FORMS

The hour of death, when the self goes to another state of existence is called the state of Ānupūrvi. According to the four states of existence, there are four Ānupūrvis or forms, namely celestial, human, animal and infernal beings.

TWO KINDS OF MOVEMENT

There are two kinds of movement to move in a pleasant manner as oxen, elephant, etc. and to move in an ugly manner as camels and asses etc.
INDIVIDUAL TYPES

They are of eight kinds, namely superiority over others, capability of breathing, hot body, cold body, a body which is neither heavy nor light, the body of a Thirthankara, the normal formation of the body, and the abnormal formation of the body.

TEN SELF-MOVABLE BODIES.

A body having more than one sense, gross body, completely developed body, individual body, firm parts of the body, beautiful parts of the body, worthy of praise without any obligation, lovely voice, sweet and suggestive speech, a body with honour and glory.

TEN IMMOVABLE BODIES.

These self-types are opposite to self-movable bodies and include immovable bodies having only one sense, subtle body imperceptible to the senses, undeveloped body, a body common with others of their species, flexible body, ugly parts of the body, unsympathetic, ill-sounding voice, unsuggestive speech, creating dishonour and shame.

VII. GOTRA-KARMA : It is of two types:

1. The Karma that bestows the individual with superior family surroundings.
2. The Karma that determines the individual of low family surroundings.  

VIII. ANTARĀYA-KARMA : The power of the self is obscured by this KARMA in the following five manners:

1. It hinders the power of giving charity alms, etc,
2. It is an obstacle to gain or profit.
3. It obstructs the enjoyment of things which can be taken once like eating and drinking, food and water, etc.
4. It presents the enjoyment which can be effected more than once like pictures, clothing etc.
5. It is a hindrance to will power.

The above classification of the main eight types of KARMA are further sub-divided into one hundred and forty-eight sub-types.

10 KARMAGRANTA, I, 52
11 Ibid.,
12 See H.V GLASENAPP. The DOCTRINE OF KARMA in JAIN PHILOSOPHY pp. 5-19
Of the above mentioned eight chief types of KARMAS the four viz., Jñānāvaraṇiya, Darśanāvaraṇiya, Mohaniya and Antarāya are the obstructive KARMA (ghāti-karma), as they create hindrance to the power of knowledge and intuition, and take the self into wrong directions and obstruct its inherent energy. Some of them are completely obscuring (SARVAGHĀTIN) and others are partially obscuring (DEŚAGHĀTIN). The other four namely, Vedniya-Karma, NĀMA-KARMA, GOTRA-KARMA and Āyus-KARMA are called AGHĀTI-KARMA, as they do not obscure the essential nature of the self. The results or effects of GHATI-KARMA can only be destroyed with hard labour, whereas the results or effects of AGHĀTI-KARMA can be destroyed easily.

After the four GHATI-KARMAS are destroyed, one can attain the stage of KEVALIN, but cannot attain the stage of final disembodied liberation unless the four AGHATI-KARMAS are destroyed. It means that when all the KARMAS are destroyed the self is freed and becomes a SIDDHA.  

The self does not lose all its essential characteristics even if it is infected by SARVĀGHATI-KARMA. The analogy of the sun and cloud is useful here. As there is always some light, though the sun is covered with the dense veil of clouds, so the self retains some fragment of pure or right knowledge, though it is covered with the dirt of KARMA.  
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