

ISSN 0021-4043
A QUARTERLY
ON
JAINOLOGY

VOL. XXVIII

JANUARY 1994

No. 3

Jain Journal



॥ जैन भवन ॥

JAIN BHAWAN PUBLICATION

Contents

Sacred Literature of the Jains	107
<i>Albrecht Friedrich Weber</i>	
The Jaina Theory of Karma and the Self	139
<i>Yuvacharya Dr Shiv Muni</i>	
Book Review	
Muni Suvrataswāmicarita :	
Rupendra Kr. Pagariya	147
<i>Satya Ranjan Banerjee</i>	
Maṇoramākaha :	
Rupendra Kr. Pagariya	148
<i>Satya Ranjan Banerjee</i>	
A Study of Tattvārthasūtra with Bhaṣya :	149
Suzuko Ohira	
<i>Satya Ranjan Banerjee</i>	
Role of Space-Time in Jaina's Syādvāda and Quantum Theory : Filita Bharucha.	149
<i>Satya Ranjan Banerjee</i>	
Purāna Perenn's : Wendy Doniger (Ed)	150
<i>Satya Ranjan Banerjee</i>	
Obituary	151
In Memoriam : Ganesh Lalwani	
<i>Satya Ranjan Banerjee</i>	

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 *Mahākāvya*, viz., *Muni Suvratasvāmicarita* 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 Suvratasvāmicarita* possesses all the good qualities of a *Mahākāvya*, though not divided by cantos. From a perusal of this *Mahākāvya*, it appears that Śrī Candrasūri is a very good poet and a master of narration.

The *Muni Suvratasvāmicarita* 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 Suvrata, the 20th Tīrthaṅkara in the line of Jaina hagiology. It narrates the story of nine great births of Muni Suvratasvāmī. In his life as a householder Suvrata was a finance minister under Cālukya king Jayasīṃha of Gujarat, and it was at that time he had composed this extensive literary work. This *Kāvya* 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 Suvrata 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 *Kāvyaratna*. 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 *Jinaratnaḥṣa*).

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 foot-notes 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 'Gujarata'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-KAHĀ of Vardhamānasūri—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-kāhā* of Vardhamānasūri 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-kāhā* was composed in prose and verse by Vardhamānasūri 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 Suzuko 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 Purāṇic 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 *aṅga*. [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 Devarddhigaṇi, the nominal redactor of the whole *Siddhānta*. Devarddhigaṇi 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 *Pākṣikasūtram* 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 *duvālasaṅgaṃ gaṇipīḍagaṃ*, 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 Dasāra, Baladeva, Vāsudeva, Harivaṃsa, and consequently as a mythological personage.

⁹⁴⁶ This is introduced in just the same manner as the previous one. See pp. 10, 13 : — *namo tesim khamāsamaṇāṇaṃ jehim imam vāiyam duvālasaṅgaṃ gaṇipīḍagaṃ, tam jahā...* and concludes in the same way : *savvehim pi eyammī duvālasaṅge gaṇipīḍage bhāgavante sasutte.....*

contain statements in reference to the correct [20] attainment of the *suanāṇam*; the last one reads : *suttattho khalu paḍhamo, bho nijjutti (!)-māso bhaṇo | taiou niravaseso, esa vihi hoi aṇuoe || 5 ||* According to Leumann, the reference in *Bhag.* 25, 3 cites this verse as the conclusion of this entire account (*jāva 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*, *anujñā*, and a renewed repetition of the titles of the 12 *aṅgas* and a reference to *Usabhasena*, 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 *Nandivṛtti* is frequently cited—see pp. 353, 354 (*Vicārāmṛtasamgraha*), 360 (Abhayadeva), — the citations from it being partly in Prakrit (*gāthā*), partly in Sanskrit. In the scholium on the *Gaṇadharasārdhaśata* (see pp. 371, 458) Sarvarājagaṇi ascribes a *nandivṛtti* to the old Haribhadra, who is said to have died 75 years after Devarddhigaṇi. The author of the *Vicārāmṛtasamgraha* appears to ascribe such a *nandivṛtti* to Umāsvāmivācaka who was about 50 years older (see pp. 371, 372). He says (fol. 3^a of the Berlin MS) *tathā cā* “*ha bhagavān Umāsvāmivācakaḥ : samyogdarśanañānacāritrāṇi mokṣamārga iti Nandivṛttau, vācakaśabdaś ca pūrvagataśrutadhare rūḍho, yathā : pūrvagataṁ sūtram anyac ca vineyān vācayamīti vācakaḥ, Nandivṛttau : [21] vādī ya* (see p. 353)”. Such statements as these in reference to commentaries of so great an age are of great importance as regards the age of the *Nandī*.

XLII. The *Anuyogadvārasūtram* is an encyclopaedic review of everything worth knowing,⁹⁴⁷ composed in *anugos*, 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 *Nandī*, the *nāṇam* 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. *ābhiniḥoḥiya*,^o *suya*,^o *ohi*,^o *maṇapayyava*,^o *kevala*.^o The second form, the *suyanāṇam*, *śrutajñānam*, is the one *par excellence* which is discussed further on in the *Anuy*. The subdivisions of the *suyan*, 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 *aṅgapaviṭṭham* and into *aṅgabāhiram*,⁹⁴⁸ the latter into *kāliyam* and *ukkāliyam* ; the latter of which again into *āvassayam* and *āvassayavairittam*.

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 : *āvassayaṃ nikkhivissāmi, suam (śrutam) ni*,^o *khamdham ni*^o *ajjhayaṇaṃ ni*.^o After a *kārikā* inserted here the author proceeds to a discussion of the *āvassayam per se*, [22] which is *caūvviham*, viz. :- *nāmā*,^o *ṭhavaṇā*,^o *daṇvā*,^o *bhāvā*,^o respectively, the latter two being distinguished from the others as *āgamao* and *no-āgamao*. At the end the synonyms (*egaṭṭhiyā nāṇōghosā nāṇāvaṃjaṇā nāmadhiyyā*) are stated as follows :- *āvassayaṃ, avassakaraṇiyya, dhuvaniggaho, visohi ya/ajjhayaṇachakkavaggo nāo ārāhaṇā maggo || samaṇeṇa sāvaṇṇa ya avassakāyavayaṃ havi jamhā/amto aho-nisassa ya tamhā avassayaṃ nāma ||*⁹⁴⁹ This designation as *ajjhayaṇachakkavagga* points unequivocally to a definite text, divided into 6 *adhyayanās*. By the 6 *adhyayanās* we may understand the six kinds of *āvassayam* enumerated in the *Nandī*, 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 *suyam* and the *khamdha*, 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 *suyam* is as follows :- [23] *sua-sutta-gaṃtha—siddhamāta-sāsaṇe āṇāvayaṇa uvaese | pannavaṇa āgame a egaṭṭhā payyavā sutte*⁹⁵⁰ ||, that containing the

⁹⁴⁸ There is unfortunately no enumeration of the *aṅgabāhira* texts in *An*.

⁹⁴⁹ = *Viśeṣ*, I, 871 f. I call attention to the following from the scholiast :— *sāmaṇikādi-śaḍṣadhyayanakalāpāt makatvād adhyayanaśaḍvargaḥ; tathā abhipretārthasiddhaḥ samyagupāyatvān nyāyo, mokṣārādhanāhetutvād ārādhanā, tathā mokṣapurāṇaprākatvād eva mārgaḥ;— ahoṛātrasya madhye.*

⁹⁵⁰ Between *āṇa*, *ājñā* and *vayaṇa* one MS. has *utti* which, however, throws the metre out of order ; *uktir vacanaṃ vāgyogaḥ* scholiast ; instead of *sutte*, *sūtraviṣaye*, we expect *sue*, *frute*, which, however, does not suit the metre.

synonyms of *khamdha* :- *gaṇakāe a nikāe khamdhe vagge taheva rāsi a | punje pīṇde niare saṁghāe dula samūhe ||* The first names for “sacred text” refer then to the contents, the second to the extent. In one subdivision of *khamdha*, the *no-āgamao bhāvakamdhe*, the following explanation is found (*se kiṁ taṁ no-ā°*) :- *eesim⁹⁵¹ ceva sāmāiya-m-āiyāṇaṁ chaṇham ajjhayaṇāṇaṁ samudāya-samiti-samāgameṇaṁ āvassaya-suabhāvakamdhe labbhate, se taṁ-no-āgamao bhāvakamdhe*. By this is meant in all probability the connection of the totality of all the above cited six *adhyayanās* of the *āvaśyaka*, *sāmāyika*, etc.

The last of these four sections designed to explain the *āvassayaṁ*, refers *ex professo* to the *ajjhayaṇaṁ*, and begins with an enumeration of these six *ajjhayaṇas*. A *kārikā* is first introduced,⁹⁵² which may have found its way from here to *painna* 1 [24]—(see p. 433ⁿ).—, though both places may have drawn this verse from a common source. This verse states in brief compass the contents of each of the six *ajjh*. Then follow again the six names as in the *Nandī*. Next the first one, the *sāmāiaṁ*, is designated expressly as the one which is treated of in the *An*. To it are allotted four *aṇugadārās*, sections for questions related to the subject-matter. These sections are *uvakkame*, *nikkheve*, *aṇugame*, *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. 5^a to 53^b. That which preceded was on foll. 1^b to 5^a; *nikkheva* is on three leaves, to 56^v; *aṇugame* is despatched in ten lines on 56^b and *nae* in six.

On p. 22 I called attention to the lack of harmony between the names of the six *āvaśyaka* 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 adduced 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

951 *sāmāidamādīṇaṁ (!) A: eṣaṁ eva prastutāvaśyakabhedānāṁ sāmāyikādīnāṁ saṇṇāṁ adhyayanānāṁ samudāyaḥ. samudāyasya samiti(r) nairāmtariyeṇa, milanā, ... samāgamas, tena niṣpanno ya āvaśyakaśrutaskamdhā sa bhāvaskamdhā iti labhyate.*

952 *āvassayassa naṁ ime atthāhigārā bhavaṁti, taṁ : sāvajjaḥogavitrati ukkittāṇa guṇavato a paḍivattī/khaliassa nimdanā vaṇa-tigicchā guṇadhāraṇa ceva || āvassayassa eso pīṇḍattho vannaṁ samāseṇaṁ / etto ekkekkaṁ puṇa ajjhayaṇaṁ kittāissāmi || taṁ : sāmāiaṁ, caṁvisathao, vaṁḍaṇayaṇaṁ, paḍikkamaṇaṁ, kāussa-ggaṁ paccakkhāṇaṁ; tattha paḍhamajjhayaṇaṁ sāmāiaṁ, tassa naṁ ime cattāri aṇugadāra, taṁ : uvakkame, nikkheve, aṇugame, naye.*

first of these, the *sāmāiyam*, or the *sāvajjajogavirati*.⁹⁵³ A genuine discussion is hardly touched upon, the real subject-matter being special topics pertaining to [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 *aṅgas* we had learned to employ it in quite a different signification, viz :— as the title of *aṅga* 1, whose contents it is true, might be characterized as *sāvajjajogavirati*. The double use of one and the same word to designate two different *termini 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 *āṇupuvvī* (in A on fol. 5^a to 15)^b, *nāmaṇ* (to 27^a), *paṇāṇam* (to 51^b), *vattavvayā* (to 52^a), *atthāhigāra* (ib.), *samavayāra* (to 53^b). And the *āṇupuvvī* is in turn divided into *nāmāṇupuvvī*, *thavaṇḍā*, *davvā*, *khetṭā*, *kālā*, *ukkittāṇā*, *gaṇaṇā*, *saṇḥhāṇā*, *sāmāyāri-ā*, *bhāvāṇupuvvī*.

