

Albrecht Weber's
Sacred Literature of the Jains
[An account of the Jaina Āgamas]

Edited by
Ganesh Chandra Lalwani
Former Editor, Jain Journal,
and
Professor Satya Ranjan Banerjee
Quondam Professor of Linguistics,
Calcutta University.



॥ जैन भवन ॥

Jain Bhawan

P-25 Kalakar Street
Calcutta-700 007

Published by
The Secretary,
Jain Bhawan,
P-25 Kalakar Street
Calcutta-700 007

Edition : July 1999

Price : Rupees One hundred only.

Printed by
Shri Bhagchandra Surana
Surana Printing Works
205 Rabindra Sarani
Calcutta-700 007

PREFACE

The study of Jainism was started sometime in the early part of the 19th c. Though the study of Jainism was not as such started with the Jaina *āgama* texts, the early part was more or less connected with the general studies of Jainism without any particular reference to any Jaina *āgama* texts. In fact, the word Prakrit was known to the European world from 1789 when Sir William Jones' translation of *Śakuntalā* appeared with a caption on the title page 'translated from the original Sanskrit and Prakrit'. Though the word Prakrit was used in the last decade of the 18th c., Europe did not know any facts about Prakrit before 1801 when Colebrooke's article on the Prakrit language came out. It was Colebrooke who, for the first time, as far as we know, focused some aspects of Prakrit. Though some of his statements, we may now find something queer, at that time it roused the feelings of scholars about Prakrit. His next article on Prakrit Poetry appeared in 1808, where his main focus was on *Gāthāsaptasatī*, *Setubandha*, *Gauḍavaha* and some other similar Prakrit Poetry. In 1832 Colebrooke's *Sketch of the Religious sects of the Hindus* (cf. his *Essays*, Vol. I p. 280f) appeared, where the Jain sects were also discussed. However, after a long time, Rev. J. Stevenson's translation of the *Kalpasūtra* along with the *Navatattva* (nine principles of Jainism) appeared in 1848. After a few years, Weber's fragments of the *Bhagavatisūtra* came out in 1865-66 and the text was so beautifully edited that it evoked inspiration of the scholarly world. It was at that time Weber was also working on the Jaina manuscripts preserved in the library of the Royal Academy. The Jaina *āgama* texts were preserved there and Weber started thoroughly scrutinising the manuscripts and prepared a descriptive catalogue of the manuscripts of the Royal Academy. The outcome of his labour was *the Sacred Literature of the Jains*. Originally the Sacred Literature of the Jains was published in German under the title *Über die heiligen Schriften der Jainas* in his *Indische Studien*, Vol. 16 (1883) pp. 211-479 and Vol. 17 (1885), pp. 1-90 containing about 358 pages of double demise size. The whole book was translated into English by H.W. Smyth in the *Indian Antiquary* from Vols. XVII upto XXI, 1888-1892; i.e. XVII (279-292, 339-345), XVIII (181-184, 369-378), XIX (62-70), XX (18-29, 174-182, 365-376), XXI (14-23, 106-113, 177-185, 210-215, 327-341, 369-373). The basis of Weber's writing the history of the Jains was Georg Bühler's collection of the Jaina manuscripts. Georg Bühler was the first man who opened up the rich treasures of the Jaina libraries. In the years 1873-1878 Bühler acquired

a large collection of the Jaina manuscripts for the Royal Library at Berlin. This collection was the basis of the first comprehensive and epoch-making accounts of the literature of the Jains by Weber. Weber's book was also the basis of later writers like E. Windisch, A. Guérinot, Helmuth von Glasenapp and others. U.D. Barodia's book, *History and Literature of Jainism*, Bombay, 1909, has little value for the history of Jain literature.

As far as I know this English version of Weber's Jaina Literature did not see the light of the day in a book form, though Hermann Jacobi in his introduction to the translation of the *Uttarādhyayana-sūtra* published in the Sacred Books of the East series Vol. XLV (1895) said that the reprint of this article was published separately in a book form from Bombay in 1893.. As I have not personally seen the book in any library, sometime in 1957 I gave a proposal to Śrī Srichand Rampuriya to publish this Weber's *Sacred Literature of the Jains* in a book form for the benefit of the Jaina scholars. Śrī Rampuriyaji readily agreed and accepted my proposal. He started typing Weber's *Sacred Literature of the Jains* from the *Indian Antiquary* and completed in 1958. For a long time, over thirty years, the typed copy of the Weber's book was lying unattended. In the mean time, Śrī Rampuriyaji handed over this typed copy to Sri Ganesh Lalwani, the then editor of the Jain Journal. Sometime in 1988 I again gave this proposal to Ganesh Lalwani for printing this book in his Jain Journal. It was he who then told me that the typed copy of this book was lying with him for a long time, and he didn't dare publish it, because of its difficulty in printing in a book form. I then gave him a proposal to reprint Weber's article on Jain literature in Jain Journal. The book was then published in several issues of the Jain Journal XXVI (1992) — XXVIII (1994) and subsequently some reprints were kept to publish it in a book form. It took 4 years to complete the book. In 1995 the printing of the book was completed. In the mean time, Ganesh Lalwani expired on the 4th of January 1994. Though we both were editing the text his death was a bolt from the blue and naturally it took 4 years to organise the reprint of the book before it saw the light of the day. This then is the background of how the reprint of this book came into existence.

As far as we know, Weber's *Sacred Literature of the Jains* was the first account of the Jaina āgama texts. Weber has critically assessed each of the āgama texts and has valued the Jaina āgama texts from the historical and social point of view. The critical acumen which Weber has shown in analysing the Jaina āgama texts is unparalleled, particularly some 100 years ago, when there were no printed Jaina āgama texts. After a long time, Winternitz's English translation of the second volume of the *History of Indian Literature* was published in

1933 (original German was in 1920). The second part of the second volume contains the history of Jain literature. Winternitz devoted nearly 175 pages to Jain literature. Between 1865 and 1920 lots of Jain texts were published. Though Winternitz did not do full justice to Jain literature, he, at least, systematised the chronology of Jain literature, apart from the Jaina āgama texts. In 1941 H.R. Kapadia wrote his *History of the Canonical Literature of the Jainas*. Like Weber his book also contains critical assessment and the evaluation of the Jaina āgama texts. In fact, these three books were the pioneers in the field of the history of Jain literature. In the post-independence India we have some authors like Jagadish Chandra Jain, Nemichand Jain, Kailash Chandra Shastri and others who wrote the history of Jain literature in Hindi. However, many scholars think that the history of Jain literature is not yet properly written in a sense that it should maintain the chronology of the contributions of the Jains to the history of their culture. Though it is a huge task to write such a history, this *Sacred Literature of the Jains* will help the scholars write a book in future.

The purpose of reprinting Weber's *Sacred Literature of the Jains* is to get the scholars acquainted with his contribution and to understand the value and method of assessing the Jaina āgama texts in a critical way. I believe that the students who are studying Jainism will be much benefited by reading this book.

In this edition some new innovations have been followed. The diacritical marks used by Weber was old-fashioned, e.g. ṣ was written with sh, so also c, ch with ch, chh respectively. Similarly ṛ was written with ri and e, o with long ē and ō and so on. These were changed in accordance with the modern system of diacritical marks, otherwise all the other diacritical marks are kept as they are in the original book. A bibliography of the books referred to by Weber could not be prepared owing to the fact that in most of the cases they were in abbreviated form. To prepare a subject index is a difficult task and requires lots of time and energy, and therefore could not be done. If this book is well-received by the scholars, all the shortcomings would be rectified in the next edition. The contents of the book are a little elaborate and the main points are generally focused in the contents. I hope the contents will be helpful to the readers.

Finally, I should say that if this book proves useful to scholars, I shall consider my plan of reprinting Weber's book is well-executed, and this will be the reward of our labour, and the wish of the publisher will also be fulfilled. I can only say *karmaṇevādhikāro me*.

1st July 1999
Calcutta.

Satya Ranjan Banerjee

The following abstract just published before the printing of the Sacred Literature of the Jains is quoted from the Jain Journal Vol-XXVI, No. 4, April, 1992, pp. 211-12, for the benefit of the readers.

It is said that Johann Georg Bühler (1837-1898) was more or less the first to open up the rich treasures of the Jaina literature. Bühler acquired a large collection of the Jaina manuscripts for the Royal library at Berlin in the years 1873-1878. This collection of manuscripts by Bühler was the basis which had given Albrecht Friedrich Weber (1825-1901) an impetus in writing the first comprehensive and epoch-making accounts of the literature of the Jainas. More than one hundred years ago, Weber's book in German entitled *Über die heiligen Schriften der Jaina* included in his *Indische Studien* (Vol. XVI, 1883, pp. 211-479, and Vol. XVII, 1885, pp. 1-90) was published between 1883 and 1885 covering nearly 358 pages. As the book is so authoritative and at the same time so detailed in giving an account of the sacred writings of the Jainas till that time that it was translated into English by Herbert Wier Smyth in the name of *Sacred Literature of the Jains* and was published in 15 issues distributed in the five numbers of the *Indian Antiquary* beginning from Vols. XVII (1888) to XXI (1892). Besides the above, a general survey of the whole Jaina literature was also given by Weber in his Catalogue of the Berlin Manuscripts under the title *Verzeichnis der Sanskrit-und-Prakrit Handschriften* (Register of Sanskrit and Prakrit Manuscripts) part II, Berlin, 1888 (Jaina literature, MS 1773-1928) and part III, Berlin 1892 (Jaina literature, MS 1929-2027, and MS 2299-2304).

