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Prof. L. Alsdorf an eminent scholar of MIA and worthy pupil of Dr.
Schubring has done great service to Jaina studies by re-editing the text of
Itthipariṇṇā, the fourth chapter of Sūtrakṛtāṅga. He has tried to set right the metre
of the text. In his opinion the metre of this text is old Ārya which is as rare as it is
important for the history of Indian prosody, viz., the older form of the Ārya. Later
Ārya or common Ārya is characteristic of the latest stratum of the Jaina canon but
completely absent from ( the genuine parts of ) the older layers.

In his opinion the metre in the texts available is spoiled and sometimes it
is unrecognisable. There are various corruptions and omissions also. He remarks
that no critical text was prepared and his aim is to supply a better text.

For this purpose he made use of the material accessible to him at that
time. No manuscript was directly consulted by him. He took help of the following
editions:

T: Pu Candrasāgara with Śīlāṅka Ṭīka.
Sā: First edition of Sāgarānandasūri.
A: Varient readings given in the edition - T.
C: Cūrṇi, Ratlam, 1950.

The aim of this study is to examine the readings offered by Dr. Alsdorf and
to find out how far the metre has been restored. I have been so far able to examine
the first section only. I consulted his text from Kleine Schriften, Wiesbaden, 1974,
Glasenap Stiftung, Band-10, pp. 193-214. Along with the text there are variant
readings, translation and critical notes in it.

In the introduction he admits that the manuscript A and I as well as Cūrṇi
offer better readings partly confirming to his emendations.
He defines the old Ārya metre as follows:

It has two pādas, every pāda (feet) has 30 mātrās like later gīti but the yati caesura does not fall on the 12th mātrā or on the final mātrā of the third gaṇa but it falls on the syllable next to it which may be small or long and this syllable is independent and here the first half of the pāda closes. This independent syllable constitutes fourth gaṇa with the initial word or words of the second half of every pāda. He further remarks that there are regularly 30 mātrās in each pāda, but sometimes this last syllable of the first half pāda is found to be an additional syllable. The second gaṇa of odd pāda and the sixth gaṇa of even pāda is generally IUU jagaṇa, sometimes having four VUUU short mātrās.

He has also given the numerical strength of first to third and fifth to seventh gaṇas with the mātric scheme that is available in them. He has also given the total number of corrupt and deficient pādas with the variant schemes available in them.

Now my purpose is to examine these corrupt and deficient pādas as well as other verses also of the first section only to see how far they are metrically perfect.

When I examine them from this angle I find that certain corrupt and deficient pādas and gaṇas can be emended to confirm with the scheme of the old Ārya and again I find that there are several other cases where the metre is not regular and many of them can also be regularised, though Dr. Alsdorf is silent about them.

According to Alsdorf there are 9 cases from the first section which are deficient and corrupt. When I examined them I could find that 6 of them could be corrected on the lines of (the method adopted by) Alsdorf himself.

Now let us have some idea of the method employed by him. He has made here and there the following types of alterations at a number of places:

He has:

1. lengthened short vowel i = ĩ.
2. shortened long vowel ā = a, ĩ = i.
3. changed the vowel with anusvāra into a vowel with anusāsika, e.g.,
   \( aṁ (\ddot{ā}) = aṅ (\ddot{ā}), iṁ = ĭ, hiṁ = ĥiṅ, e = eṅ, o = oṅ. \)
4. dropped anusvāra.
5. dropped one or two syllables.
6. added one or two syllables.
7. replaced a word by another word.
8. changed grammatical forms, viz., plural into singular, instrumental into locative and so on.

9. done sandhi of an anusvāra with the vowel immediately following it.

The above types of emendations are made not always on the basis of the readings available in the editions referred to by him. He has applied his own imagination on several occasions.

I. Out of the nine pādas which are corrupt and deficient according to Alsodorf, 6 of them can be emended.

II. Over and above that remain still several pādas in the first section which are defective but are not pointed out or discussed by Alsodorf in the introduction or notes given by him. Most of them can be corrected on his own lines of emendation. I have, while suggesting emendations, arranged them in two categories and again under different heads pointing out the type of deficiency observed in them.

Group 1

This category is of the following nine verses:

(A) 2c: 1st gaṇa has 3 mātrās only.
    3b: 5th gaṇa has 5 mātrās.
    3d: is corrupt after 5th gaṇa.
    4d: 5th gaṇa is deficient. It has 3 mātrās only.
    6d: 5th gaṇa is deficient. It has 3 mātrās only.
    7d: is corrupt after 5th gaṇa.
    13b: initial moras of even pāda are wanting.
    26c: has 5 mātrās in the 2nd gaṇa and an extra syllable in first half.
    31c - 2nd gaṇa has 3 mātrās only.

Group 2

(B) Over and above that deficiencies remain in other stanzas too, but not pointed out by Dr. Alsodorf.