Without paying any greater attention to the stereotyped expressions of the text [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 *résumé* 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 *ā ī ū* are shortened,

A species of *davvāvassayam* (A 2^b) is divided into *loiyaṃ*, *kuppāvay-aṇiyaṃ* and *louttariyaṃ*. The first is referred to the usages of the *procures*, who appear in the usual enumeration that we have met with

⁹⁵³ In the *atthāhigāra* section of the *uvakkama* in one MS. ! the contents of all the six *ajjhayaṇas* is seemingly ascribed to the *sāmāiyam* alone. The actual facts of the case are different, see p. 37n.

in the *āṅgas* : *je ime rāi*—“*sara-talavara-koḍambiya*⁹⁵⁴—*māḍambiya-ibha-setṭhi-senāvai-satthavāḥapabhiio*.”⁹⁵⁵ The *kuppāvayaṇiyam* describes in the following enumeration the character of those sects which do not share the Jaina belief :—*je ime*⁹⁵⁶ *caraga-ciriya-cammakhamdiya-bhicchamḍaga-paṇḍuraṅga Goyama-govvaiya-gihidhamma-dhammacim*—[27] *taga-aviruddha-viruddha-vuḍḍhasāvagapabhiyao pāsamḍatthā*, and states that these : *Imḍassa vā Khamḍassa vā Ruddassa vā Sivassa vā Vesamaṇassa vā devassa vā nāgassa vā jakkhassa vā bhūyassa vā Mugumḍassa vā Ayyāe vā Koṭṭakiriyāe vā*⁹⁵⁷ *uvalevaṇa-sammayyaṇā*—“*varisaṇadhūvapupphagamḍhamallāyāim davvāvassayāim karemiti*. The *loguttariyam* finally is referred to the merely external Jaina-yogin : *je ime samaṇaguṇamukka-jogī cakkāyaniraṇukampī hayā iva uddāmā gayā iva niraṇkusā ghaṭṭhā maṭṭhā tuppottṭhā*⁹⁵⁸ *paṇḍurapaḍapāuraṇī*⁹⁵⁹ *jināṇam aṇāṇāe (anājñayā) sacchamḍam vihariṇam ubhaya-kālam dvassagassa uvaṭṭhamti*.

954 On *talavara*, see p 38 fg. 313; *koḍambiya* from *kuṭamba*, the older form of *kuṭumba*, see Ind. Streifen I, 284. *Pañcadaṇḍacch*. p. 41 : *yasya pārsvata āsannam aparaṁ grāmanagarādikam nā 'sti tat sarvataśchinnajanāśraya-viśeṣarūpam māḍambam ucyaṭe tasyā 'dhipatir māḍambikāh*.

955 ... *muhadhoyāna-daṁṭapakkhāṇa-tella-phaṇiha-siddhatthaya-hariyāliya-addāga-dhūva-puppha-mallagamḍha-taṁbolavattha-m-āyāim davvāvassayāim karemiti tao paccha rūyakulam vā devakulam vā sabham vā pavam (prapam ?) vā āramam vā uyyāṇam vā niggaḍḍhamti*.

956 *dhāṭi(?)vāhakāḥ samto ye bhikṣām caraṁti te carakāḥ; rathyāpotitaciraparidhānās cirikāḥ; carmaparidhānās carmakhaṇḍikāḥ; ye bhikṣām eva bhūmijate na tu svaparigṛhītam godugdhādikam te bhikṣatāḥ, Sugatasāsanasthā ity anye; pām-ḍuraṁgā bhasmoddhulitagātrāḥ; vicitrāpāḍapatanaḍisikṣakalāpayuktavarātakamulika-dicarcitavṣabhakopāyataḥ (?) kaṇabhiḥsāgrāhiṇo Gautamāḥ; cf. Kaṇabhuḥ, Kaṇāda !) gocarāṇukārīṇo govratikāḥ, te hi “vayam api kila tiryakṣu vasāma” iti bhāvaṇam bhāvayānto gobhir nirgacchamṭibhiḥ saha nirgacchamṭi sthītābhis tiṣṭhamti āsinābhir upaviśamti bhūmjanābhis tathai “va tṛṇapāṭṭrapausaphalādi bhūmijate, tad uktaṁ ; gāvīhi samam niggaṇapavesathāṇāsaṇādi pākariṁti | bhūmijamti jahā gāvī tiricchavāsam vibhāvamā || ; gṛhasthadharma eva śreyān iti ... gṛhidharmās, tathā ca tadanūsāriṇam vacaḥ : gṛhāśramasam dharmaṁ na bhūto na bhaviṣyati | tam pālayamti ye dhīrāḥ, klīvāḥ pāsamaṇ āsritā iti ||) ; Yājñavalkyaprabhṛtiṣipraṇāṭṭadharmaśamhitās cūṭṭayamti.. dharmacimṭakāḥ; devatā-kṣitīśamāṭapitṛ-tiryagādinām avirodhena vinayakāritvā aviruddhā vainayikāḥ; puṇyapāparalokādyanabhiyugapamaparā akriyāvādinā viruddhā(h), sarvapāśam-ḍibhiḥ saha viruddhacāritvāt; prathamam eṇā “dyatirīhakarakāle samutpannatvāt. prāyo vṛddhakāle dikṣāpratipatteṣ ca vṛddhās tāpasāḥ; śrāvakāḥ brāhmaṇāḥ ... ; anye ta vṛddhaśrāvakā ity ekam eva padam vrāhmaṇavācakatvena vyācakṣate (Buddha is the same word not referred to here ! (see *Bhag.* 2, 214); and AC? R read *vuḍḍha*, BC alone having *vuddha*); *pāsamḍam vratam, tatra tiṣṭhamti 'ti pāsamḍasthāḥ*; on *Goyama* fg. see *Aupap.* § 73. See chap. 15 in *Varāhamihira's Bṛhajjātaka (pravrajyāyogādhyāya)*, or *Laghujāt.* 9, 12). *Ind. Stud.* 2 287, where also *vṛddhaśrāvaka*.*

957 *Mukumḍo Baladevaḥ; Ārya prasāntarūpā Durgā; sai 'va mahiṣarūdhā tat-kuṭṭanaparā Koṭṭakriyā; atro 'pacārād imḍrādisabdena tad-āyatanam apy ucyaṭe*, the same arrangement of the gods, except *Mukunda*, occurs also in the *Bhagavatī*. 3, 1, 56; see my treatise 2, 113, 1, 439.

958 See p. 161 on *Hāla* 459 *Bhuv*.

959 According to all appearance this speaks against the connection of the text with the *Śvetāmbaras* and refers it to the *Digambaras* [cf. *Bhag.* 2, 187n, 321, where I have partially misunderstood the passage].

[28] In the *bhāvāvassayam* (intellectual exercise) we read in the passage attributing a similar division to the *loiyaṃ* : *puvvaṇhe Bhārahaṃ, avaraṇhe Rāmāyaṇam*⁹⁶⁰ and as regards the *kuppāvayaṇiyam*, it is said of the same sects as above (*caragacīriya*^o) i.e. that they *ijja'mjali-homa-japa-umduurukka namukkāra-m-āiyāim bhāvāvassayāim kareṃti*.⁹⁶¹ The *davvasuyam* is characterized⁹⁶² as *pattaya-potthayalihiyaṃ* and as *aṇḍayaṃ, voṇḍayaṃ, kiḍayaṃ, vālayaṃ, vakkayaṃ*.

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

[29] In the enumeration of the names from *āyāra* to *diṭṭhivā* (*aṅga 5* as *vivāhapannatti*) the *duvālasaṃgaṃ gaṇipidaṃ* takes the place of the *louttariyaṃ*, etc.

In the case of the *khetṭāṇupuvvī*, the groups of the *aholoe* (*Rayaṇa-ppabhā* to *Tamatamappabhā*), *tiriyaloe* (*Jambuddive* to *Sayaṃbhuramaṇe*), *uḍḍhaloe* (*Sohamme* to *Isipabhārā*) are enumerated, and in the case of the *kālāṇu*^o, the gradations of the divisions of time from *samāe* to *savvaddhā*. As we learn from a second discussion of the subject in a passage later on (see pp. 34, 37), we have to deal here with a

⁹⁶⁰ See *Bhag. 2*, 248n, my treatise on the *Rāmāy*, p. 34; *loke hi Bharata-Rāmāyaṇayor vācanaṃ śravaṇaṃ vā pūrvāparāhṇayor eva rūḍhaṃ*.

⁹⁶¹ *ijjā yāgaḥ, athavā deśabhāṣāyāṃ ijje ti (iṣṭeti B) mātā(!) tasyā namaskāraavidhau ..; umduurukka tti deśivacanata umdu mukhaṃ, rukkaṃ vṣabhādiśabdakaraṇaṃ, devatāḍipurato vṣabhagarjitādikaraṇaṃ*.—B has also *itthaṃjali* in the text; this is manifestly caused by a misunderstanding of the ligatures *ṣṭ. ṣv.* and *jj* See Vol. XVI. *Ind. Stud.* 2n; *ijja, mātā* is to be referred either to root *yaj* or to *āryā*.

⁹⁶² *pat(t)irakāṇi talatālyādisambamdhini, tatsaṃghātāniṣpannās tu pustakās, tataś ca patrakāṇi ca pustakās ca, teṣu likhitam; athavā potaṃ vastram* (see I. S. Vol. 16, p. 155) *pa(t)irakāṇi ca teṣu likhitam* :—*aṇḍayaṃ haṃsagabbhādi; haṃsaḥ patamgaḥ, garbhaḥ tu tannivartitakoṣikāro... tadutpannaṃ sūtraṃ aṇḍajam ucyaṭe ādiśabdhāḥ svabhedaprakhyāpanaparaḥ* :—*voṇḍayaṃ (bo° R, po° A) karpāsa-m-ādi, Ind. Stud. XVI. 111* : *voṇḍaṃ vamaṇiṣphalaṃ tasmā jātam voṇḍajam; phalaḥ vamaṇi, tasyāḥ phalaṃ phalaḥ karpāśrayakoṣakarupam* :—*kiṭṭaj jātam kiṭṭajam sūtraṃ* ; is fivefold : *paṭṭe paṭṭasūtraṃ* (detailed citation from the *vṛddhavyākhyā*), *Malae Malayaviṣayotpannam, aṃsue, Cīṇaṃsue Cīṇaviṣaye, kimirāge,—lomabhyo jātam vāḷajam*; is fivefold *unnie aṇṇikam, uṭṭhie aṇṇikam, miyalomae, kutave (ko°) umduuroromanispannam, kiṭṭise ūṇādinam yad uḍḍhari tam* :—*vakkayaṃ (vāgayaṃ A) ṣaṇa-m-ādi valkajam, tatāṇa tasiṣūtraṃ Mālavakādiṣasiddham*. 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 *śrutam*. Their use as paper, etc. for MSS. is doubtless here referred to as in the case of *pattaya*^o.

progression by 84's and not by 10's. Cf. *Bhagav.* 1,427 above, pp. 268, 411, 412. In the case of the *ukkittaṇṇu*⁹⁶³ 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—*hriḥ śrīḥ dhīḥ strī* (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 (*mūrdhābhiṣikta*) examples. The same fondness for Sanskrit may be observed in the metrical rules concerning gender, statements in reference to the finals of nouns, (*ā, ī, ū, o* and *aṁ, iṁ, uṁ*), *saṁdhi* (*āgama, lova, pagadi* i.e. *prakṛti*, and *vikāra*) and the five classes of words. For some of the names of these classes (e.g. *nāmikam, naipātikam, ākhyātikam aupasargikam, miśram*) and the examples⁹⁶³ 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 *saṁdhi*; *vadhū ūhate vadhūhate*, but Sanskrit has no nominative or rather no form *vadhū*. The nomin. is *vadhūs*.