Before Weber, Henry Thomas Colebrooke (1765-1837) noted a few observations on the Jainas and their sects, and gave a little account of Prakrit literature. His two articles—*The Sanskrit and Prakrit Language* (1801) and *The Sanskrit and Prakrit Poetry* (1808) created a sensation among the scholars at that time. His *Sketch of the Religious Sects of the Hindus* (1832) (vide his *Essays* Vol. I, p. 280f) might be regarded as the starting point of the studies of the Jain sects. Even before Bühler and Weber, Col. James Tod in his *Travels in Western India* (1839) gave us information about the Jaina Temple Libraries. However, the account of Jaina literature was given first by Weber.

After Weber, some scholars have attempted to write the history of the sacred writings of the Jainas. Moriz Winternitz's (1863-1937) *History of Jaina Literature* forming the part II of the volume two of his *History of Indian Literature* translated into English and published by the University of Calcutta in 1933 was a systematic one. Jarl Charpentier's Introduction to his edition of the *Uttarādhyayana-sūtra* (Upsala, 1922) contains an elaborate discussion on the problems of the *Āgama* literature. Hiralal Rasiklal Kapadia's *A History of the Canonical Literature of the Jainas* (1941) is, in a sense, a monument of scholarship. There are many others in Hindi as well.

Despite the fact that there are books on the Jaina Canonical literature, not a single author has yet surpassed Weber in his treatment of the subject as well as in his analysis of the *Āgama* texts. He is still unique and pioneer in this respect. Even the scholars who write books on Jaina literature do consult Weber every now and then, and always find new materials in it. It is still a treasure house of Jaina literature. As the *Indian Antiquary* is not easily available at present and at the same time nearly one hundred years have elapsed, there is enough scope to reprint the same for the benefit of the scholars. Hence Weber's *Sacred Literature of the Jains* is being reprinted here. But as the Romanization of Weber was antiquated, the latest method of Roman scripts with usual diacritical marks are only adopted for easy comprehension and pronunciation.

Contents

		Pages
	Introduction :	1-27
§ 1.	Rṣabha, the first Jina	1
§ 2.	Existence of the eleven Aṅgas	1
§ 3.	<i>Diṭṭhivāya</i> , a lost text	1
§ 4.	<i>Caturdaśa-pūrvī</i>	2
§ 5.	<i>Daśa-pūrvī, nava-pūrvī</i>	3
§ 6.	Account of the loss of the <i>pūrvas</i>	3
§ 7.	References to Cāṇakya, Bindusāra and Aśoka	3
§ 8.	The collection of 11 aṅgas	3
§ 9.	<i>Diṭṭhivā</i> , a lost text regained	4
§ 10.	Division of the Āgamas	5
§ 11.	Authors of the Āgamas	5
§ 12.	The Council of Pāṭaliputra	5
§ 13.	The interval of the composition of Āgamas from Mahāvīra	6
§ 14.	Writings of the Āgamas [References to <i>bambhi livi</i> and 18 other <i>livis</i> as also mentioned in the <i>Lalita-vistara</i>]	7
§ 15.	Jaina Āgama texts later than Pali	7
§ 16.	The Council of Pāṭaliputra	8
§ 17.	References to <i>aṅgavāhīriya</i> texts	8
§ 18.	<i>Vihimaggaṇapavā</i> (= <i>Vidhiprapā</i>)	9
§ 19.	<i>Samdeha-viśauśadhi</i> (samvat 1363-A.D. 1307)	9
§ 20.	<i>Pāṭṣika-sūtra</i>	9
§ 21.	A passage quoted indicating the diurnal occupation necessary to learn the <i>Siddhānta</i>	9
§ 22.	The names of the 45 āgama texts	11
§ 23.	Introductory discussions about the āgama texts	11-17
§ 24.	Mention of the Non-Aryan people : Arab	17-21
§ 25.	Description of the <i>Siddhānta</i>	21-27
	1. The Eleven or Twelve Aṅgas	21-112
I.	Ācārāṅga-sūtra :	27-35
II.	Sūtrakṛtāṅga-sūtra :	35-39
III.	Sthānāṅga-sūtra :	39-46
IV.	Samavāyāṅga-sūtra :	46-58
V.	Bhagavati Vyākhyāprajñapti :	58-65
VI.	Jñāṭṛdharmakathā :	68-72
VII.	Upāsakadaśā-sūtra :	72-75
VIII.	Antakṛd-daśā-sūtra :	75-78
IX.	Anuttaraupapātika-daśā-sūtra :	78-80
X.	Praśna-vyākaraṇa :	80-86
XI.	Vipāka-śrutam :	86-91
XII.	Drṣṭivāda	91-112
	2. The Twelve Upāṅgas	112-147
	Introduction :	113-115
XIII.	Aupapātikadaśā-sūtra	116-118
	[18 <i>deśibhāṣās</i> mentioned, but not the names cf. 18 <i>lipsis</i>]	

XIV.	Rājaprasāniya :	119-122
XV.	Jivābhigama-sūtra :	122-125
XVI.	Prajñāpanā-sūtra :	125-131
	§ 1. Milikkhas :	128
	§ 2. Ariyas :	128-129
XVII.	Sūrya-prajñapti :	131-137
XVIII.	Jambūdvīpa-prajñapti :	138-141
XIX.	Candra-prajñapti :	142-143

XX-XXIV. Nirayāvalikās 143-144

XX.	Nirayāvalika :	144-145
XXI.	Kalpāvatamsikā :	145-146
XXII.	Puṣpikā :	146
XXIII.	Puṣpacūlikā	146
XXIV.	Vṛṣṇidaśā	146-147

3. The Ten Prakīrṇas 147-160

	Introduction :	147-152
XXV.	Catuḥśaraṇa	152-154
XXVI.	Āturapratyākhyāna	154-155
XXVII.	Bhakta-parijñā	155
XXVIII.	Samstāra	156
XXIX.	Tandula-vaitālika	156-157
XXX.	Caṇḍāvijjhaya	157-158
XXXI.	Devendra-stava	158
XXXII.	Gaṇi-vidyā	159
XXXIII.	Mahāpratyākhyāna	159
XXXIV.	Virastava	160

4. The Six Cheda-sūtras 160-183

	Introduction :	160-164
XXXV.	Niśītha	164-166
XXXVI.	Mahā-niśītha	166-172
XXXVII.	Vyavahāra	173-174
XXXVII.	Ācāraśā	174-179
XXXIX.	Bṛhatkalpa	179-180
XL.	Pañca-kalpa/Jita-kalpa	180-183

5. The Two Individual texts 183-207

XLI.	Nandi-sūtra	183-194
XLII.	Anuyogadvāra	194-207

6. The Four Mūla-sūtras 207-241

	Introduction :	207-208
XLIII.	Uttarādhyayana-sūtra	209-214
XLIV.	Āvaśyaka-sūtra	214-232
XLV.	Daśavalkālika-sūtra (Ogha-niryukti)	232-237
XLVI.	Pākṣika-sūtra (Piṇḍa-niryukti)	237-241
	Conclusion :	241

Sacred Literature of the Jains¹

According [211]² to the conception of the modern Jains, their collective sacred texts date back to the first Jina, Ṛṣabha.³ The first trace of this view appears to be found in the concluding paragraph⁴ of the *Nandi*, in which the *aṇunnā* (*anuññā*) is referred to Usabhasena,⁵ the 12 *aṅgas* having in the passage just before been enumerated as *bhāvāṇunnā* and in an earlier passage, in which 8,400,000 *paimas* are attributed to Vaddhamāṇasāmi, the scholium substitutes Ṛṣabhasvāmin.⁶

The statements (in four 436 in Nemicandra's *Pravacanasāroddhāra* §36, composed in Prakrit, on *tiṭṭhavucchea* (in four verses inserted between 435 and 436) are, to a certain extent, in agreement with the above. These verses⁷ are a detailed explanation of the statements in v. 434, which are rather general in character and obscure; and assert that during the eight *jīṇamṭaras* : *Usahajīṇindāu jā Suvihī*, i.e. from Usaha 1 to Suvihī 9, there existed only eleven *aṅgas*, without the *diṭṭhivāa*, which stands in the twelfth place : *muttūṇa diṭṭhivāyaṃ havarṃti ikkārase 'va aṅgāim*. During [212] the following seven *jīṇamṭaras* : *Suvihijīṇā jā Saṃti* from Suvihī 9 to Saṃti 16, all twelve *aṅgas* were *vucchinna*. But during the last eight *jīṇamṭaras* : *Saṃtijiṇā jā Viraṃ*, from Saṃti 16 to Vira 24, they were not *vucchinna*.

The *diṭṭhivāa* was a second time lost : *vucchinno diṭṭhivāo tahiṃ*.

1 The Editors beg to acknowledge much valuable assistance kindly given by Professor Leumann, of Strassburg, in taking this paper through the Press; and the translator adds his acknowledgments for assistance of the same scholar in respect of the translation from the German, also, for some additional notes distinguished by asterisks with the initial L put after them.

2 The figures in brackets indicate the pages of the original German article.

3 Dharmasāgara in his *Kupakṣakaṣikāditya*, in the proceedings of the Royal Academy of Sciences, Berlin, of 1882, p. 813, 23 (I cite this essay of mine under the abbreviation *Kup.*) and Jacobi in this Journal *ante*, Vol. IX. p. 161 (1880).

4 Doubtless of secondary origin.

5 *ādikarapurimatāle* (*kāle* !) *pavattīa Usabhasenassa*.