1. (a) lengthening of a vowel is required in 17a, 17c & 22d.
    (b) shortening of a vowel is required in 5c-d, 25c & 26c-d.
    (c) change in the order of words is required in 16c without disturbing the original meaning.
2. Emendations by Alsdorf have disturbed the metre. 
   (a) One māṭrā has been reduced in 7a, 8a, 13c, 16a & 21a. 
   (b) One māṭrā has been increased and unnecessary postulation of 
one extra syllable, short or long, is made in 19a-b & 19c-d. 
3. Superfluous changes have been made by Alsdorf. 
   (a) changing of an anusvāra (\textsuperscript{\textdegree}) into an anunāsika (\textsuperscript{\textcircled{\textdegree}}): (i) 2a 
   naṇ for na (ii) 4a & 15c him for hi. 
   (b) Why at the end of a pāda having originally a vowel with an 
anusvāra has been replaced by a vowel with an anunāsika, i. e., a long vowel 
   changed into a short vowel when again it is to be counted as a long māṭrā. 
   (c) Change of form was unnecessary in 20a: posehiṁ into posesu. 
   It reduces one māṭrā. Why it should not be replaced by posesuṁ if locative plural 
is to be preferred. 
   (d) Emendations are required further in 6a āmantiya-ussaviyam into 
   āmantiyam osaviyam va. 
   To set right the 2nd gana which is defective U U - in Alsdorf’s text. 
4. Postulation of an extra syllable in the first half of a pāda is unwar-
ranted. 24 a-b has 31 māṭrās and therefore the postulation of one additional 
syllable — 
   Why not cintenti be made cintenti and vāyā annam ca to vāyāe ca. 
5. One word is occurring twice by oversight in 20a change vasam̐ to 
   single vasam. 
6. Deficiency not pointed out (4th gana ) 28c-d (The fourth gana has 
   three māṭrās U-only ). 
   I shall not like to discuss all the cases suggesting my emendations but 
two or three typical cases will serve the purpose. 
   Category 1, verse no. 136, 26c-d. 
   Category 2, verse no. 19 a/b, 19c/d, 16 a/b and 10 c/d. 

Category No. 1 
   (1) 13 a-b. Alsdorf’s text : 
   Avi dhūyarāhi suṇhāhīṁ......dhāhīṁ aduva dāśihīṁ. 
   According to Alsdorf the initial moras of the even pāda are wanting. In this 
pāda there are 27 māṭrās only. In the Cūmī, Agamodaya, Vaidya and Hyderabad 
editions suṇhāhīṁ and thāhīṁ readings are available but Alsdorf has nasalised 
him in place of him. Had Aduva been changed to Aduvā to restore the missing
mātrās of the fourth gaṇa there would not have been deficiency. The Āduvā reading is now supported by the Kh-1 manuscript of the Jambū edition though not accepted by him. In the text of Alsdorf Āduvā is available at l. 21 and 23.

1. 26 c-d Alsdorf’s text :
2. Jau-kumbhe jahā uvaįjoi / samvāśe vidū vi sīeįjā.

It has 32 mātrās in all and Alsdorf has accepted ‘i’ of ‘uvaįjoi’ as an extra long syllable of the first half of the second pāda but the whole pāda is faulty and the second gaṇa has then five mātrās. If we shorten the ‘e’ of ‘kumbhe’ into ‘en-kumbḥē’ and ‘jahān’ into ‘jaha’ then the second gaṇa is of four short mātrās as available in other verses also and the total mātrās come to 30. In verse no. 27a the text is ‘jaukumbe’ the ‘beįn’ having short ‘en’ and in the verse no. 2d there is ‘jah’ for ‘jahā’ which is obtained in the Agamodaya, Vaidya and Hyderabad editions as well as in A and I manuscripts referred to by Alsdorf.

Group 2

(1) 19 a-b and c-d
Sayaṃ dukkaدافع ca no vayai / āििtho vippakattha bāle
Veįṇuviyi mā kāsi / coįjanto gilāi se bhujjo.

The first pāda has 31 mātrās because the fourth gaṇa has five mātrās and therefore postulation of one additional syllable ‘i’ of ‘vayai’. Here ‘vayai’ could be changed to ‘vayai’ and ‘vippakatthai’ should be ‘pakatthai’ only. ‘Pakatthai’ reading is given by all the editions consulted by Dr. Alsdorf. The first pāda will read as follows :

Sayaṃ dukkaدافع ca no vayai / āििtho pakatthai bāle.

\[
\begin{array}{ccc}
4 & 5 & 6 \\
\end{array}
\]

(2) In the second pāda 19c/d there are 32 mātrās and therefore one additional syllable is postulated in it. Here ‘si’ of ‘kāsi’ should have been shortened to ‘si’, i.e., ‘kāsi’ which is available in the Čūrṇi & Kh-1 manuscript of Jambū and Puṇya editions. There is “maṇusso’si” at l. 1u. and not ‘si’ in his edition too. The ‘to’ of ‘coįjanto’ should have been shortened to ‘to’ and then no necessity of an extra syllable or two extra mātrās either in ‘co’ or ‘to’ of ‘coįjanto’.

(3) 16 a/b Alsdorf gives the following readings :
Kuvvanti santhavām ṭainį / pabbhaṭṭhā samāhi jogeįmī.

The ending syllable of a pāda always is to be counted as long then where lies the necessity of nasalising it when ‘him’ is available ( with an anusvāra ) in all the editions uniformly.
(4) 10 c/d Alsdorf offers the following readings:

Evaṁ vivegamādāya / samvāso na kappaye daviye.

This pāda has 29 mātrās only. If ‘ādāya’ is changed to ‘ādāye’ then the fourth gaṇa has four mātrā instead of three and the 30th mātrā is restored. ‘Ādāye’ the absolutive form is more popular in Ardhamāgadhī.

This critical analysis reveals that still the text needs revision and the claim of Dr. Alsdorf that he is offering revised text removing the deficiencies and corruptions as regards the metrical regularity can not be admitted wholly.

With regards for and respect to the late Professor, I have to say that how could not all these discrepancies and deficiencies attract his attention.
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