In mentioning a subspecies of *Chanāme* (*ṣaṇṇ*⁹⁶⁴) 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.⁹⁶⁴

Under the head of *Sattanāme* we find a very thorough-going account of the seven *svara*'s⁹⁶⁵ interwoven with all sorts of *gāthās* : under

⁹⁶³ Thus *saṁdhi* : *āgameṇaṁ.. padmāni payāmsi, loveṇaṁ.. te atra te 'tra, pato atra paṭo 'tra payatīe.. agni etau, paṭu imau, sāle ete, māle ime, vikāreṇaṁ.. dāṁḍasya agraṁ dāṁḍagraṁ, sā āgatā sāgatā, dadhi idam, dadhidam, nadi ūhate nadūhate, madhu udakam madhūdakam, vadhū (!) ūhate vadhūhate*—then, after mentioning the five classes of words, the examples to illustrate them are given in Sanskrit :- *aśva iti nāmikam, khaiv iti naip., dhāvati 'ty ākhy, pari 'ty aup., saṁyata iti miśram*.

⁹⁶⁴ *abbhā ya abbhārukkhā saṁjāhā gaṁdhavvanagarā ya ukkā vāyā disādāghā vijjū gajjitaṁ nigghāya jūvā, jakkhalittā (yakkṣādiptakāni, nabhodṭṭīyamānāgnipīṣācāh) dhumā mahā (dhumikāh mahikāh) rauggāyā (raja-udghātāh, rajasvalā diṣāh) cāmdovazāgā surovarāgā cāmdaparivesā sūrapa⁹⁶⁵ paḍicāmdayā paḍisūrayā, imdadhāṇū, udagamachhā (*matsyāh, indradhanuḥkhamḍāni) kavihasiā (kapihasitāny akasmān nabhasi jvaladbhīmaśabdarupāni) amohā (amoghāh suryabimbād adhaḥ kadācid upalabhyamānaśakāṭoddhisamsthitaśyāmādirekhāh) vāsā ... The same enumeration is found also *Bhagav.* Ed.p. 224 and in *aṅga* 3,10 according to Leumann.*

⁹⁶⁵ See my treatise on the *Pratijñāsūtram*, pp. 109, 110.

aṭṭhanāme a similar account of the eight cases (*vibhatti*), under *navanāme* of the nine poetical (*kavva-*) *rasas*. 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 *khettasarijoga* :- *Māgahae*, *Mālavae*, *Soraṭṭhae*, *Marahattṭhae*, *Kurikaṇae*, *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 names⁹⁶⁶ refer *par excellence* to Jainism. That the list is limited to these six names, whereas in *aṅga* 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 *aṅga* 5 and in *upāṅga* 4 has no securer a foundation than that of a stereotyped literary tradition.

In another of these subdivisions, the *ṭhavaṇāpamāṇe*, which contains a discussion of the seven kinds of formation of names, we find an enumeration of the 28 *nakkhattas*, still beginning with *kṛttikā*, though with their secondary titles (*puṣṣa*, *jeṭṭhā*, *mūla*, *savaṇa*, *dhaṇiṭṭhā*, *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*, *dhamma*, *samma*, (*śarman*), *deva*, *dāsa*, *sena*, *rakkhia*,⁹⁶⁷ thus, e.g., *kattia*, *kattidinna* (*kitti*°), *kattidhamma*, *kattisamma* etc. Furthermore the patronymics from the names of each of their 28 divinities;⁹⁶⁸ thus *aggie*, *aggidinne*, *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 *nakṣatra* 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* (*Aikṣvāka*), *Nāye* (the *kulam* of Mahāvīra) and *Koravve* are cited. The following appear as *pāsaṇḍa* in the same connection :- *samaṇe paṇḍaraṇḍe*, *bhikkū kāvāḷe*, *tāvase* and *parivvāyāe*, s, *Bhag.* 2, 213". The scholiast explains *bhikkhū* by *Buddhadarśanaśritaḥ* and on

⁹⁶⁶ On *Soraṭṭhāe* cf. *Kalpas*, *Therāv.* 9.

⁹⁶⁷ The names in °*bhūti* cf. *Imda*°, *Aggi*°, *Vāyu*°, are omitted strangely enough.

⁹⁶⁸ *ahibudhnya* appears here as *vivaḍḍhi* (!), cf. *vividhhi* in *aṅga* 3 (p. 268); both are forms which are much more corrupted than the *abhivaddhi* (°*vuddhi*) of the *Sūryaprajñapti*, see *Ind. Stud.* 10, 295.

the other hand asserts that there is a five-fold division of *samaṇa* i *niggaṇṭha-Sakka(Śākya)-tāvasa-geruya ājīvā* with which Abhayadeva too is acquainted (see p. 281ⁿ). He connects the *paṇḍuramga* with the *naiyāyika*. (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. :— 1. *darṇḍa*, examples : *darṇṭās ca oṣṭhaṃ ca, darṇtoṣṭhau, stanau ca udaram ca stanodaram.. vastrapātraṃ aśvamahiṣau .. ahinaku-lam*. 2, *bahuvvīhi*, 3. *kammadhāraya*, 4. *dīgu*, 5. *tappurisa*, 6. *avvayibhāva*, and—7. *ekasēṣa*, the plural as a collection of several units (there is no dual). The eight-fold *taddhitas* follow the compounds : *kammaṃ 1 sippa 2 siloe 3 saṃjōya 4 samīvao 5 a saṃjūhe 6/ issariā 7 'vacceṇa 8 ya taddhitānāmaṃ tu aṭṭhaviham.*||

It is peculiar that among these examples there are almost as many of primary as of secondary formation and in fact [33] even compounds.⁹⁶⁹ The commentary explains this peculiarity, which is to be ascribed to actual ignorance (cf. the wilful blunder, p. 30) as follows - *iha taddhitaśabdena taddhitaprāptihetubhūto 'rtho gṛhyate, tato yatrā'pi tunnāe taṃtuvāe ity-āḍau taddhitapratyayo na dṛśyate tatrā 'pi taddhetubhūtārthasya vidyamānatvāt taddhitajatyam (perhaps merely taddhitatvam) siddham bhavati,*

It is especially interesting that here *saṃjūha*, *saṃyūtha* are explained by the scholiast as *grāṇṭharacanā*, so that the examples cited in the text are to be regarded as titles of literary compositions :- *Taraṅgavatī*, *Malayavatī*, *Sattānusaṭṭhi* (*attā°*) and *Bimḍu* 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 sattāyāṃ parasmaibhāṣā, edha vṛddhau, spardha saṃharṣe, gādhy pratiṣṭhālipsayor grāṇṭhe ca, bādhy loḍane, se'ttaṃ dhātue*. This is nothing more than the beginning of Pāṇini's *dhātupāṭha*; see Westergaard *Radices*, p. 344. The fourth group, *niruttie*, enumerates in Sanskrit a large number of very peculiar etymologies; *mahyāṃ śete mahiṣaḥ,*

⁹⁶⁹ On 1 *taṇahārae* etc., — on 2 *vatthie*, *tunnāe taṃtuvāe* etc., — on 3 *samaṇe*, *māhaṇe*, — on 4 *ranno sasurae sālae*, — on 5 *girissa samāve nagaraṃ girinagaraṃ. Vidiśe s. n. Vedisam* — on 6 *Taraṅgavaṅkāre* (in BR invariably *kārae*), *Malaya-vatī* (vai BR) *kāre, sattā* (*attā* BR) *nusattikāre, bimḍukāre* (cf. *dharmabimḍu lokabimḍu*, p. 457) — on 7 *isare talavare māḍambie ...* on 8 *grahamāṇāyā, cakkavattimāyā, Baladevamāyā, Vāsudevamāyā.*

bhramati ca rauti ca bhramarah, [34] *muhur muhur lasati musalam. kapi-
iva lamvate thac* (v. 1. are *ghatti, beti, seti*) *ca karoti (patati ca is
added by BC) kapittham, cid iti karoti khallam ca bhavati cikkallam,
ūrdhvakarṇa*⁹⁷⁰ *ulūkaḥ khasya mālā mehkālā.*

Under the head of *pamāṇa*, that is divided into *davva*°, *khetta*°, *kāla*°, and *bhāva*°, 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 similiar to that in the *kālāṇupuvvī*, above page 29, the progression by 84's beginning three gradations after the quinquennial yuga. In the discussion on *paliovame* (*palyopama*) we find inserted a lengthy passage from the *Pannavaṇṇā* (*ṭhiipaa*) 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 ṇaṃ codae (codakaḥ), prerakaḥ, pṛcchakaḥ) pannavayam (ācāryam) evaṃ vayāsi*, and then follow questions and answers in the usual way introduced by *atthi ṇaṃ ...*, and *haṃtā ! atthi*. 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 *Guṇappamāṇa*, the first group of the *bhāvappam*, the *nāṇaguṇap.* is said to be four-fold :— *paccakkhe, aṇumāṇe, uvamāṇe, and āgame*. The last is divided into *loiye* and *louttarie*. To the *loiya* is ascribed everything that is *annāṇṭhiṃ micchādīṭṭhiḥiṃ saccamdabuddhimativigappiyam* :— *tam jahā : Bhārahaṃ Rāmāyaṇaṃ jāva* (BCR, *evaṃ A) cattāri a vedā saṃgovamgā*. Here we have a reference to an earlier enumeration. See above, pp. 9,28. We find that *jam imam arahamtehiṃ bhagavamtehiṃ savvadaristhiṃ paṇṭam duvālasaṃgaṃ gaṇipiḍagam, tam : āyāre jāva dīṭṭhivāe* is considered to be *loguttarie*. There are, however, other divisions of the *āgama* ; thus, those into *suttā*°,

⁹⁷⁰ *ūrdhvakarṇa ...* omitted in R.

⁹⁷¹ Where *uddhareṇu* is to be translated by *ūrdhvareṇu saṇha*°, *ussaṇha*°, by *ślak-
ṣṇaślakṣṇikā, ucchlakṣṇa*°; *saṇha* can be also for *sūksma*; see Hem. 1, 118,
where, however, we have *āṣe suhumam*. Cf. 2, 75 ? Hālā 732.

⁹⁷² While correcting the proof Leumann informs me of its occurrence in the *Nandi*
NED. p. 335. It is also found in the *av. nijj.* see p. 69.

atthā° and *tadubhaya°*, or into *attā° aṇamtarā°*, and *paramparā°* original doctrine, doctrine that has been directly received, and traditional doctrine (see p. 216). The *carittagunapamāṇe* is said to be five-fold, *sāmāiacar.*, *chedovaṭṭhāvaṇiacar.* (AC, merely °ṭṭhāva BR) etc., and the *sāmāiacar* two-fold : *ittarie* and *āvakahie* ; 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 *diṭṭhamitas*, 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 *visuddho*. In this section Paḍaliputta appears as the residence of the person who is questioned (Devadatta, Skr., not °dinna !), [36] and as situated in the *dāhiṇaḍḍha* of the *Bharaha khetta*⁹⁷³ Under the head of *parimāṇasamkh(y)ā*—the *kāliasuaparim*, i.e. manifestly the first 11 *angas*,⁹⁷⁴ is contrasted with the *diṭṭhivā*. The point treated of is their mutual division into,⁹⁷⁵ and enumeration of *payyava*, *akkhara*, *saṃghāya*, *pada*, *pāda*, *gāhā*, *siloga*, *veḍha*, *nijjutti*, *anuogadāra*, and from here on the enumeration of the *uddesaga*, *ajjhayaṇa*, *suakkhamdha*, *aṅga* in the *kāliasua*, and of the *pāhuḍa* *pāhuḍia*, *pāhuḍapāhuḍia*, *vatthu* in the *diṭṭhivā*.