6 See *Ind. Stud.* 17, 15, note. *Catalogue of the Berlin Sanskrit and Prakrit MS.* 2, p. 679.

7 In the commentary of Siddhasenasūri, composed Saṃvat 1242 (A.D. 1186) these verses are not explained, but in the MS. which I have before me they are found in the text, page 212, in the middle of the page, and are counted in with the rest.

These statements are, it is true, obscure, yet become clear by means of verse 434,⁸ which they are designed to explain. According to this verse, all three statements are valid merely for the interval between the Jinas. Their significance is as follows :

At the time of Usabha all twelve *aṅgas* were extant ; between Jinas 1-9 only the first eleven ; between Jinas 9-16 all twelve were lost ; and under or between Jinas 16-24 they were all extant. The twelfth *aṅga* was however lost again after Jina 24.

Though these statements appear to establish the fact that the 12 *aṅgas* are said to have existed as early as the time of Usabha, nevertheless it becomes perfectly plain, from a consideration of their nature, that this claim rests upon an insufficient foundation. The commentator characterizes the degree of the *vucchea* during the *jinaṃtaras*, which existed between Suvihi, to Saṃti, as follows : *arhaddharmavārttā 'pi tatra naṣṭā* ; a peculiar testimony, we may remark in passing, to the result of the activity of each of the seven saints 9-15.

In reference [213] to the *vucchea* of the twelfth *aṅga* (i.e. the *diṭṭhivāa*) which happened again after Mahāvīra, we have additional information derived from tradition.

The fourteen so-called *pūrvāṇi*, cf. Hem. 246-247, which, according to the statements handed down to us, formed a part of this *aṅga* and which Mahāvīra is said to have transmitted to all his pupils (though only one of these, Sudharman by name, transmitted them to a pupil of his own, Jambū, the last Kevalin) are said to have existed for only six generations longer. In consequence of this the six patriarchs in question, namely : Prabhava 3, Śāyyambhava 4, Yaśobhadra 5, Sambhūtivijaya 6, Bhadrabāhu 7, and Sthūlabhadra 8, had the honorary title of Śrutakevalin, or *cauddasa-puṇḍrī* (in the *Nandis.*), *caturdaśa-pūrvadhārin*, °*pūrvin*.⁹

The following seven patriarchs : Mahāgiri, Suhastin, to Vajra (Hem. v. 35), knew only ten of the whole number, inasmuch as tradi-

⁸ It runs : *purimaṃtīma-aṭṭhaddha (aṭṭhaṭṭha !)—'māresu (caturvimsates tīrthakṛtām trayovimsatir evāṃtārāṇi bhavanti) tiṭṭhassa na 'tthi voccheu/majjhillaesu sattasu itṭiyakālaṃ tu voccheu* [434]. Dr. Leumann informs me that the source of these statements is found in *Bhagavatī*, 20. 8 ; cf. also *Āśāy*, 3, 16 : *paḍhamassa (jīṇassa) bārasaṃgām, sesānikkārasaṃgasualāmbho*.

⁹ Cf. Hem. 33-34 : Comm. p. 293 in Böhtlingk-Rieu.

tion asserts that with Sthūlabhadra the knowledge of the 4 last *pūrvas*¹⁰ (11-14) ceased. In consequence of this they are called *daśapuvvi* (cf. *Nandis.*), *daśapūrvin*; and from that point the knowledge of the *pūrvas* decreased gradually. In *Anuyogadvārasūtra* there is still mention of the first gradation lower, *navapuvvi*, cf. *Bhag.*¹¹ 2, p. 318 so that finally in the time of Devarddhigaṇi, 980 years after Vīra "only one *pūrvas* remained", cf. Klatt, *ante*, Vol. XI, 247b, 1882.¹² Also according to Śānticaṇḍra on *up.* 6, the *diṭṭhivā* was entirely *vyavacchinna* 1000 years after Vīra.

In the 9th book [214] of the *Parīṣiṣṭaparvan* v. 55 ff., Hemacandra gives us a detailed account of the first loss of the knowledge of the *pūrvas*, viz. of the 'reduction of their number from 14 to 10. Unfortunately in the MS. (Berlin MS. or fol. 773) which lies before me, and which is rather incorrect, a leaf is lacking with v. 69-98, cf. Jacobi, *Kalpāsūtra*, p. 11. After Hemacandra has informed us in the preceding verses about Cāṇakya and Bindusāra, about Aśoka and Śrī-Kuṇāla, and also about Samprati, he passes to the synod of Pāṭaliputra, held at the end of this "wicked" period. The principal duty of this council which was to collect the *śruta*, from all who were in possession of any portion; and it succeeded thus in collecting the 11 *aṅgas*.¹³ As regards the *dr̥ṣṭivāda*, Bhadrabāhu was the only person to whom recourse could be had. He, however, was on his way (?) to Nepal (*nepāladeśamārgastha*) and refused the summons of the Saṃgha (which had sent two Munis to fetch him), saying that he has begun a *dhyānam* of 12 years, and that he could not interrupt it. The Śrīsaṃgha, however threatening him, by means of two other Munis, with the punishment of exclusion (*saṃghavāhaya*), he begged that capable scholars should be sent to him, to whom, at appointed times, he would give 7 *vācanās*. The Saṃgha thereupon sent Sthūlabhadra,

¹⁰ *trayodaśapūrvin*, *dvādaśa*°, *ekādaśa* never existed according to tradition. Cf. commencement of the *avaṇṇi* to the *Oghaniryukti*.

¹¹ *Ueber ein Fragment der Bhagavatī*, two papers of the author in the Transactions of the Royal Academy of Sciences of Berlin 1866 (1) & (2).

¹² I cite this article as Klatt's.

¹³ *itaśca tasmin duṣkāle karāle kālarātrivat |
nirvāhārtham sādhusaṃghas tīram niranidher yathā ||55||
aguṇyamānam tu tadā sādhuṇām viṣṇutam śrutam |
anabhyasanatonaśyaty adhītam dhīmatām api ||56||
saṃghaḥ pāṭaliputr (ak)e duṣkālaṃte 'khilo milat |
yad aṃgādhyayanoddeśādy āśid yasya tad ādāde ||57||
tataś cai 'kādaśāṅgaṇi śrīsaṃgho melayat tadā |
dr̥ṣṭivādanimittam ca tasthau kiṃcid vicimṭayan ||58||*

(v. 69) who, [215] however, after he had learned the first 10 *pūrvas*, so enraged Bhadrabāhu, that the latter as a punishment gave him the remaining four for his own personal knowledge only, and forbade him to teach them to others (*anyasya śeṣapūrvāṇi pradēyāni tvayā na hi*, v. 109).

In opposition to this information is the fact, that not only in *aṅga* 4 and in the *Nandisūtra*, do we find a detailed table of contents of the whole *diṭṭhivā*, including the 14 *pūrvas*, but also that partly in the just-mentioned places, partly in several other texts (*Mahānīśītha*, *Anuyogadv.*, *Āvaśy.*, *nijj.*) the *duvālasaṅgaṃ gaṇipīḍagaṃ* is repeatedly mentioned; consequently the *Diṭṭhivā* appears to have still existed at the date of those texts, and moreover to have been still intact, since there is no mention of any imperfection. The Bhadrabāhu, to whom the above-mentioned legend has reference, died, so says tradition, 170 after Vīra, whereas in two of the texts, which mention the *duvālasaṅgaṃ gaṇipīḍagaṃ*, there are contained dates which refer to a period later by 400 years. The whole legend appears to me, after all, to be nothing more than an imitation of the Buddhist legend of the council of Aśoka etc., and thus to have little claim to credence.

Be this as it may, the legened manifests a direct opposition between the 11 *aṅgas* and the *pūrvas*. And in fact from the scholium on *aṅga* 4 we must conceive their inter-relation to be as follows: the Tīrthakara, i. e., Mahāvīra—here is no thought of Rṣabha,—first recited to his Gaṇadharas the contents of the *pūrvagata sūtras* (whence the name *pūrvāṇi*); whereupon the Gaṇadharas on their part brought¹⁴ the contents of the *pūrvagata sūtra* into the form of the *aṅgas*, *ācāra*, etc. According [216] to another view the Gaṇadharas first brought the *pūrvagataśrutam* after its recital by the Arhat, into a textual form, and afterwards directed their attention to the *aṅgas*, *ācāra* etc.¹⁵ Later on we shall return to the explanation of the name *pūrva* and the difference between *aṅgas* 1-11 and *aṅga* 12.