According to the fourth *aṅga* and *Nandī* (see p. 354 fg. 631), the latter method of division does not belong to the entire *diṭṭhivā*, but merely to the *puvvas* contained in it; [37] and the evidence of occasional citations made from the *puvvas* (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 Paḍaliutte pāsā* 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 *Vicāraṃṭasamgraha* in reference to a *Mathurī vacanā* (*Śkandilācāryāṇām abhimatā*).

⁹⁷⁴ Likewise in *Āvaśy.* 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 *kāliya* is a subdivision of *anaṅgapaviṭṭha*, or *aṅgabāhira*.

⁹⁷⁵ *veḍha*, *veṣṭa*, perhaps a group of verses? *nijjutti* an explanatory section? *anuogadāra* a paragraph *tatra paryavāḥ paryāyā dharmā iti yāvat, tadrūpā saṃkhyā paryāva-samkhyā* (the meaning of *paryāva* here as a preliminary stage of *akkhara* is obscure; *per se* it doubtless denotes the different groups of alphabet, *sā ca kālikaśrute anaṃtaparyāyātmikā draṣṭavyā, ekaikasyā 'py akārādyakṣarasaya tadbhidhe-yasya ca jivādivastunaḥ pratyekam anaṃtaparyāyātvaḥ; evaṃ anyatṛā 'pi bhāvaṇā kāryā; navaraṃ (!) saṃkhyeyāny akārādyakṣaraṇi; dvyaadyakṣarasasamyogāḥ saṃkhyeyāḥ saṃghātāḥ; sūptināntāni samaya (?) prasiddhāni vā saṃkhyeyāni padāni; gāthādicaturthāṇsarūpāḥ saṃkhyeyāḥ pādāḥ; .. saṃkhyeyā veṣṭakāḥ; nikṣepaniryukti-y-upodghātaniryukti-sūtrasparśikaniryuktilakṣaṇā trividhā nir-yuktir (see p. 38); vyākhyopāyabhūtāni tatpadaparaprāṇatādīny (?) upakramādīni vā saṃkhyeyāny anuyogadvārāṇi.—The division into *granthas*, or at least this name for the division is not mentioned here. It is really identical with *siloga*.*

Vattavvayā is then divided into *sasamayav.* (*sva°*) *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 *atth-higāra* section consists⁹⁷⁷ merely of the *gāthā* : *sāvajjajoga*,[°] which states the contents (*attha*) of each of the 6 *ajjhayaṇas* 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 *savvaddhā*. See pp. 29, 84. In the second *dāra*, *nikkheva*,⁹⁷⁸ the author returns to the *sāmāiam* and describes in several verses the nature of the *samaṇa* [38] who possesses the *sāmāiam*.⁹⁷⁹ Two of these verses recur in the *sāmāiyajjhay*, of the *Āvaśy. nijj.* 8, 109, 110. See pp. 67, 68. The last section of the *nikkheva*, the *suttālavayanipphanna*, is not given in full⁹⁸⁰ by the author "for brevity's sake," *lāghavattham*, since its contents is, he says, contained in the third *dāra*, the *aṇugama*, which follows thereupon.

This deals particularly with the *suttāṇugāma* and the *nijjutti-aṇug.* which latter is divided into *nikkhevanijj.*[°] *uvagghāyanijj.*[°] and *suttaphāsianijj.*[°] (*sūtraspārśika*[°]) — see p. 36, 36ⁿ. Of the *gāthās* cited in it one in part recurs⁹⁸¹ in *Āvaśy. nijj.* 9, 6^b,

⁹⁷⁶ The latter passage reads : *āgāram āvascāntā vā āraṇṇā vā pavvaiyā idam darisaṇam āyannā savvadukkhā vimucchaṃtī 'tyādi*; on this the scholiast says : *gṛhassthāḥ, āraṇyā vā tāpasādayaḥ. pravrajitāś ca Śākyādayaḥ idam asmādiyam matam āpannā āsritāḥ sarvaduḥkhebhyo vimucyaṃta ity' evaṃ yadā Sāṃkhyādayaḥ pratipādayaṃtī tad evaṃ parasamayavaktavyatā, yadā tu Jaināś tadā svasamayavaktavyatā, tataś cā sau svasamaya-parasamayavaktavyato 'cyate.*

⁹⁷⁷ It reads : *se kiṃ taṃ atth° re ? jo jassa ajjhayaṇassa atth° ro.* In R, instead of *taṃ* we have *sāmāiyassa atth° ro*, and this is doubtless merely an example of how the verse is to be understood; *sāvajjajoggaviraī sāvajjajoggaṇṇaṃ ukkittaṇṇaṃ cauvissatthassa atth°* etc.; i.e. according to the scholiast : "arthādhikāro 'dhyāyane" *adipadād ārabhya sarvapadeṣvanuvartate.*

⁹⁷⁸ Is threefold : *ohanipphanne nāmaṇi°* *suttālavayani°*; *ohani°* is fourfold : *ajjhayaṇaṃ, ajjhine (akṣiṇa), ae (ayaḥ), jhavaṇā (kṣapaṇā)*, names which are also : *sāmāyikacaturviṃśatistavādīśrutaviśeṣāṇaṃ sāmānyāni.*

⁹⁷⁹ See *Bhagav.* 2, 186.

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

⁹⁸¹ *kiṃ kaivīhaṃ kassa kaḥiṃ kesu kahaṃ keciraṃ (kacci°) havai kālaṃ | kai sāmāraṃ aviraḥiṃ bhavaṃ.* "garisa phāsaṇa - nirutti || sāmāiam is to be supplied according to the scholiast. The verse recalls the *quis? quid? cur? contra, simile, paradigmata, testes* applied in German schools to the analysis of proverbs, etc.

Under the head of *suttaphāsia*⁹⁸² the correct pronunciation of the *suttas* is treated of. According to the scholiast there are 32 *dosas* and 8 (or 6) *guṇas*, which he discusses at length.⁹⁸² The six different means⁹⁸³ of making oneself certain of the correct understanding of the text are also mentioned; they are :- *saṃhitā*-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) : *saṃhiyā ya payaṃ ceva payattho payaviggaho | cālaṇā ya pasiddhi ya chavvihaṃ viddhi lakkaṇaṃ*.

[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*, *saṃgahe*, *vavahāre*, *ujjusue*; *sadde*, *saṃabhiruḍḍhe*, *evaṃbhūe*. The scholiast says that they are named thus in reference to their connection which the *sāmāyikādhyaṇam* 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 *sāmāyam*; 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 contents of the *Anuyogadv*. 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 *Dhātupāṭha*. Next the information of a definite nature concerning the other literatures, Brahminical, etc. of that period. The nine *kavvarasas* point to a highly developed system of rhetoric, and the *gāthās* cited therein demonstrate the existence of a rich Prakrit poetry after the fashion of the verses in Hāla's *Saptaśatakam*. The names cited in the formation of *taddhitas* are perhaps to be regarded as titles of dramas (cf. *nāḍagādi* at the end of the *loiya* works) or [40] of romances. See p. 386. *Bhāratam* (but not *Mahābh.*) and *Rāmāyaṇam*

982 The scholiast is here very prolix, though the text is very compact and brief.

983 See on this .Haribh on *Āvaśy.* 10, 1 etc.; in an *avacūri* on the *oghaniryukti* we read : *askhalitapadocārāṇaṃ saṃhitā; padavibhāgaḥ padāni; padānām arthaḥ padārthaḥ; padavigrahasu samāsabhāṃji padāni; cālaṇā purvapakṣa-sāmkā; pratyavasthānaṃ nirākaraṇena svapakṣasthāpanam*.

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 *kāliam suam* and *diṭṭhivā* is of importance to Jaina literature. At the date of this work and at that of the *Nandī*, see above, p. 11, there existed a work, consisting of six *ajjhayaṇas*, on the six *āvaśyakas*, the first of which is said to form the foundation of the *Anuy.*, though no evidence can be drawn from the *Anuy.* 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.⁹⁸⁴ 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 *Cinā*, *Soraṭṭha* and *Marahaṭṭha*, and those of the different *pāsaṇḍas*, or of each of the divinities honoured by them, must not be overlooked.

There is a commentary by Hemacandrasūri, scholar of Abhayadevasūri.⁹⁸⁵

[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,⁹⁸⁶ which has come to light only in quite modern times in connection with these texts. In the second *mūlasūtra* the expression *mūlasūtragāthā* (see p. 54) occurs (see scholiast on *Āvaśy. nijj. 11,61*) though it is there probably used in contrast to the *gāthās* of the *nijjuttī*; so that *mūlasūtra* would mean nothing more than *sūtra* (see *ibid.* on 11, 39), i.e. the original to which the *nijjuttī* 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 *Sidhānta*. The following examples, however, belong here :- *Asāḍha*, *Aggidatta*, *Somadatta*, *Pūsamitta*, *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 Mahāvira's time. Cf. also *Pussabhūti*, *Siva°*. See *Mahābh.* on Pān. 8, 2, 107 (*Ind. Stud.* 4, 381) on the common name of Agnibhūti.

⁹⁸⁵ Other predecessors are Munisumḍarasūri, Virādeva and Jayasiṃhasūri; the *gaccha* is *Śrī-Haṣṭapuriya*, the *kulam* that of *Sri Praśnavāhana*. The well-known Hemacandra is, therefore, not referred to, and the above mentioned Abhayadeva is doubtless not the *navāṅgīrṭtikṛt*. Cf. pp. 276-7.

⁹⁸⁶ Does it perhaps refer to the 5 *mūlaguṇas* (*Āvaśy.* 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 *nijj*. 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 *nijjuttī* being extant. The title of the fourth *mūlas*. expressly declares it to be a *nijj*.; and since both the others have essentially the same form, it is not an *improbable* conjecture to regard these too as *nijjuttīs* to a *sūtram* of like name. On the other hand, however, special *nijjuttīs* on each are cited by the scholiast, and these *nijj*. appear to be still extant. Of this kind are probably the two texts which the author of the *Āvaśy*. [42] *nijj*. 2,5 declares that he composed on *dasakālia* and *uttarajjh*°

The prose portions found here have in places the old introductory formula : *suyam me āusam*.; and the concluding formula of each of the *ajjh*. (and *uddes*.) of *mūlas*. 1 and 3 *ti bemi* 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. nijj*. is ascribed to a definite author, although the author of the *Āv. nijj*. himself says, in the beginning of chap. 2, that he is author of a large number of *nijjuttīs* on the most different parts of the *Siddhānta*, especially on several *chedasūtras*, and, as already mentioned, on *mūlas*. 1 and 3. The *Āvaśy nijj*. 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 *vinayapiṭaka*. The Nom. sg. 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 *nijj*. 2550, that of 3,700 gr. The author of the commentary on 2 is said to have died Vīra 1055.