¹⁴ *atha kiṃ taṃ (tat !)* *pūrvagataṃ ? ucyate, yasmāt tīrthakaras tirthapravartanakāle gaṇadharāṇāṃ sarvasūtrādhāratvena pūrvagata sūtrādhāratvena pūrvaga (ta)-sūtrārtham (m; the second sūtrādhāgata is perhaps a repetition of the scribe) bhāṣate tasmāt pūrvāṇi 'ti bhaṇitāni, gaṇadharāḥ puṇaḥ śrutaracanāṃ vidadhānā ācārādi krameṇa racayaṃti sthāpayānti ca. Cf. also Wilson, Sel. W. I 285 ed. Rost (from Mahāvīracar. 3): sūtrītāni gaṇadharair aṅgebhyaḥ pūrvam eva yat/ pūrvāṇi 'ty abhidhiyante tenai tāni caturdaśa ||*

¹⁵ *matāntareṇa tu pūrvagatasūtrārtha(h) pūrvam arhatā bhāṣito gaṇadharair api pūrvagataśrutam eva pūrvavaracitaṃ, paścād ācāra (here perhaps a lacuna) nirvyuktyā abhihitāḥ; savvesi āyāre paḍhamo ity-ādi, tat katham ? ucyate, tatra sthāpanāṃ āśritya tatho 'ktam iha tv akṣararacanāṃ pratītya bhāṣitaṃ, pūrvāṇi kṛtāni 'ti.*

In full agreement as we find here that the actual contents have been ascribed to the Arhat, *i. e.* Tīrthakara (cf. *Āv.*, 2, 13), but the external form to the Gaṇadharas, so likewise in the *Anuyogadvārasūtra* we find that the *āgama* is divided into *aṭṭā°*, *aṇamtarā°* and *paramparā°*, *i. e.* (1) original doctrine, (2) doctrine that has been received immediately from its author and (3) traditional doctrine. The first category belongs to the Tīrthagaras (plur.) alone unconditionally; to their pupils, the Gaṇadharas, it belongs only as far as the *suttam* (text) is concerned, while the Gaṇadharas, as regards the *attha* (contents) possess the *aṇamtarā°* alone. The pupils of the Gaṇadharas possess, as regards the *suttam*, the *aṇamtarā°*, as regards the *attha*, they have only the *paramparā°*. And after them only the latter (*paramparā°*) exists; there is no longer *attā°* or *aṇamtarā°*. According to the commencement of the *avacūri* of the *Oghaniryukti*, [217] the activity of *daśapūrvīn* was already limited to the composition of *Samgrahanis*¹⁶ to the *upāṅgas* etc.

We must however not omit to remark that for some texts of the *Āgama* distinct authors are named, part of whom, at least, are even considerably later than the *daśapūrvīn*, *Upāṅga* 4 mentions as its author Ajja-Sāma, characterizing him as "the 23rd" (*i. e.* "saint" after Vīra¹⁷) and as one who possesses wisdom ripened through listening to the *puvvas*, as being therefore in unison with the *diṭṭhivāa*. The name of Jīṇabaddha (*Āvaśy.* 14) belongs perhaps to a much later date. We have however, no information of an exact nature in reference either to him or to Vīrabhadra, who was probably author of *painna* 1. Sijjambhava, presumably author of the third *mūlasūtra* and Bhadrabāhu, to whom *chedasūtra* 3-5 and other texts are ascribed, belong to the *caturdaśa-pūrvīn*, but not to the immediate pupils of the Gaṇadharas, and consequently can lay claim to the *paramparāgama* alone. Nevertheless their works, as those just mentioned, are included in the existing *āgama*. We must therefore accept the conclusion, that we have to deal in it with constituent parts which differ widely from each other.

The text-constitution of the *āgama* appears, after all, on nearer view, to be of a very multifarious character. And this is vouchsafed also by tradition itself. The council of Pāṭaliputra, which the account of Hemacandra [218] places in the immediate neighbourhood of the

¹⁶ *daśapūrvadharā apy upakārakā, upāṅgādi (°dinām C) samgrahanyuparacanena (°nena hetunā C).*

¹⁷ "He (Kālikācārya) is the 23rd personage from Vīra, including the 11 Gaṇadharas. In the *Siddhānta* he is called Syāmārya"—Bhau Daji in *Jour. Bombay Br. R. As S.* 9. 150 (1867).

date of Aśoka, had, as we have seen above, been able to collect the 11 *aṅgas* only in a rather indifferent fashion by acquiring one portion from one quarter, another from another (*yad aṅgādhyayanoddeśādy āsīd yasya*); and of the twelfth *aṅga* had been able to acquire only a part from Bhadrabāhu. The existence of what had thus been collected, was, as time went on, endangered from the fact that its transmission was only oral;¹⁸ for which, according to tradition, writing was not substituted till eight centuries later, in the year 980 Vīra. This was effected by a council in Valabhī under the presidency of Devarddhigaṇi Kṣamāśamaṇa; though others state that this ensued 13 years after (993 Vīra) at the hands of a council in Mathurā under Śrī Skandilācārya. In connection with this the statement may be placed that in the year 980 the Valabhī king Dhruvasena commanded that the *Kalpāsūtram* should be recited publicly. Herein a special participation of the king in the work is indicated, be it in that of Devarddhigaṇi or in that of Skandila, to whom by this act he gave decisive support.

If, then, as a matter of fact in the interval of 800 or 1000 (980) years after Vīra, the doctrines whose contents were promulgated by him (though the form of the doctrines is ascribed to his pupils and not to the master himself) were handed down by oral tradition alone—and in unison with this assumption is the fact that just in the older portions of the text we find the introductory formula [219] *suyam me āusam, teṇam bhagavayā evam akkhāyam* as well as for the single sections the concluding formula *ti bemi*—then we may well be astonished that the existing *Siddhānta* contains so many traces of antiquity as is the case. What knowledge would we possess of Christ if the New Testament had existed in an unwritten form till 980 A.D.,¹⁹ and if we were limited to a codification of traditions under Pope Sylvester II, which was based not on written, but on oral transmission!

Truly, in this interval the cultivation of the sacred text had not been entirely abandoned. So, for example, to the 19th patriarch, Vajra, is ascribed particular solicitude in its behalf²⁰ cf. *Kup.* 811(21). According to the statement of the Digambaras, cf. Jacobi, *Kalpas*, p. 30, the written codification of their sacred texts had been effected

¹⁸ *pūrvam sarvasiddhāntānām pāṭhanam ca mukhapāṭhenai 'vā'sīt.* Jacobi, *Kalpas*, p. 117, from the *Kalpadruma* of Lakṣmidhara.

¹⁹ Or 950, as we reckon from the birth of Christ, the Jainas from the death of Vīra.

²⁰ Cf. also the accounts which exist in reference to *aṅga* 1, 1, 9.

by Puṣpadanta A.V. 633-683,²¹ 300 years before the date above mentioned. The sacred texts alluded to are not the same as those of the usual *Siddhānta*, which belongs to the Śvetāmbaras, cf. Wilson, Sel. W. 1, 279 & 281 ed. Rost.

In the *āgama* which we possess, writing plays a very important role ; so that [220] it becomes clear that writing had, at the time of the written codification of the *Siddhānta*, long been extensively used for literary purposes. Indeed the very lateness of the above-mentioned date necessitates already this conclusion, A.V. 980, corresponding to the middle of the fifth, or the beginning of the sixth, century A.D.²² A distinct proof for this extensive use of writing is the expression *bambhī livī* frequently used in *aṅgas* 4, 5, *upāṅga* 4 etc., to denote the "sacred writing". Furthermore, the characterization of its most important part, the *aṅgas*, as *duvālasaṃgam gaṇipīḍagam* makes for the same conclusion.²³ *Leham* (writing) always stands at the head in the enumeration of the 72 *kalās*, which we meet with in *aṅga* 4 and frequently elsewhere. The material of which the MSS. are made : *pattaya*, *potthayalihiyam*, is spoken of distinctly in the *Anuyogadvāraśūtra*. In *aṅga* 4 and *up*, 4, eighteen different kinds of writing are mentioned, *bambhī* and *javaṇāliyā* (*yavanānī*) being placed first. Herein we may observe a close connection with the similar enumeration in *Lalitavistara*. Moreover all 18 are mentioned as used for the *bambhī livī*. The 46 *māuyakkharāṇi* in *aṅga* 4 ought to be mentioned here in this connection.

Jacobi (*Kalpas*. p. 16n) has called our attention to the peculiar synchronism of the activity of Devarddhigaṇi (or of Skandila), with the contemporaneous activity of Buddhaghoṣa as regards the drawing up in writing of the Pāli canon. Since this latter is, furthermore, several decennia older (almost a century older than Jacobi's "adjusted date" of A.V. 980), we must conclude that in any case he must have been followed in the wake [221] by his Jaina colleagues and not *vice versa*. A great difference is manifest, it must be confessed, between both parties. While Buddhaghoṣa did not change the linguistic make-

²¹ Jacobi's statement "the whole of the *aṅgas* was lost after Puṣpadanta ; he reduced the sacred law to writing" is so self-contradictory as to baffle explanation on my part. Also the double statement in reference to the year of Vikramāditya's birth, *ibid*, 470 A. V. and 683 A. V. remains a riddle. The Puṣpadanta mentioned *aṅga* 4, 75, 86 is the 9th Jina.

²² A. V. 980 corresponds either to the year 543, if we establish as the date of Vikramāditya 470 Vira,—or, if we accept Jacobi's assumption (*Kalpas*. p. 15), to the year 514 A. D.

²³ Cf. *Bhag*. 1, 282n.

up of the Pali texts, the redactor of the Jaina texts adapted to the requirements of his own age the Māgadhi language, in which, it is probable to suppose, they were originally composed (cf. in *aṅga* 5, 2, 1, the salutation *Māgahā* ! see *Bhag.* 2,250) and in which they had been in all likelihood allowed to remain by the council of Pāṭaliputra. The character of the language of the redactor of the Jaina texts is incomparably younger than Pāli,²⁴ and consequently its official name *addha-Māgahā bhāsā* (in *up.* 1, 4, and elsewhere)²⁵ or *ardha-Māgadhi* (with the Jain grammarians) bears traces of this late date. In fact, of the Māgadhi only a few remnants, especially the Nom. Sing. Masc. of the 1 Decl. in *e*, have been retained, while even these disappear gradually in the course of time. In general the language may be characterized as a very much younger sister of Pāli. The reason for this fact must probably be sought in local influence, whether it be Valabhī or Mathurā, where the written codification was made; at least such is a safe assumption. To the dialect of either Valabhī or Mathurā these ancient texts, composed originally in Māgadhi, had to accommodate themselves.

The Council of Pāṭaliputra, it is supposed, [222] limited its functions to the collection of the *aṅgas*; the written codification of Devarddhi-gaṇi, it is claimed, embraced the entire *śrīsiddhānta*, *āgama*²⁶ the *sarvān granthān* of this *Āgama*. See Jacobi, l.c.p. 115-117. What position have we here to assume? In *aṅga* 3, 4, 1 we find *aṅgabāhīriya* texts expressly recognised as different from the *aṅgas*, and as *pannattiū* of this kind the names of *upāṅgas* 5-7 are mentioned, together with a fourth name, which is that of a section in *upāṅga* 3. In *aṅga* 3, 10 ten *dasā* texts, each comprising 10 *ajjhayaṇas*, are enumerated of which we possess only four, as *aṅgas* 7-10, and a fifth, as *chedasūtra* 4. In *aṅga* 4 there are mentioned, besides the 11 (or 12) *aṅgas*, the names of the 36 sections of the first *mūlasūtra*, and three other texts, which are no longer extant; the last occur only in a statement in reference to the number of their *ajjhayaṇas*. A real enumeration of those texts, which besides the *aṅgas* belong to the *suam* (*śrutam*) is not found in the *aṅgas*,

²⁴ cf. *Bhagav.* 1, 392-7 *Vorlesungen über Indische Lit., Gesch.* 2, p. 316.

²⁵ *se kiṃ taṃ bhāsāriyā? je naṃ addha-Māgahāe bhāsāe bhāsānti jatthayanam bambhī, livi pavattai.*—Also according to *upāṅga* 1, 56 (see Leumann, *Aupapāt*, p. 6) Mahāvīra himself already preached in Ardha-Māgadhi.—Accordingly we read in the quotation given by Hemacandra IV. 287: *porāṇam addhamāgahabhāsāniyam haviṇī suttam*; cf. Pischel's note on this passage in his translation, p. 169. The ordinary term for that idiom with Hemacandra is *ārṣam*.

²⁶ Other synonyms are *śruta*, *sūtra*, *grantha*, *sāsana*, *ājñā*, *vacana* *upadeśa*, *prajñāpanā*. Such is the enumeration in the *Anuyogadv.* (but in *Prākṛt*).

but in the *Nandisūtra*, a work that is probably a production of Devarddhigaṇi himself. See below. In this work the sacred texts are divided into two groups ; (1) the *aṅgapaviṭṭha*, i. e. the 12 *aṅgas*, and (2) the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts. A further subdivision shows that under *anaṅgap*, there are 60 single texts enumerated, 27 of which prove to be names of existing parts of the *Siddhānta* ; the other names appear either to be merely titles of sections of single texts of this number [223] or, and this is the majority of cases are not found in the *Siddhānta*, though *aṅga* 3, 10 is acquainted with some few of them. A repetition of this enumeration in the *Pākṣikasūtra*²⁷ adds at the end to the latter category four^{28*} additional texts, the former existence of which can be proved from another source. Inasmuch as this proof is as entirely free from suspicion as it is surprising I deem it fit to discuss this matter already here in some detail.

In the *Vihimaggapavā*, called briefly *Vidhiprapā*, that is to say, in a *sāmāyārī* of Jīnapahamuni (Jinaprabha in Kosalā ; likewise author of the *Samdehaviṣaṇṇasādhī*) composed Saṃvat 1363 (A.D. 1307) in Prakrt, the above mentioned enumeration of the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts is found with the addition of the same four names as in the *Pākṣikasūtra*. To these four there are added two more names. On this occasion we now find there, inserted between *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*, the following remarkable statements in reference to that state of advancement in which the student is to study the single texts. The statement occurs in a passage where the author describes in detail the diurnal occupation necessary to learn the single texts of *Siddhānta*. The passage is as follows :

*itthā ca dakkha*²⁹ *pariyāyeṇa tivāso āyārapakappaṃ vaḥijjā vāijjā ya, evaṃ cauvāso sūyagaḍaṃ, paṃcavāso dasākappavavahāre, aṭṭhavāso ṭhāṇasamavāe, dasavāso bhagavāi (°vāim), ikkārasavāso khuḍḍiyāvimāṇāi (°nāḍini) paṃca °jjhayāṇe, vārasavāso arunovavāyāi (°ādini) [224] paṃca °jjhayāṇe, terasavāso utṭhāṇasuyā (°yāḍini) caurajjhayāṇe, cauddasāi-aṭṭhārasamtavāso kameṇa āsiviśabhāvaṇa-diṭṭhivisabhāvaṇa-cāra-ṇabhāvaṇa-mahāsumiṇabhāvaṇa-teyanisagge, egūṇaviṣavāso diṭṭhivāyaṃ, sampunnavisavāso savvasuttajogottī. The same statements recur in an older form (cf. the name *vivāha* for *aṅga* 5 and not *bhagavāi*) in Śānticaṇḍra's*

27 Where the texts in question are called *aṅgabāhira*.

28*Or 'five' ? they seem to have been mentioned also by the original MS. commented on by the *bhāṣā* of the Calcutta edition of the *Nandis* ; see the explanation of the five names in that edition p. 418 (after *Vaṇhidasāo*).—L.

29 The MS has *dakkha*. But *visarga* is of course here inappropriate. Is *dikkha* ('*dikṣā*') the correct reading ?

Comm. on *upāṅga* 6 in 7 verses, the first two of which are found in Abhayadeva on *aṅga* 3 :

tivarisapariyagassa u āyārapakappanāmam ajjhayaṇam |
cauvarisassa ya sammam sūgaḍam nāma aṅgam ti || 1
dasakappavavahārāsamvaccharapaṇagadi-kkhiyasse 'va |
ṭhāṇam samavāociya aṅg ete³⁰ atṭhavāsassa || 2
dasavāsassa vivāho egārasavāsagassa ya ime u |
khuddiyavimāṇa-m-āi ajjhayaṇā paṁca nāyavvā || 3
bārasavāsassa tahā aruṇovāyāi paṁca ajjhayaṇā'
terasavāsassa tahā utṭhāṇasuyāiyā cauro || 4
caudasavāsassa tahā āsivisabhāvaṇam jiṇā bīmīti |
pannarasavāsagassa ya diṭṭhāvisabhāvaṇam taha ya || 5
solasavāsāisu ya eguttaravuddhiesu jahasaṁkham |
cāraṇabhāvaṇa-mahasuviṇabhāvaṇā-teaganisaggā³¹ || 6
egūṇavāsagassa diṭṭhivāo duvālasaṁgam |
sampunnavāsavariso aṇuvāi savvasuttassa tti || 7

This enumeration is exceedingly noteworthy, from the fact, that of the texts which now belong to the *Siddhānta*, only nine are mentioned (six *aṅgas* and three *chedasūtras*), whereas the other eight names to which reference will be made later on when we examine the *Nandī*, are at present not found therein. The question [225] arises ; are we justified in placing the composition of these verses³² at a period in which the remaining portions of the present *Siddhānta* were as yet not embraced therein, their place being occupied by the eight lost texts, which are mentioned in the enumeration ? In any case the enumeration cannot be otherwise than ancient, since at the date when it was composed, the *diṭṭhivā* manifestly still existed, and in fact as the highest in the order of gradation.

If we now return to a consideration of the 60 *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts

³⁰ *aṅga* masculine or 'ete' neuter; see *ime' ajjhayaṇā* in v. 3.

³¹ *teyanisagga* is, according to another passage of the *Vidhiprapā*, another name of the Gośāla book in the *Bhagavatī*, the latter in its turn being *dasavāsassa*.

³² Śānticaṇḍra maintains a different view, viz.—that since in v. 3 *aṅga* 5 is ascribed to *daśavarṣaparyāyasya śādhūh* therefore *eo ipso aṅga* 6, and the connected *upāṅga* 6, took, their places accordingly. But how is the case with *aṅga* 7 etc ?

of the *Nandī* we shall find that we have to deal with a rich literature of which nearly half has probably been lost. On the other hand, among these 60 texts we miss not only at least six names which are now enumerated as portions of the *Siddhānta* ; but all the titles of those groups are lacking, in which the *Siddhānta* is at present divided. These 60 names are enumerated without any reference whatever to any definite order in groups, and in a succession entirely different from the present order. Does this state of things permit us to conclude that neither the texts which are not mentioned in the enumeration nor the present groupings or titles of group existed at the date of the *Nandī* ?