XLIII, First *mūlasūtram*, the *uttarajjhayaṇam*, in 36 *ajjhayaṇas*. The names of these *ajjh.*, which are cited (see page 280) in *aṅga* 4, § 36, are identical with those in the MSS. with but a few exceptions. By the *chattisam ca apuṭṭhavāyaraṇām*, mentioned in the *Kalpas. Jinac.* § 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 *isibhāsiātm* mentioned there by *Uttarajjhayaṇādṭṭi*;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 *sarveṣām adhyayanānām pradhānatvam* which belongs to this work. The author of the *Āvaśyakanijj.* states (2,5) that he is also author of a *nijj.* on the *Uttarajjh.*

With the exception of chap. 29 and the beginning of 2 and 16 which three chapters commence with the formula :- *suyam me āsaṃ teṇaṃ bhagavayā evaṃ akkhāyaṃ* (or *t. bh. Mahāvīreṇaṃ Kāsavenaṃ e.a.*), the text is composed in metre and principally *ślokas*, though there is an admixture of *gāthās*, *triṣṭubh*, 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, *śiṣyāhitā*, by Śāntisūri (Śāntiācārya) in which frequent reference is paid to a *nijjuttī* belonging to the text.⁹⁸⁹ See pp. 41, 43.

1. *viṇayasuyajjhayaṇam*, 48 vv. begins : *sarvajogavippamukkassa aṇagārassa bhikkhuṇo | viṇayaṃ pāuṃkarissāmi | vāṇupuvvīṃ suṇeha 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. *parisahajjh.*, 46 vv. with a prose beginning, which enumerates how the 22 *parisahas* : *samaṇeṇaṃ bhagavayā Mahāvīreṇaṃ Kāsavenaṃ*

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

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

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 Deverndragani, which was composed *Samv.* 1179 (A.D. 1123), is based upon that of Śāntisūri,

paveiyā. In the metrical portion the first person is used : *parisaḥaṇaṃ pavibhattī / Kāsaveṇaṃ paveiya / taṃ bhe udāharissāmi / āṇupuvvīm suṇeha me ||1||*

3, *cauraṃgaṃ*, °*giyyaṃ* in S,⁹⁹⁰ *cāu(ram)gijjaṃ* V, 20 vv.; of the *mānuṣatvādi*. In the commentary on v. 9 we find particular statements in reference to the seven schisms.

4. *asaṃkhayaṃ*, *asaṃskṛtaṃ*, *paṃyappamāyaṃ* vā V, 13 vv. Of *pramāḍāpramāḍau* (cf. No. 10 in the *anaṅgapavittṭha* list of N., above p. 11), and of the *apramāda*, *maraṇakale* 'pi.

[45] 5. *akāmamaraṇijjaṃ*, 19 vv.; of the *paṇḍitamaraṇaṃ*.

6. *khuddāga-niyaṃhiijjaṃ* (cf. chap. 20), *purisaviyyaṃ* S, 18 vv. Of the *vidyācaraṇavikalpās* of the *virata*. Its appellation in S is very different though the name there suits the present contents very well,

7. *elaijjaṃ* (so also V; of *edaka*); *ura(b)bhiyaṃ* 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-driṣṭāntaḥ* resp. *rasagrddhityāgaḥ*,

8. *Kāvilīyaṃ lijjam* S.V.; 20 vv. Of the *nirlobhatvaṃ*. It closes : *ii esa dhammo akkhīe / Kavileṇaṃ visuddhapaṇṇeṇaṃ / . . tti bemi ||20||*

9. *Namipavvijjā*, 62 vv. Of the *caraṇaṃ prati niḥkampatvaṃ*; *puttaṃ ṭhaviija rajje abhinikkhamai* *Namī rāyā*.

10. *dumapattayaṃ* *drumapattrakaṃ*, 37 vv.; *apramāḍārthaṃ upamādvāreṇa* 'nuṣāsaṇaṃ. Instruction addressed to Goyama. It closes thus :- *buddhassa nisamma bhāsiyaṃ / sukaḥiam atthapahopasoḥiyam / rāgāṃ dosāṃ ca chindiyā / siddhigayaṃ gāe Goama tti bemi ||37||*.

11. *bahussuyapujjaṃ* (°*puvvaṃ* V), *bahuśrutapūjā*, 32 vv.—In v. 1 the refrain of 1,¹ 2,¹ : *pāukarissāmi, āṇupuvvīm suṇeha me*.

⁹⁹⁰ S=Samavāya (aṅga 4); V=Vidhiprapā, where the names are enumerated in detail.

12. *Harikesiajjm* (*Hariesi*^o V) 47 vv. Of the *tapahsamṛddhi* of Hariesabala. The stories belonging here and also to the following chapters are related in detail in the commentary.

13. *Cittasambhūjjam*, *Citrasambhūṭṭyam*, 35 vv.; *nidānam tyājyam* *nidānadoṣa* | *Kampillasambhūo Chitto*.

14. *Usuārijjam*, *Isukāṭṭyam*, 55 vv. : of the *nirnidānatāguṇa*; pure *purāṇe Isugāra nāme* (i.e, not as *Ind. St. 2,843*).

[46] 15. *Sabhikkhu*, *ṽugam* S, 16 vv. Of the *bhikṣugūṇas*. Each verse closes with the refrain : *sabhikkhū*, cf. *Dasaveālia* 3,10. Begins : *moṇam carissāmi samicca dhammam*.

16. *bambhacerasamāhiṭṭhāṇam*, *bambhagutti C*, *samāhiṭṭhāṇam S*. First an enumeration of the ten *bambhaceras* of the *bhikkhu* in prose, then 17 *silogas*. Of the *brahmahacaryagutti*.

17. *pāvasamañijjam*, *pāpaśramaṇṭṭyam*, 21 vv. Of the *pāpaśramaṇa-svarūpam*, and of the *pāpavarjanam*. Verses 3 to 19 close with the refrain : *pāvasamani tti vuccai*.

18. *Samjaijjam*, *Samjayṭṭyam*,⁹⁹¹ 54 vv. Of the *bhogarddhityāga*. *Kampille nayare rāyā* | *udinnabalavāhaṇe* | *nāmeṇam* | *Samjao nāma* | *migavvaṇam* (*mṛgavyāṇam*) *uvanijjae* ||.

19. *Miyāputṭṭyam*, *Ma^oijjam* V, *Miyacaritta* (or *Miyācārītā*) S, 97 vv. Of the *niḥpratikarmatā*, and of *Miyāputta*, son of King *Bala-bhadda* and of *Miyā*; *Suggīve nayare*.

20. *mahāniyamṭhijjam* (cf. chap. 6), *mahānirgramṭhīyām*; *anāhapavayyā* S; 60 vv. Of the *anāthatvaṇam*; *Seṇio Magahāhivo* v. 2. The title found in S agrees with the contents (as was the case with 6 and 7).

21. *samuddapālījjam* (*lejjam* V), *samudrapālṭṭyam*, 24 vv. Of the *viviktacaryā*. Begins : *Caṃpāe Pālīe nāma* | *sāvāe āsi vāṇie* | *Mahā-vīrassa bhagavao* | *sīso so u mahappaṇo* ||

⁹⁹¹ This might be *per se* for *samṃyattiyam*; since the *pāpavarjanam* is : *samṃyatasyaol'va, sa ca bhogārdhityāgata eva*.

22. *rahanemiḥḥam*, 49 vv. Of the *anorathanemivac caranam*; *utpann-aviśrotasikenā 'pi dhṛtiḥ kāryā*. Begins : [47] *Soriyapurammi nayare / āsi rāyā mahiddhīe / Vasuḍeva' tti nāmeṇam / rāyalakkhaṇasaṃjue ||1|| tassa bhajjā dūve āsi / Rohiṇī Deval' tahā / tāsim' duṇham pi do puttā / itthā Rāma-Kesavā ||2|| v. 1^{ab} / Samuddavijae nāmaṇ / v. 1^a ||3|| tassa bhajjā Sivā nāma / tise putte mahāyase / bhagavaṇ Aritṭhanemi tti / loganāhe damṭsare ||4||...*

23. *Kesi-Goyamiḥḥam*, *Keṣi Gautamiyaṇ*; *Gotamakesiyyam* S; 89 vv.; *cittaviplutiḥ pareṣām api Keṣi-Gautamavad apaneyā*. Begins : *jīṇe Pāsi tti nāmeṇam / arahā logapūte / . . ||1|| tassa logapaivassa / āsi sise mahāyase / Kesī Kumārasamaṇe / vijjācaraṇapārage ||2||* See p. 837 on *upāṃga* 2.

24. *samitu samitto* S, *pavayaṇamāyaro* (!) C; 27 vv. Of the *prava-cānamāṭṭsavarūpaṇ*, i.e. the 5 *samiti* and 3 *gupti*, which are together also called *aṭṭha samito* : *iriyā-bhāse- 'saṇā dāṇe uccāre samii iya / maṇo-gutti vayagutti kāyagutti ya aṭṭhamā ||2||*. These are regarded as the mothers as regards the *duvālasaṃgaṇ* *Jiṇakkhāyaṇ pavayaṇam*. See *Ind. Streifen*, I, 133, 209, 2, 047, in reference to the ethical three-fold division into *maṇo*, *vaya*, *kāya*.

25. *jannaiḥḥam*, *yajñiyaṇ*, 45 vv. *Jayaghoṣacaritavaraṇanadvāreṇa brahmaguṇā iho'cyamte*. Begins : *māhaṇakulasambhūo / āsi vippo mahājaso / jāyāṭi jamaḥannammi (yamayaḥṇe) / Jayaghosu tti nāmāo || ||*

26. *sāmāyāri*, *dasasā*°C, 53 vv. Only he who is in possession of the *brahmaguṇas* (chap. 25) is a *yati tena cā'vaṣyaṇ sāmācāri vidheyā*: This is ten-fold⁹⁹² : [48] *āvassiyā, nisihiyā*,⁹⁹³ *āpucchāṇā, paḍipucchāṇā, chaṇḍaṇā, icchākāro, micchākāro, tahakkāro, abbhutṭhāṇam, uvasaṃpayā*. The similar enumeration in *Āvaṣy, nijj. 7, 12*, where there is, however, a different arrangement (the same as in *aṅga* 3, 10, and *Bhag. 25, 7* according to L.) : — *icchākāro, micchā, tahakkāro* (6-8), *āva*°... *chaṇḍaṇā* (1-5), *ulamaṇṭanā* (instead of 9), *uvasaṃpayā* (10) — *Haribhadra* on *Āvaṣy, nijj. 6, 88*, says⁹⁹⁴ that there are three kinds of *sāmācāri*, 1. the

⁹⁹² The word *sāmāyāri* recalls especially the *sāmāyācārikasūtra* of the *Brahmins*, with which the significance and contents of these texts is in agreement. From this I am led to conclude that *sāmāyāri* is an intentional deformation of *sāmāyācāri*: see pp. 223, 238, 243 fg.

⁹⁹³ *ṇaiṣedhikī*, see pp. 452, 257.

⁹⁹⁴ See pp. 357, 449.

oghasāmācārī, represented by the *oghanirukti*, on the 20th *prābhṛtaṃ* (*oghaprā°*) of the 3. *vastu* (*ācārābhidhāna*) *pūrvā* 9,2. the *daśavidha-sāmācārī*, for which our chapter and *Āv. niḥj. 7* is authoritative, and 3, the *padavibhāgasāmācārī*, which too is represented by *chedasūtralakṣaṇān navamāi pūrvādeva nirvyūḍha*, or by *kalpavyavahārau*.⁹⁹⁵—Begins : *sāmāyārīm pavakkhāmi savvadukkhavimukkhaṇīm | jaṃ carittāṇa niggamhā | tinnā saṃsārasāgarāṃ || 1 ||*

27. *khalumkijjāṃ*, *khulū* V, 15 vv. Of the *saṭhatā*; the *asāṭhatā* is the antecedent condition for the *sāmācārī*. It begins : *there gaṇahare Gage (Gārgyaḥ) muṇi āsi visārāe | ainne gaṇibhāvammi samāhīm paḍi-samādhāe || ||* The name comes from v. 3 : *khalumke jo u joei khalumkān galivrṣabhān* (s. Hem. 1263) *yo yojayati*.

28. *mukkhamaḡgagaṭ*, *sivamaḡga°* C, 36 vv. Of the *mokṣamārga*. Begins : *mukkhamaḡgagaṭīm taccam | suṇeha jīṇabhāsiyam*.

29. *sammattaparakkamaṃ*, *samyaktva°*; *appamāo* S. In prose; *anantaram* (in chap. 28) *jñānādīni muktimārgatveno°ktāni*, *tāni ca saṃvegādimūlāni akarmatavasānāni*; [49] *yadvā mokṣamārgagater apramāda eva* (on this then is based the title in S) *pradhānam*. Enumeration of the 73 *saṃvegādīni*, means of deliverance (cf. Leumann, Gloss. *Aup.* p. 155, s. v. *saṃvejaṇa*) : *saṃvege* 1, *nivvee* 2, *dhammasaddhā* 3, *gurusāhammiya-susūsaṇayā* 4, *āloaṇāya* 5, *nirḍaṇayā* 6, *garihaṇayā* 7, *sāmāie* and the remaining 5 *āvassaya* 8-13, etc. to *akammayā* 73 (cf. the 48 *saṃvegādīni*, *Bhagav.* 16, 3 and 27 *saṃv*, in *aṅga* 4, 27 Leum). As in the beginning (see p. 43) so in the end there is a direct reference to Mahāvira : *esa khalu sammattaparakkamassa ajjhayaṇassa aṭṭhe samaṇeṇaṃ bhagavayā Mahāvireṇaṃ agghavie pannavie parūvie daṃsie nidaṃsie uvadaṃsie tti bemi*.

30. *tavamaggiḡjāṃ*, *°ggo* S, *°maijjāṃ* V, 37 vv., *tapomārgagati*. Begins : *jahā u pāvagaṃ kammaṃ rāgadosasamajjiyam | khavēi tavaṣā bhikkhū tam egagamaṇo suṇa || 1 ||*

31. *caraṇavihi*, 21 vv.; *caraṇavidhi*.

32. *paṃḍayaṭṭhāṇaṃ*, 111 vv.; *pramādashānāni* Begins : *accamtakālassa samūlayassa | savvassa dukkhassa u jo pamakkho | tam bhāsao me paḍi-punnacittā | suṇeha egaṃtaṇiyam hiyattham*.

⁹⁹⁵ The three *sāmāyāri* texts which I have before me—see pp. 223, 369 fg.—contain another division than that stated above. Their contents is, however, connected, and they agree in the main with each other.

33. *kammapayaḍi*, *karmaprakṛtiḥ*, 25 vv. Begins : *aṭṭha kammāni* (cf. *Bhag.* 2, 166) *vucchāmi | āṇupuvvīm jahakkamaṃ | jehiṃ baddhe ayaṃ jive | saṃsāre parivattāe || 1 || nāṇassā "varaṇijjaṃ | daṃsaṇāvaraṇaṃ taḥ | veyañijjaṃ | taḥ mohāṃ | āukammaṃ taheva ya || || nāmakayyaṃ ca goyaṃ ca | aṃtarāyaṃ taheva ya.* Closes : *eesiṃ saṃvare ceva | khavaṇe ya jāe (yateta) buhe tti bemi || ||* The *nāṇam* e. g. is (see *N. Anūy. Āvaśy. Aupap.* p. 41) five-fold *suyaṃ, ābhinibohayaṃ, ohiṇṇāṇaṃ, maṇaṇāṇaṃ, kevalaṃ.*

34. *lesajjhayaṇaṃ*, *leśyā*, 62 vv.; *anantaram* (in 33) *prakṛtaya uktās*, *tatsthiṭṭi ca leśyāvaśataḥ*; *apra* [40] *śastaleśyātyāgataḥ prasastā eva tā adhiṣṭhātavyāḥ.* Begins *lesajjhayaṇaṃ pavakkhāmi | āṇupuvvīm jahakkamaṃ chaṇhaṃ pi kammaleśāṇaṃ | aṇubhāve suṇeha me || 1 ||* Closes : *appasatthāu vajjittā | pasatthāu ahiṭṭhāe (adhiṣṭhet) muni tti bemi || 62 | Bhag. 1, 160, Leum. Aup p, 149.*

35. *aṇagāramaggaṃ*, °gge S, °ggo V; 21 vv.; *himsāparivarjanādayo bhikkhugunaḥ.* Begins : *suṇeha me egamaṇā maggaṃ Savvannudesiyaṃ | jaṃ āyamaṇto bhikkhū | dukkhāṇa 'mtakaro bhava || 1 ||.* Closes : *nimmamo nirahaṇikāro viyārāgo aṇāsavo | saṃpatto kevalaṃ nāṇaṃ sāsayāṃ parinivvuda tti bemi || 31 ||.*

36. *jivāvivavibhatti*, 268 vv. Begins : *jivāvivavibhattiṃ | suṇeha me egamaṇā io | jaṃ jāṇiṇṇa bhikkhū | sammāṃ jayai saṃjame || 1 ||.* Closes : *ii pāukāre būddhe | ṇāyāe parinivvue | chattiṣaṃ uttarajjhāe | bhavasiddhiṃ sammai (saṃvude 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 *niryuktikāra* in praise of the work : *je kira bhavasiddhiā | parittasaṃsāriā a je bhavvā | te kira paḍhami ee | chattiṣaṃ uttarajjhāe || 1 ||...*

XLIV. Second *mūlasūtram*, *āvaśyakasūtram*. By *āvaśyaka*, as we have often seen in the case of *painna* 1, *Nandī* and *Amuyogadv.*, are meant six observances which are obligatory upon the Jain, be he layman or clerical. That the regulations in reference to these observations had an established text as early as the date of *N.* and *An.*, is clear from the fact that they appear in the *Nandī* as the first group of the *aṇaṃgapaviṭṭha* texts (see above p. 11); and in the *Amuyogadv.* the word *ajjhayaṇachakkavagga* is expressly given as its synonym. See p. 22, We have also seen [51] that the *Amuyogadvārasūtram* claims

to contain a discussion of the first of these 6 *āvaśyakas* (the *sāmāiyam*), but that this claim is antagonistic to that limitation of the *sāmāyam* to the *sāvajjajogaviratīm* 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 Anny.

The *āvaśyakasūtram* is a work which deals with all the six *āvaśyakas* in the order⁹⁹⁶ which is followed in the *Nandī* and *Anuyogadvāra*, and discusses the *sāmāyam* actually, not merely nominally as the *Anuyog*, does. Unfortunately we possess, not the text of the *āvaśy.*, but merely the commentary, called *śiṣyahita*, 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 *pratīkas* only and not in full, with the exception of foll. 73^b to 153^{b999} 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 *sāmāyam*, the *sāvajjajogavirai*, which extends to fol. 196^b, 2, the *caivīsaithava* or praise of the 24 *Jinas*, extending to 204^b, 3, *vaṇḍaṇayam* or honour paid to the teachers, reaching to 221^a, 4, *paḍikkamaṇam*, confession and renunciation (to 298^b), 5, *kāussaga*, expiation (to 315^a), and 6, *pacca-kkhaṇam*, acceptance of the twelve *vratas* (to 342^a).

By *sāmāyam* much more than the *sāvajjajogavirati* is meant. It is etymologically explained by *samānām Jñānadarśana-cāritrāṇām āyaḥ* (35^b). 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 *gaṇaḥaras* and of his opponents, the

⁹⁹⁶ See p. 434 on this arrangement.

⁹⁹⁷ At the close he is called a pupil of Jinadatta from the *Vidyādharakula*, or an adherent of *Sitāmbarācārya* Jinabhaṭa : *samāptā ce yaṁ śiṣyahitā nāma "vaśyakaṭṭhā kṛtā Sitāmbarācārya Jinabhaṭanigadānusārino Vidyādharakulatilakācārya Jinadattasiṣyasya dharmato joiṇi (yākiṇi !) -mahattarāmnānār-alpamānārā(?) cārya Haribhadrasya*. The *Gaṇadharasārdhaśata* is here referred to (cf. v. 52 fg) and the great Haribhadra (+ Vira 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-Tilakācārya, scholar of Śivaprabha, composed Śaṁvat 1296.

⁹⁹⁸ 342 foll. Each page has 17 lines of 58-62 *akṣ.* each.

⁹⁹⁹ *Nijj* 3, 315—9, 3.

different schisms (*niṇhagas*, *nihnavaś*) which gradually gained a foothold in his teachings. The latter are chronologically fixed. Haribhadra quotes very detailed legends (*kathānakas*) in Prakrit prose (sometimes in metre) in this connection and also in connection with the *diṭṭhamā* 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 *Nijj.* 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 *mūlaṭikā* (see on *Nijj.* 19, 122), which in turn appears to have been the foundation of the Bhāṣyakāra.

[53] Even if we do not possess the text of the *ṣaḍāvaśyakasūtram* with its six *ajjhayaṇas* which was commented upon by Haribhadra, our loss is to a great degree compensated by a metrical *Nijjuttī*. This is even called *āvaśyakasūtram* at the close in the MSS., and is probably the only *Āvaśy.* text which is extant.¹⁰⁰⁰ 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 *Niryuktikṛt*, °*kāra*, (e.g. on chap. 16, 17) as *Samgrahanikāra*, 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 *gramthakāra*, °*kṛt* (see for example *Nijj.* 8, 44, 10, 95) and even as *sūtrakāra*, °*kṛt* (e.g. *Nijj.* 1, 76' 16, 50). The verses of the *Nijj.* are occasionally called¹⁰⁰¹ *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 *Nijj.* lies in the different division—the text being divided into 6, the *Nijj.* into 20 *ajjhayaṇas*. See below. The fact that Har. does not cite at all some sections of the *Nijjuttī* (for example the *Therāvalī* at the very start) may, however, be held to militate against the above conclusion. His text too contains besides the *Nijj.* several other parts, chiefly in prose, [54] which he calls *sūtras* or words of the *sūtrakāra* (see *Nijj.* 13, 53), e.g. especially a *pratikramāṇasūtram* given in *extenso*. He furthermore occasionally contrasts

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

¹⁰⁰¹ e. g. *tathā ce 'ho 'padeśikam gāthāsūtram āha Niryuktikāraḥ : saṃsāra°* (2, 18).

the *sūtragāthā* or *mūlasūtragāthā* 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 *Nijj.* there are inserted in the text short remarks in Sanskrit which refer to the proper *sūtram*. This *sūtram* has, however, not been admitted into the text, e.g. *Nijj.* 10, 3, 12.¹⁷⁶ In one case, chap. 20, this *sūtra* portion (in prose) has actually been incorporated into the *Nijj.*

It is, furthermore, noteworthy that in the *Nijjuttī*, 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 *saṃgrahaṇikāra*, 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 *pratīkas* and then explains, first by a *gamanikā*, or *akṣaragam.*, 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 *Nijj.* we ought to find *sūtrasparśintī nijjuttī* according to his statement; but : *no'cyate, yasmād asati sūtre* (!) *kasyā 'sāv iti*. Haribhadra devotes a long discussion to *sūtras* in general, which recurs *Nijj.* 10, 2, 89, 11, 7 (*sūtra* and *niryukti*), 12, 17, 13, 55.