At present the entire *Siddhānta* embraces the following 45 texts³³ divided into the following six groups : 1. eleven (or twelve) *aṅgas* : [226] *Ācāra*, *Sūtrakṛtam* (*°kṛit*), *Sthānam*, *Samavāya*, *Bhagavati*, *Jñātādharma-kathas*, *Upāsakadaśās*, *Antakṛddasās*, *Anuttaraupapātikadasās*, *Praśnavyākaraṇam*, *Vipāka* (*Drṣṭivāda*, no longer extant), 2. twelve *upāṅgas* : *Aupapātikam*, *Rājapraśniyam*, *Jivābhigama*, *Prajñāpanā*, *Jambūdvipaprajñapti*, *Candraprajñapti*, *Sūryaprajñapti*, *Nirayāvali* (or *Kalpikā*), *Kalpāvataṁsikā*, *Puṣpikā*, *Puṣpacūlikā*, *Vṛṣṇidaśas*, 3. ten *paiṇnas* : *Catuḥśaraṇa*, *Samstāra*, *Āturapratyākhyānam*, *Bhaktaparijñā*, *Taṇḍulavaiyāliā*³⁴ *Candāvijā*,³⁴ *Devendrastava*, *Gaṇivijā*,³⁴ *Mahāpratyākhyānam*, *Virastava*, 4. six *chedaśūtras* : *Niśītham*, *Mahāniśītham*, *Vyavahāra*, *Daśāsrutaskandha*, *Bṛhatkalpa*, *Pañcakalpa*, 5. two *Sūtras* without a common name, *Nandī* and *Anuyogadvāram*, 6. four *mulaśūtras* : *Uttarādhyayanam*, *Āvaśyakam*, *Daśavaikālikam*, and *Pinḍaniryukti*. This division is that of Bühler (see Jacobi, *Kalpas*, p. 14), with an exception in the succession of up. 5-7, where I have deviated from his arrangement on the strength of the *Vidhiprapā* and the scholium on up. 6. The same division is found also in *Ratnasāgara* (Calc. 1880) except that there groups 3 and 4 have changed places with 5 and 6, not to mention some minor differences. It is a very remarkable fact that in Rajendra Lal Mitra's *Notices of Sanskrit MSS.* 3. p. 67 (Calc. 1874)—on the authority of a definite source of information, the *Siddhānta dharmasāra*, we find an enumeration³⁵ varying materially from the above. First a very different grouping may be noticed ; [227] secondly, there

³³ Those are probably the "45 āgamas," which the patron of the writer of a *MS* (Samvat 1666, A. D. 1609) of the *Vyavahārasūtra* (Berlin MS. or. fol. 1038) had copied ; see v. 10 of the statements at its end.

³⁴ These names, both as regards form and signification are either of doubtful explanation, or are involved in obscurity.

³⁵ Repeated in the "Report on the Sanskrit MSS. examined during 1880-81" addressed to the Govt. of the Punjab, by Pandit Kashinath Kunte. He has given the report twice with tolerable similarity—Jan. 24, 1881 (p. 4-7) and June 6, 1881 (p. 6-9).

are a few additional names (50 instead of 45) and finally remarkable variations in the names themselves. The first two groups of *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas* are identical, although *aṅga* 10 has changed place with *aṅga* 11, and the name of *upāṅga* 12 having fallen out, in its stead another name (*Kappiyāsūtra*) has been introduced in the ninth place.³⁶ The four *Mūlasūtras* appear as Group 3, and of these two have different names (2. *Viśeṣāvaśyaka*, 4. *Pākṣika*). Group 4 bears the title *Kalpasūtras* and consists of five texts, viz : *mūlas*, 1, *chedas*, 1 and 3, *Kalpasūtra* (part of *chedas*, 4) and *Jitakalpasūtra*. Group 5 embraces 6 *chedasūtras* of which the first three alone are perhaps identical with *chedas* 1; the fourth corresponds to *mūlasūtra* 4 of Bühler. The names are : 1, *Mahāniśīthavṛhadvācanā*, 2, *Mahāniśīthalaghuvācanā*, 3. *Mahāniśītha* (not in Rajendra Lal Mitra, but in Kashinath Kunte) *Madhyamavācanā*, 4. *Piṇḍaniryukti*, 5. *Aughaniryukti*, 6. *Paryuṣaṇākālpa*. Group 6 : the ten *painna* or *payanna* texts, but in a different order. The *Marāṇasamādhisūtram*, which is in the eighth place, takes place of *painna* 10. *Nandisūtra* and *Anuyogadvārasūtra*, counting separately as groups 7 and 8 respectively conclude the list. If, now, [228] after a consideration of the above, it is manifest that even the parts of the *Siddhānta* are at present uncertain, we have herein a sure proof of the unsettledness and uncertainty which attaches to the entire writings of the Jains. As a matter of fact it is apparent that the oldest portions of their literature are in reality nothing but *disjecta membra*, that they are very unequal and, as regards the date of their composition, separated from each other by extensive periods.

In the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas* we may observe groups, which are well defined, individual, and united through criteria which prove their inter-connection. These groups were in a later age brought into connection with the other groups of like nature.

On the other hand, it cannot be denied that a hand, aiming at unification and order, has been brought to bear especially upon the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*. This is clear from the many remarks in reference to the redaction (*Bhagav.* 1, 389) which consist partly of the parallel references of one text to another, partly of *kārikās* which are placed at the beginning to serve as a general introduction or inserted in the middle or subjoined at the end. The linguistic character of those re-

³⁶ Here Kashinath Kunte deviates from Rajendra Lal Mitra, adducing the common name of *up.* 12 but in the ninth place. A further variation is that in the place of *Candapannatti* he adduces the *Mahāpannavanā*, which is found in the list of the *anaṅgapayittha* texts in the *Nandī*. The *Mahāpannavanā* is characterised as "obsolete and extinct" by Kashinath Kunte.

dactionary remarks can be readily distinguished from that of the text. Among those parallel references, there are doubtless many, which are to be ascribed, not to the redactor but (cf. below) to the copyists ; and among the *kārikās* may be contained many additions of a decided secondary stamp. If now we do not discuss at length the problem as to whether we are to consider all the 45 *āgamas* of Bühler's list as collected by Devarddhigaṇi, [229] as is the belief of Jacobi, *Kalpas*, p. 16, we must accept *this* as a fact ; that their present state cannot be that to which they were possibly brought by him. Despite the firm foundation erected by his activity, and despite the care which the Jains especially have, even from the earliest times, devoted to the restoration of their MSS., nevertheless both the constitution and condition of the *Siddhānta* text have been subject to most important modifications. Jacobi, p. 16, 17, has called attention to the numerous *pāṭhas* (various readings) recognized in the Scholia, and has expressed it as his conviction that it is impossible to restore Devarddhigaṇi's recension or text. There exist however other differences between the original and the present *Siddhānta* text. Not only have there been lost passages or sections of the text, which were extant at the date of the older commentaries, but also there have been inserted large interpolations which are apparent ; and furthermore the text, according to all probability, has even suffered complete transformations. I conjecture that the reason of these changes may be sought in the influence of the orthodoxy of the Svetāmbara sect,³⁷ which became more and more unbending to the various divisions of sectaries. The existing *Siddhānta* belongs exclusively to the Svetāmbaras. The loss of the entire *dr̥ṣṭivāda* (cf. below), is doubtless principally due to the fact that it had direct reference to the doctrines of the schismatics. This point of view may afford us an explanation for the omissions, additions, and transformations in the constitution of the other *āngas*. The [230] rigour of the polemic against the *annaut̥ṭhiya*, *anyatīrthika*, *parapāṣaṇḍa* and against the *ninhaga*, *nihnava*, is so sharp and cutting, that we are justified in drawing ulterior conclusions, which are of significance for the history of Jain literature.

Thus we have seen above, page 222f, that of works mentioned in *āngas* 3 and 4 with special reference to their contents and extent, eight are no longer extant, as is also the case with some 30 of the 60 *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts mentioned in the *Nandisūtra*, etc. Again, it is a definite and certain conclusion that the *Mahāpaina* chapter of the first

³⁷ A patent example of this inflexibility is to be found in the *Kupakṣakausikāditya*,

part of *aṅga* 1 long formed an integral part of that *aṅga* before it was lost, as is at present the case. The *nīsīhajjhayaṇam*, which originally belongs to the second part of that *aṅga*, has been removed thence and given an independent position, that is to say, it exists, according to all probability, as *chedasūtra* 1. Some verses, which originally had their place at the end of the first chapters of *upāṅgas* 5 and 7, and which the scholium ascribes to that place, are now not extant. On the other hand, there is no lack of insertions : At the date of the fourth *aṅga* (§84) the fifth had not yet attained the half of its present extent (84,000 instead of 184,000 *paḍas*). The addition of certain portions called *cālās* (protuberances), is expressly recognized by tradition as having taken place partly in *aṅga* 5 (*vivāhacūlā*) partly in *aṅgas* 1 and 12 as also in *mūlasūtra* 3. In the case of *chedasūtra* 4 we have a certain instance of a growth out of manifold constituent parts. Besides, these changes, be they omissions or additions, there are traces of evident textual transformations. The statements in *aṅga* 3, 10 in reference to the contents of *aṅgas* 8-10, are drawn from a text quite different from our own. Furthermore [231] the statements in reference to the extent and division of all the 12 *aṅgas*, to be found in a detailed discussion of the subject partly in *aṅga* 4, partly in the *Nandī*, are oftentimes in unison neither with each other nor with the actual constitution of the text. Even the modern representation of the *Vidhiprapā*, dating from the commencement of the fourteenth century, shows extensive variations in the case of an *aṅga* 6. It is furthermore to be noticed that chapter 16 of the first part of *aṅga* 2, has a title which does not comport with the character of its contents. The same may be affirmed of *aṅga* 10, the commentary to which refers to a textual division no longer in existence ; nor does this *aṅga* contain the same dialect as the others. Finally, the name of the second *upāṅga* does not harmonize with its traditional explanation, which, in turn, stands in no genuine relation to the contents of the *upāṅga*. In this latter case there exists perhaps some connection with a Buddhistic text of similar denomination, to which we may, in the last instance, ascribe some influence in bringing about the transformation of the text. We have seen that the constituent parts of the text in general have been exposed to modifications of the most varied character ; and the same, we can confidently assume, has been the case with the state of the text itself. The peculiar style of these works in the first instance is to be held responsible for this result. The massiveness and ponderosity especially of the presentation by means of continual repetitions and constantly recurring stereotyped forms, has often sorely tried the patience of the Jain clergy. All the precautions which were taken by the division of the text into *granthas*,

that is to say, groups of 32 syllables³⁸ and by counting the latter by hundreds [232] or by thousands, which precautions according to Jacobi, *Kalpas* p.24 emanated from Devarddhigaṇi himself, have not been able to protect the text against the insertion of single words, or against abbreviations and omissions. The latter were then made good by reference to the parallel passages in other texts, cf.p. 228. All this, together with the dangers accruing from the constant copying of the MSS., has produced a state of confusion which is utterly irremediable. Often the catchwords alone, the skeletons of the page so to speak, are left, and that which must be supplied is to be found in the preceding, which was identical in tenor. The omitted portion was thus left to oral delivery or to oral instruction. The allusions to certain stereotyped descriptions, the *epitheta ornantia*, the so-called *vannaa*, *varṇaka*, are doubtless to be referred to the period of the redaction,