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

¹⁰⁰³ e.g. 4, 3, *ityaṃ niryuktigāthā, etās tu mūlabhāṣyakāragāthā : bhīmaṭṭha°* (4, 4-6).

¹⁰⁰⁴ The *sūtrakṛt* appears here as later than the *saṃgrahaṇikāra*, fol. 260a :—*tān abhidhīsur āha saṃgrahani-kārah : ambe* (*Nijj.* 16, 48) *gāhā; asi°* (49) *gāthā; idaṃ gāthādvayam sūtrakṛt-niryuktigāthābhir eva prakāṭhābhir vyākhyāyate* (*sūtrakṛtā .. vyākhyāyate* or *sūtrakṛt niryu vyākhyāti* would be better); *dhādānti padhādānti* ; then follows the text of *Nijj.* 16, 50-64 in full but without commentary. Here it is to be noticed that one of the MSS. of the *Nijj.* in my possession omits these 15, verses from the text. See p. 59 in regard to the assumption that the *Nijj.* is the work of several authors.

¹⁰⁰⁵ An occasional reference to other methods of treating the subject is found, e.g. 2, 61, *iti samāsārthah, vyāsārthas tu viśeṣavivaranād avagāntavyah.* Or on 10, 19, *iti gāthākṣarārthah, bhāvārthas tu bhāṣyagāthābhyovaseyah, taś ce māh* (in Prakrit, but not from the *Nijj.*).

Using due caution in reference to an explanation of the mutual relation which exists in our text between *Sutta* and *Nijjuttī*, 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 *ajjhayaṇas* 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, *Kalpa* 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. Sgl. Masc. 1. Decl. ends, with but very few exceptions, in o.

It must be prefaced that Haribhadra treats chap. 1-10 under *ajjhayaṇa* 1, 11-12 under *ajjh.* 2 and 3 respectively, 13-18 under *ajjh.* 4, and the last two chapters under *ajjh.* 5 and 6 respectively. This is done, however, without specially marking off the conclusions of the chapters of the *Nijj*.¹⁰⁰ Only the conclusions of the six *ajjhayaṇas* are distinguished from the others.

1. *Peḍhiā, pīṭhikā*, 131 vv. (in P the *thirāvalī* has nominally 125 and *peḍhiyā* 81 *gā°*!). It begins with the same *Therāvalī* (50 vv.) that occurs in the beginning of the *Nandī*, and treats, from v. 51 on, of the different kinds of *nāṇa* (cf. *Nandī* and *Anuyogadv.*) Haribhadra does not explain the *Therāvalī* at all and begins his commentary (fol. 3) at v. 51 : *ābhiniḥānāṇaṃ/suanāṇaṃ ceva ohināṇaṃ ca | taha maṇapajjavanāṇaṃ | kevalanāṇaṃ ca pañcamayaṇaṃ ||51||*.

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

¹⁰⁰ Chapter 8 forms an exception, though at the end at least it says : *samāptā ce' yam upodghātaniṇyuktir itī*, 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 :

*titthayare bhagavaṁte / aṇuttaraparakkame amiaṇṇi /
tinne sugaigaigāe / siddhipahapāesae vaṁde ||1||
vaṁdāmi mahābhāgaṁ / mahāmuṇiṁ mahāyasaṁ Mahāvīraṁ /
amaranararāyamahiaṁ / titthayaram imassa titthassa ||2||
ikkārassa vi gaṇahare / pavāyāe pavayaṇassa vaṁdāmi /
savvaṁ gaṇaharavaṁsam / vāyagavaṁsaṁ pavayaṇaṁ ca ||3||
te vaṁdiūṇa sirasā / atthapuhuttassa¹⁰⁰⁷ tehiṁ kahiassa /
suaṇṇassa bhagavaṁ / niyyuttiṁ¹⁰⁰⁸ kittaiṣṣāmi ||4||
āvassagassa dasakā / liassa taha uttarajjha-m-āyāre¹⁰⁰⁹ /
suagaḍe niyyuttiṁ / buccāmi taha dasāṇaṁ ca ||5||
kappassa ya niyyuttiṁ / vavahārasse 'va paramaniyaṇassa /
sūriapannattīe / buccaṁ isibhāsiāṇaṁ¹⁰¹⁰ ca ||6||
eesiṁ niyyuttiṁ / buccāmi ahaṁ jīṇovāseṇaṁ /
āharaṇaheukāraṇa- / payaṇivahaṁ iṇaṁ samāseṇaṁ ||7||
sāmāianiyyuttiṁ / buccaṁ uvāesiṁ gurujaṇeṇaṁ /
āyariaparaṁpareṇa / āgayaṁ āṇupuvvito ||8||
niyyuttā to atthā / jaṁ baddhā teṇa hoi niyyutti /
taha vi ai cchāvei / vibhāsiṁ suttaparivāḍi ||9||*

There is no doubt that we have here the beginning of a work, [58] and that chapter 1 (which is itself called *pīṭhikā*, 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 *āvaśyaka* matter and especially the *sāmāyam*. The separate statements of his account show that he intended to carry his investigations into the first two *aṅgas* too, the fifth *upāṅga*, three

1007 *Arthapīṭhutvam*.

1008 *sūtrārthayoh paraṣparaṁ niryojanaṁ niryuktiḥ; - kiṁ aśeṣasya śrutajñānasya? no, kiṁ tarhi? śrutaviśeṣaṇaṁ āvaśyakādīnāṁ ity ata evā 'hā: āvaśya'; - niryuktiḥ is perhaps an intentional variation of nirukti.*

1009 *samudāyaśabdānāṁ avayave vṛttidarśanād, yathā Bṛhmasena Sena iti, uttarādhyā ity uttarādhyāyanam āvaśeyam.*

1010 *devendrastavādīnāṁ.*

1011 They are placed thus in a palmleaf MS, No. 23, in Peterson's *Det. Report* (1883) (only 1, 51 *ābhiniḥoḥa*... see p. 56, precedes) at the beginning of a text entitled "niryuktayāḥ." which contains at least several, if not all, of the above 10 *niry*.

chedasūtras, two more *mūlasūtras*,¹⁰¹² and, if Haribhadra's explanation of *isibhāsiāi* is correct,¹⁰¹³ to *painna* 7 fgg.

If we compare these statements with those in the commentary of *Ṛṣimaṇḍalasūtra* in Jacobi, *Kalpas*, p. 12, in reference to the ten *niryuktis* 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 *Therāvalī* 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 *pīṭhikā* 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 *oghanīryukti* 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 *cauddasapuvvī* (+ Vīra 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 *Niryuktis* 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 *Nijjuttī* 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 *Nijj*. The fourteenth chapter is expressly stated by him to have been composed by another author, viz. Jīṇabhadda. See my remarks on pp. 61, 62 in reference to the incorporation of the *oghanījjuttī*. 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. nijj*. At any rate the statements made in the text remain of extreme interest since they show the interconnection of the ten *niryuktis* 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 *niryuktayaḥ*, mentioned above p. 58^a, we must confess that Peterson's account does not make it clear in which of the above ten texts it is contained. On the *ācāranīryukti* see p. 258, Peterson, Palm-leaf 62, Kielhorn's

¹⁰¹² *dasaveāliam* is undoubtedly referred to under *dasakāliam*. 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 *uttarajha*.

¹⁰¹³ This is, however, extremely doubtful as regards the existing *painnam* called *devemdrastava*. See pp. 442, 259, 272, 280, 281, 402, 429, 431, 43.

Report (1881) p. 10; on a *suyagaḍaṇijj*. see *Pet. Palm-leaf*, 59, a *dasaveḍḍiaṇijj*, ib. 167. We have also citations from the *nijj*. in *up. 5* and *mūlas*, 1.

What follows is very interesting :—

attham bhāsai arahā | suttam gaṇṭhami gaṇaharā niṇṇam | sḍaṇassa
(*ṇasa* !) *hi aṭṭhāe | tao suttam pavattai ||13||*

sāmāia-m-āiam | suanāṇam jāva bimḍusārāo | tassa vi sāro caraṇam |
sāro caraṇassa nivvāṇam ||14||.

Here the *contents* of the doctrine is referred back to *Arahan*, but the *composition* of its textual form is ascribed to the *gaṇaharas*. See pp. 216, 345, above p. 35 and p. 80. The word *sāmāiam*, which we have found in v. 8 used as the title of the first *āvaśyaka*, is now used in its other signification, i.e. as the title of *aṅga 1* : for *bimḍusāra* is the title of the first *pūrva* book in the *diṭṭhivā*, *aṅga 12*. See above pp. 243, 244.

3. *biā varacariā*, 349 (also Pπ, 359 B) vv., of like contents.¹⁰¹⁴ It begins *Vīram Ariṭṭhaṇemim Pāsam Mallim ca Vāsujjam ca | ee muttūna Jiṇe avasesā āsi rāyāṇo ||...* Despite its seeming exactness, its statements give the impression of being apocryphal. Verses 287 (297) fg. treat of Siddhattha and Tisala,¹⁰¹⁵ the fourteen dreams of Tis., etc.

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

5. *samavasaraṇam*, 69(64 P) vv., as above.

6. *gaṇaharavāo*, 88(33 P, 90B) vv. (is wanting in π); the history of the 11 pupils of *Vīra* : *Imḍabhūi 1, Aggibhūi 2, Vāubhūi 3, Viatta 4, Suhamma 5, Maṇḍia 6, Moriaputta 7, Akāmpia 8, Ayalabhaya 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 *Devānamdā* see v. 279 (289); but *Usabhadatta* is not mentioned. We read *Somilābhidhāpo* in the scholiast.

¹⁰¹⁶ *Gosāla* v. 15 fg.

Meajja 10, Pabhāsa 11 (see Hemac. vv. 31, 32); *titthaṃ ca Suhammāo, niravaccā gaṇaharā 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 *ittha'mtare ohanijjutti bhāṇiyavvā*. In A v. 89 appears as v. 1 at the beginning of chap. 7 and then follows in partial Sanskrit : *atthau*¹⁰¹⁷ *'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 *sāmācārīs* enumerated in 6₈₈, and the first receives no mention, it was necessary to remedy this defect. The third *sāmācārī* 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 *oghanijjutti* which he had before him (perhaps his own production) to be the best expression of the first form of the 3 *sāmācārīs*, and consequently, not taking the trouble to compose a new one, incorporated¹⁰¹⁸ *brevi manu* this *oghanijj*. (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. 357² : —that the first verse cited here from it, in that it mentions the *dasapuvvi*, 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 *caūddasapuvvi*. The same, of course, holds good *a fortiori* of the author of our text, in which this verse is quoted,

¹⁰¹⁷ *attha* instead of *atra*.

¹⁰¹⁸ In the *Vidhiprapā* (in v. 7 *des jogavivhāṇa*) the *oghanijjuti* is said to be "oinnā," *avatīrṇā* into the *āvassayam*.

¹⁰¹⁹ Haribh. says : *sāmpratam oghaniryuktir vācyā, sā ca prapañcitavāt* (perhaps on account of its fulness) *na vivṛyate* ; and likewise at the end : *idāniṃ padavibhāgasāmācāryāḥ prastāvāḥ. sā ca kalpayyavahārārūpā bahuvistarāsvasthānād avaseyā ; ity uktāḥ sāmācāryupakramakālaḥ*.

¹⁰²⁰ The *oghaniryukti*, which in P² is actually incorporated with the text, has but 58 (or 79^π) verses. See below, p. 82.

7. *dasavihasāmāyārī*, 64(Pπ, 65B) vv. ; cf. *uttarajjh* 26; the enumeration here in chapter 7 is as follows (see above p. 48) : *icchā, micchā, tahakkāro, āvassīā nisīhiā | āpucchānā ya [63] paḍipucchā chaṇḍaṇā ya nimaṇṭaṇā ||1|| uvasaṁpayā ya kāle sāmāyārī bhavē dasavihā u | eesim tu payāṇaṁ pattea paruvaṇaṁ buccaṁ ||2||*

8. *Uvagghāyanijjuttī*, 211(214 B, 216 P, 210π) vv. In vv. 40-50 glorification of Ajja Vayārā (plur. *maj.*), °Vairā, Vajrasvāmin, who extracted¹⁰²¹ the *āgāsagamā vijjā* from the *mahāpāinnā* (see p. 251) and made ample use of the latter. In his time there still existed (p. 247) *apuhatte kāliāṇuoassa, apṛthaktvaṁ kālikāṇuyogasya*, but after him (*teṇārena, tata ārataḥ, Haribh.*), i.e. perhaps through him there came into existence *puhattaṁ kāliasua diṭṭhivāe¹⁰²² a, pṛthaktvaṁ kālikaśrute dṛṣṭivāde ca* (v. 40). *Tumbavaṇa, Ujjeṇī, Dasapura, nayaraṁ Kusumanāme* (Pāṭaliputra) appear in regular order as exercising an important influence upon his life. In vv. 50-53 glorification of his successor *Rakkhiājā* (plur. *maj.*), *Rakkhiakhamāṇā*, i.e. of Ārya Rakṣitasvāmin, son of Somadeva and Ruddasomā, (elder) brother of Phaggurakkhia and pupil of Tosaliputta. These two names : Vajrasvāmin and Āryarākṣita (cf. Hemacandra's *Parīśiṣṭap.* 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 *Therāvalī* (see Klatt, 1, c. pp. 246^b, 247^a), 252^a, his death is placed Vira 170, but that of Vajra, 400 years later, Vira.584¹⁰²³ 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 "*daśapūrvīn*," 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 *Kupakṣakaśik*, *Kup.* p. 21(811). The two-fold division into *kāliasua* 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 : *kāliasuaṁ ca isibhāsiyāim taio a sūrapannattī | savvo a diṭṭhivāo caūthao hoi aṇuogo ||54|| jaṁ ca mahākappasuaṁ jāṇi a sesāṇi cheasuttāni | caranaḥkaraṇāṇuogo tti kāliatthe uvagayāni ||55||* Here then the *isibhāsiyāim* (which Har. explains here by *uttarādhyayanādīni* ! see above pp. 43, 58)

1021 But according to the *Gaṇadharasārddhaśata*, v. 29, it was taken from the *sumahāpāinnapuvvāu* ! see p. 479.

1022 In v. 36 there was mention of 700 (!) or 500 *nayas, eehim* (v. 37) *diṭṭhivāe paruvaṇā suttā a tha kahaṇā ya*; each of the 7 etc. *nayas* —see p. 350 ff. and p. 39 — *sataviddhaḥ*.

1023 See also *Kupakṣak*, p. 21 (811)ⁿ.

and *upāṅga* 5 are enumerated as members holding equal rank¹⁰²⁴ with the *kāliasuam* i.e. *aṅgas* 1-11, and the *diṭṭhivā*, i.e. *aṅga* 12. Although the “*mahākappasuam*” and “the other *chedasūtras*” (*kalpādīni*, scholiasts) are said to have been borrowed from *aṅga* 12, they are akin (or *ṛiṣibhāṣita*) to the *kāliasua*, i.e. *aṅgas* 1 to 11. Such is apparently Haribh’s conception of the passage.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 *ninhagas*, *nihnavaś*, schisms,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*, *bahurata*, under *Jamāli* in *Sāvattthi* in the fourteenth year after he obtained knowledge (*Jiṇeṇa uppāḍiassa nāṇassa*), —the second (vv. 64, 65), the *Jivapaesiya*, under *Tisagutta* (*caūdasapuvvi*) in *Usabhapura* in the sixteenth year thereafter. The third schism (vv. 66, 67), the *Avvattaga*, *avyaktaka* under *Āsāḍha* in *Seabiā* (*Śvetavikā*), in the 214th year after the end of *Vīra*’s death (*siddhiṃ gayassa Vīrassa*). They were “brought back to the right faith” (Jacobi, *Kalpās* p. 9) by the *Muria* (*Maurya*) *Balabhadda* in *Rāyagiha*. The fourth schism (vv. 68, 69), the *Sāmucchea* or *°ccheia* under *Āsamitta* (*Aśva°*) in *Mihilapura* (*Mithilā*) is placed in the year 220 after *Vīra*.¹⁰²⁷ The fifth (vv. 70, 71), [66] the *Dokiriya*, under *Gaṃga* in *Ullamatīra* (? *A*, *Ullaga* *B*, *Ulluga* scholiast, *Ullukā* in *Skr.*) in the year 228. The sixth, the *Terāsia*, *trairāśika*, under *Chaluga* in *Aṃtaramjīa*, in the year 544, is treated of at greater length (vv. 72—87),

(To be continued)

1024 The terminology in the *Nandī* — see above p. 11 — is quite different. There the *kāliam suam*, together with the *ukkāliam*, as a subdivision of the *anaṅgapavittṭha* texts, is opposed to the *duvālasaṃga gaṇip*; the *isibhāṣitām* together with the *surap*. are regarded as parts of the *kāliyam*. In reference to the use of the word *Anuy*, see above, p. 36n 2.

1025 *upalakṣaṇāt kālikaśrutām caraṇakaraṇānuyogaḥ, ṛiṣibhāṣitāni dharmakathānuyoga itī gamyate; sarvaś ca diṭṭivādāś caturtho bhavaty anuyogaḥ, dravyānuyoga itī; tatra ṛiṣibhāṣitāni dharmakathānuyoga ity uktam, tataś ca mahākālpaśrutādīni ṛiṣibhāṣitām tvā (tatvāt?), diṭṭivādād uddhṛitya teṣām pratipāditatvāt dharmakathānuyogavvā(? tvā ca?) prasāṃga ity atas tadapohadvārācīkṛṣayā ha : jam ca...* (v. 55). See p. 258.

1026 See above, pp. 275, 381 on *aṅga* 3 and *upāṅga* 1. Further information is found in the second *chedasūtra* (see p. 463) and in the scholiast on *uttarajjh.* 3, 9).

1027 *Abhayadeva* on *up.* 1 mentions *Puṣyamitra* instead of *Āsamitta* See p. 381. Is this merely a *lapsus calami* ?

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 KARMAN 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 PRADEŚAS, 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 (PRADEŚAS), the KARMAS are classified into eight major types and one hundred and forty eight sub-types.⁵

¹ KARMAGHANTHA, Vol. 1, p. 2

² AMṚTACANDRA'S TATTVĀRTHASĀRA, 16—18.

³ H.V. GLASENAPP, The Doctrine of KARMA in Jain Philosophy, p. 3

⁴ AṢṬASĀHASRĪ, p. 51 (com. on ĀPTAMIMĀMSĀ).

⁵ KARMAGRANTHA, 1. 2.

A. NATURE OF KARMA (PRAKṚTI)

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) ⁶ |

Each of the main eight types of KARMA (*Mūla-Prakṛtis*) can be divided further into a number of sub-types (*Uttaraprakṛtis*). 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. *Avadhijñānāvaraṇīya* which hinders transcendental knowledge of material things.
4. *Manahparyāyajñānāvaraṇīya* 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. *Avadhidarśanāvaraṇīya* 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 while walking.
9. *Styānarddhi* induces deep sleep while walking and doing some superhuman deeds.

III. *Vedanīya Karma* : It is of two kinds creating pleasant and sorrowful feelings, viz

1. *Sātāvedanīya* which produces healthy, glorious and pleasant feelings.
2. *Asātāvedanīya* which creates unhealthy sensations like pain and suffering (*Dukkha*)

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

(a) *Darśana-Mohanīya* is further sub-divided into ;

- (1) *Mithyātva Mohanīya* (wrong belief)
- (2) *Samyaktva Mohanīya* (right belief)
- (3) *Miśra Mohanīya* (mixed belief)

(b) *Cāritra Mohanīya* 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 | 14. Less intense greed |
| 2. Less intense anger | 15. Mild greed |
| 3. Mild anger | 16. Still milder greed |
| 4. Still milder anger | 17. Laughing and joking |
| 5. Intense pride | 18. Prejudicial liking |
| 6. Less intense pride | 19. Prejudicial disliking |
| 7. Mild pride | 20. Sorrow (<i>Śoka</i>) |
| 8. Still milder pride | 21. Fear (<i>Bhaya</i>) |
| 9. Intense deceit | 22. Disgust (<i>Jugupsā</i>) |
| 10. Less intense deceit | 23. The male sex desire (<i>Puruṣu-Veda</i>) |
| 11. Mild deceit | 24. The female sex desire (<i>Strī-Veda</i>) |
| 12. Still milder deceit | 25. The neuter sex desire (<i>Napuṃsaka-Veda</i>) ⁷ |
| 13. Intense greed | |

V. *Āyuskarma* : Jainism recognizes four kinds of existence according to the age determining *Karmas*. They are as follows :

1. The celestial age.
2. The age of human beings.
3. The age of plants and animals.
4. The age of hellish beings⁸

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 bodies⁹

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*, I, 23

⁹ *Ibid*, I 23 51 : Jainendra Siddhanta Kośa, vol. II, p. 582.

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 *Ānupūrvīs* 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.¹⁰

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.¹¹

The above classification of the main eight types of KARMA are further sub-divided into one hundred and forty-eight sub-types.¹²

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., Jñānāvaraṇīya, Darśanāvaraṇīya, Mohanīya 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, Vednīya-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 SIDDHA¹³.

The self does not lose all its essential characteristics even if it is infected by SARVĀGHĀTI-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.¹⁴

¹³ SARVĀRTHASIDDHI, X. 2

¹⁴ NANDISUTRA, 42

BHILAI ENGINEERING CORPORATION LTD.

Industrial Area, Post Box No. 31

Bhilai 490 001, Madhya Pradesh

Telephones : 355417/356447/355358

Fax Numbers : 0788 355527/355427

Telex Numbers : 0771-214/245/204

**Manufacturers Erectors of Equipments
for
Coal Mining, Steel Plant, Power Plant, Cement Plant
and
Manufacturers of Sulphuric and Super Phosphate
Fertilizers**

Regional Offices

13 Masjid Moth, Local Shopping Centre

New Delhi 110 048

Telephones : 6445815 6445819 6434987 6414390

Fax Number : 011 6445819

4B Little Russel Street, 2nd Floor

Calcutta-700 071

Telephones : 242 7606 / 3372

Fax Number : 033-2427061

31 Makers Chambers III

3rd Floor, Nariman Point, Bombay 400 023

Telephones : 231724 2043647 244208 2873789

Telex Number : 0118 4054

Fax Number : 022 287 3611