So the text itself, as we see, has met with enormous losses in the course of time ; also the form of the words has suffered equally. I do not refer here to the frequent *pāṭhas*, of which mention has already been made and which were intentionally changed from reasons of the most various character, but to the form of the words itself. The Prakrit of these texts was, as we have seen, page 221, afflicted in the very beginning with "a thorn in the flesh". Its origin is to be sought in the East of India, in Magadha, and it was therefore provided at the start with those peculiarities, or at least with a good part of them, which belonged to the Māgadhi dialect according to the testimony of the old inscriptions and of the tradition of the later grammarians. These texts were collected for the first time [233] by the Council of Pāṭaliputra probably in that dialect, and after 800 years' transmission by word of mouth, if we trust the voice of tradition, were codified in writing in Western India. In this codification the attempt was doubtless made to preserve a part of the ancient grammatical form, particularly the termination of the Nom. Sing. Masc. of the 1st decl., in *e* not in *o*. Such was the ancient colouring of the language of the "Scriptures", as the texts were now called. But, aside from this attempt at preserving an ancient flavouring, it may be stated as a general proposition that the texts were written down in that form, which the language assumed at the time and place where the written codification took place. In the case of those texts which were then not merely collected or compiled from ancient material, but newly created by the sole assistance of this ancient material, the desire to preserve the ancient

38 Also called *śloka* or *anuṣṭubh*. See *Ind. Streifen*, III. p. 212.

form held good merely as regards the ancient citations. The remainder of the contents, including the notes of the redactor and his additions, was at the outset, composed in the new form (e.g. Nom. in *o*, not *e*). This then remained for the future the only authoritative form which as far as can be discovered, was imperfect and contaminated by the most varied defects. No reference was paid to a substructure of grammar, and the flexibility of the rules as regards flexion or non-flexion recalls the latitude which the Prakrit grammarians of a later age [234] ascribed³⁹ to the Apabhraṃśa in this particular. In compounds the single members are either entirely without *saṃdhi*, or the case termination is lacking in the latter member, so that it stands, like the other members, in its pure thematic form. The pure theme especially is frequently found instead of the inflected forms in the *kārikās*, which are inserted into the *aṅgas*. The gender and number of the words which are associated, do not agree in a very large number of cases.⁴⁰ The insertion of an inorganic *m* in the middle of compounds and at the end of a word, is a recognized practice. Corresponding occurrences or rather beginnings of such a use are found even in ancient times, and in fact in the *Veda* (cf. *śatamūti*). The use of the particles *to* (from *ato*) and *o*, *tu* and *u* as mere expletives, is exceedingly common. The indiscriminate variation of *i* and *u* with *e* and *o* before double consonants makes many passages obscure and difficult. If to these considerations we add the so-called *yaśruti* it is apparent what a wide field is opened up for the disfigurement of words. There is, however, one circumstance more, and that of a very peculiar nature. By reason of the falling out at any time of a *t* in the frequently recurring forms of the 3rd pers. Singul. Pres., and of the Past. Perf. Pass., a misunderstanding arose in the minds of the copyists, which is only to be explained from the fact that there was no absolutely established grammatical use. This misunderstanding arose from the belief of the grammarians that *t* was a sound [235] that could be omitted or inserted at pleasure. The insertion of such an inorganic *t* in time gained ground so extensively, that the recognition of the original form becomes a matter of exceeding difficulty. As a matter of fact it can be proved that this situation of affairs led even at quite an early date to grotesque misunderstandings.⁴¹ As the result of all this many words of the

39 A perfect analogy is presented by the peculiar Sanskrit of the North Buddhistic texts *Lalitavistara*, *Mahāvastu*, etc.

40 Just as in the texts of the *Avesta*, especially the *Vendidad*, which were collected at about this period.

41 All sorts of false forms which had no claim to existence came gradually into use in this way. An interesting case of this, which, if my conception is correct, transplants us into a period before Varāhamihira A. D. 504-587, will be found in the

tèxts are exceedingly corrupt. We find therefore it almost beyond belief when we consider the nature of the licenses which modern Jain authors allow themselves when they write Prakrit. In the scholia all matter of this class is explained simply as *chāndasa*, or *ārṣa*. If now, despite the above great transformation of the constitution and condition of the text of the *Siddhānta* since Devarddhigaṇi, it is always difficult in a given case to demonstrate the posteriority of any definite text after him, there is nevertheless, [236] in the contents a sufficient number of dates which correspond exactly, or at least tally well, with the period in which he is placed by tradition, namely the fifth century A. D.

Of the evidence of this character we must first mention the astronomical and astrological conceptions, which are anterior to the authoritative influence of Greek astronomy, or at least in all essentials independent of it. There is as yet no knowledge of the Zodiac ; the planets are not arranged in the Greek order (as is the case in several of the Ath. Paris.), and play a very unimportant part. The *nakṣatras* and the Vedic *yugam* of five years still hold sway. The *nakṣatras* are often found, arranged after the old order, starting with *kṛttikā*. At the same time we find in the *upāṅgas* the change of the vernal equinox from *kṛttikā* to *bharaṇi* indicated by the commencement with *abhijit*, which is such a favourite in the *upāṅgas*.⁴² In this fact we have a sign that the influence of Greece had already become active. In general, however, the statements of the *upāṅgas* still represent the stage of the so-called *Jyotiṣam* and of a part of the *Atharvaparīśiṣṭas*. The names of the *karaṇās* that have a foreign sound : *bava*, *bālava*, etc. belong, it is true, to the *upāṅgas* ; *horā* is found however for the first time in *paiṇna* 8. v. 60.

We must also mention the enumeration of the foreign, non-Aryan peoples, [237] which are frequently referred to in the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*.

name of the metre *vaitāliyam* in *aṅga* 2. 1. 2. The title of the first *upāṅga* is incorrectly stated to be *aupapātika* instead of °*dika*. The name *Meṇṇa* (*Metayya*) became *Metārya*, the common form. In my treatise on the *Satrumjaya Māh.* p. 3. 4, when I had no knowledge of this inorganic *t*, I conjectured *Metārya* to have originated from *Mevārya*. The Schol. on *aṅga* 2. 2. 7 has, it must be confessed, *Medārya*. Furthermore the later Jains have been guilty of all sorts of wild misconceptions in reference to their own language ; as for example, the completely erroneous explanation of the name *nivāha* by *niśūtha*. In this category we may perhaps place *Licchaki* for *Licchavi*.

⁴² So also in *aṅga* 3 ; in *aṅga* 4. 7 probably is an interpolation. The names of the *nakṣatras* appear, we may notice in passing, here only in their secondary form, thus : *puṣya*, *bhadrāpada*, etc.

This enumeration transplants us with tolerable certainty to a period from the second to the fourth century A.D., which is the most ancient period in which the enumeration can have originated, though the present texts may be much later. The mention made of the Arabians among the list, in the form *ārava*, which has yet not been discovered as occurring elsewhere in India, might lead us to suppose that we had to deal with a period far posterior to that delimited above. This could, however, be the case only on the supposition that the Arabians of Islam are referred to. It is my opinion that a reference to an ante-Islamic period (in which Arabia and India were closely connected by commercial ties), is as fully justified as a reference to the Islamic period. From the mention of this peculiar denomination of the Arabians, which as before said appears here for the first time in the history of Indian literature, I conclude that the first author of the enumeration in question lived in a part of India in which the commercial connections with Arabia were very close, that is to say, on the west coast. The mention made of the seven schisms in *aṅgas* 3, the last of which occurred in the year 584 Vīra, compels us to regard the second century A. D. as the extreme limit *a' qua* for the composition of the texts of the *Siddhānta*. We have therefore to conclude that the period from the second to the fifth century is the period to which their composition must be relegated.

The other dates, which we can extract from the texts, are in agreement with this delimitation of the period of their origin, of special importance are the references in the *aṅgas* to the corpus of Brahmanical secular literatures [238] which existed at the time, see *Bhagav.* 1. 441 ; 2. 446 8. Then too the use of the word *aṅga* to denote the oldest portions or the chief group of the *Siddhānta*⁴³ deserves attention, and makes probable the assumption that the period of their origin is the same as that to which belong the Brahmanical *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*, often alluded to in their most ancient portions. The second of those two names (*upāṅgas*) has been adopted by the Jains as the title of the second chief group of their texts. I have already called attention to

43 The Buddhists in the case of the chief group of their own scriptures make use of the word *sūtra* to denote a class of literature of somewhat ancient date. The word *sūtra* occurs also in the colophons of the Jaina *Siddhānta* and plays a very important role in the Scholia ; yet is never used in the texts themselves with the same significance as among the Buddhists, if we except the *Anuyogadvāras* and *Āvaśy. nijjuttī* together with that section of *aṅga* 12 which has the specific title of *suttāim*. See *Bhag.* 1, 441, 2, 196, 247 and *Vorles. über Ind. Lit. Gesch.*² 316. The style of some of the oldest parts of the *Siddhānta* reminds us in a very slight degree of that of the later Brahmanical *sūtra*. In reference to the connection, of somewhat problematic character, between *sāmāyika* or *sāmāyāri* and *sāmāyācārika*, see later on under *aṅga* 1, or in *Uttarādhy.* 16.

the close connection between the astronomical doctrines of the *aṅgas* and those of the “*Jyotiṣa*” *vedāṅga*. Finally may be mentioned (see *Bhagav.* 1. 383) the solemn composition in the *āryā* measure⁴⁴ of verses which are cited in the *Siddhānta* or inserted therein. This measure must at the time of the redaction of the *Siddhānta* have enjoyed especial authoritativeness, otherwise it had never been made so exclusive a vehicle of composition. We must however call attention to the fact that the oldest material portions of the texts are not composed in *gāthās* but in *ślokas*; thus *aṅga* 2, the metrical portions of the *cheda-sūtras* and those of *mūlasūtras* 1 and 3 [239] are composed in *ślokas*, while the *nijjutti* and *cārṇi* belonging to those *mūlas* are in *gāthās*. In *aṅga* 2 we find also the *vaitāliya* measure. The name of this metre (cf. *ad loc.*) which exists even in the “*Chandas*” *vedāṅga*, appears to have been caused⁴⁵ by a misunderstanding of the name of a chapter of this *aṅga*, brought about by the insertion of an inorganic *t*. The existence of the name of this chapter of the *aṅga* would receive by this supposition a valuable attestation, inasmuch as it dates far back to a very remote period. In *ślokas* and *vaitāliyas* are composed the verses of the *Dhammāpāda* of the Buddhists, with which several portions of this *aṅga*, as well as of *mūlasūtras* 1 and 3, are very closely connected.

We come at this point to a question, which I will here merely mention. What is the relation of the *Siddhānta* of the Jains to the sacred writings of the Buddhists, both northern and southern? A few sidelights of this character will be brought into use as the course of our investigation progresses. The solution of the question can only then be successfully undertaken, when we are in a position to compare the texts themselves.

The following review of the contents of the *Siddhānta* endeavours, in the first place, to disclose to us the actual constitution of the texts which are at the present day reckoned as belonging to the *Siddhānta*. In this review I follow the order adopted by Bühler (see above, page 226). Secondly, it purposes from the dates contained therein to cast light upon the most important points for the date of the composition of each single division, and for the life of the founder [240] of Jainism, as far as this is possible for me in this first assault upon its literature, remarkable not less for its immensity than for its monotony and intellectual poverty.

⁴⁴ There is frequently a great lack of metrical correctness in these verses.

⁴⁵ The metre in question existed earlier as may be seen from its use in the *Dhammāpāda*.

The more exact details will be found in the second part of my catalogue of the Sanskrit and Prakrit MSS. of the Royal Library of Berlin, which is at present in the press.^{46*} I have unfortunately been able to make use of the editions of *aṅga* 10 and *upāṅga* 2 alone out of the Calcutta and Bombay editions of the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*, published 1876 ff.

At the conclusion of this introduction it may be permitted me to state that personally I still continue to regard the Jains as one of the oldest of the Buddhistic sects.^{47*} The fact that the tradition in reference to the founder of Jainism deals partly with another personality than Buddha Śākyamuni himself—with the name of a man who in the Buddhistic legend is mentioned as one of the contemporary opponents of Śākyamuni—this fact, I say, does not, in my opinion, militate against the conclusion that Jainism is merely one of the oldest of the Buddhistic sects. It appears to me that the conception of the founder of Jainism as an opponent of Buddha can well be regarded as an intentional disavowal of religious opinion which took its rise in sectarian hate. The number and the significance of common features in both Buddhistic and Jain traditions in reference to the life and labours etc. of each of their founders outweigh any arguments that make for the contrary opinion. If we reflect and I here repeat what I have said on page 219—that the Jain texts were, as the Jains themselves claim, codified in writing 1000 years after the death of the founder of Jainism, then it is really marvellous [241] that they appear to contain so much that is original. How large the number and how influential the character of the events which occurred in the interval, is for the present veiled in obscurity, although the information emanating from the Jains themselves (or more particularly from the Śvetāmbaras with whose literature we have specially to go) in reference to the seven schisms etc.⁴⁸ affords us at least some slight base of operations. One fact, for example, is noteworthy : that the nakedness, which is adduced by the Brahmins (e.g. also by Varāhas mih. 58,45,59,19) as a chief characteri-

45* Of this new catalogue Vol. I has since appeared under the title : *Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königl. Bibliothek zu Berlin*. Vol. V. Part II. Vol. I (352 pages ; see ante 1887. p. 316), Vol. II (p. 353-828) which is particularly devoted to the sacred Jain Literature, is nearly ready.—L.

47* This view (which in Europe has apparently persuaded only M. Barth of Paris) will scarcely be maintainable any longer, since Prof. Bühler has discovered inscriptional proofs for the authenticity of the Old Thera lists given by the *Kalpasūtra*. see the two papers by Bühler in the *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, Vol. I. p. 165ff and Vol. II., (II), p. 1ff.—L.

48 According to v. 43 of Dhammaghosa's *Kālasattari* : *terasasaehim* (1300) *Virā hohimti anegahā mayavibheā/bandhamti jehim jivā bahuā kamkhāi mohāṇam*. ||

stic of the Jains, and which according to Buddhistic statements, was resolutely opposed by Buddha, assumes an unimportant position in the *aṅgas* and at least is not regarded as a matter of necessity, see *Bhag.* 2,187,239,314. Later the necessity of appearing naked was introduced as a dogma by a sect of dissenters. If we take into considerations the hate which the Śvetāmbaras, who played the role of the orthodox sect, manifested so vigorously against the Digambaras in particular⁴⁹ (*Kup.* 797 7), it is no rash conjecture to assume that many prescriptions or traditions in regard to this point have been removed from the *Siddhānta* of the Śvetāmbaras. Even the orthodox do not deny that the Jinas themselves went naked;⁵⁰ they assert merely that, what was permissible then is no longer permissible at the present day.

At the head of [242] the *Siddhānta* stand then :

a. The (11 or 12) *aṅgas*.

We have seen above on page 211 ff. that, according to tradition, at the time of the first Jina all 12 *aṅgas* were extant ; that then between Jinas 2-9 there existed only eleven, *i. e.*, all except *aṅga* 12 ; that between, Jinas 9-16, those eleven also were lost, whereas in the time of, or between, Jinas 16-24, all twelve were extant, and that the 12th afterwards was again⁵¹ lost. If we exclude the mythical first Jina from our consideration, the essence of this tradition is perhaps this : the number of the *aṅgas* was at first eleven, to these a twelfth was joined, which twelfth *aṅga* was again lost. This assumption corresponds to the conclusions to be derived from the *Siddhānta* itself. In the *aṅgas* themselves and in the *upāṅgas* too,⁵² only eleven *aṅgas* are as a rule mentioned. The principal exception to this assertion is the fourth *aṅga* where at the very outset we find a short enumeration (which can easily be shown to be of secondary addition) of the single parts of the *duvālasaṃgaṃ gaṇipīḍagaṃ* ; alike in §§18,46,88, some declarations in reference to *aṅga* 12 ; and finally at the end a detailed exposition of this subject, in which the *duvālasaṃgaṃ gaṇipīḍagaṃ* is glorified as hav-

⁴⁹ *deśavisamvādino dravyaliṅgenā 'bhedīno nihnavāḥ, Boṭīkāś tu sarvavisamvādino dravyaliṅgato 'pi bhinnāḥ*, according to the *Vicārāṃṭa-saṃgraha* in Malayagiri's Comm. to *Āvaśy.* ; cf. Jacobi, *Kalpas.* p. 15n.

⁵⁰ See Wilson *Sel. W.* I, 294 ed. Rost in reference to the nakedness of Mahāvīra : cf. also the characterization of his doctrine in *aṅga* 3, 9 fin. as *acelae*.

⁵¹ Accord. to *Bhagav.* 20, 8, *aṅga* 12 was lost *savvattha*, *i. e.* in all 23 *jīṇam̐taras*, as Leumann informs me.

⁵² But see *up.* 1,26 (p. 36, Leumann).

ing existed eternally in the past and as destined to exist forever in the future. This laudation of *aṅga* 12 is very surprising, and may well be explained as an intentional polemical assertion to satisfy all doubts that might arise. According to all probability the last section, which is found almost *verbatim et litteratim* in the *Nandī*, composed probably by Devarddhigaṇi himself, [243] is to be regarded as a later addition to *aṅga* 4, whether it was borrowed from the *Nandī* itself, or, if this cannot be the case on account of some few differences between them, from a common source. Besides this mention in *aṅga* 4 and some other references, which eventually may also be of secondary origin (e. g., *aṅga* 5,20,8) the *duvālasaṅgaṃ gaṇipīḍagaṃ* is mentioned only in those portions of the *Siddhānta* which do not belong to the *aṅgas*.

The later origin of the passages in question is manifest from the form in which they are referred to.

When anything is said of the eleven *aṅgas*, they are always characterized⁵³ as "beginning with the *sāmāyika*", in case the statement is not merely limited to this number itself, but when the first one is specifically referred to by name. When, on the other hand, anything is said of twelve *aṅgas*, in which case the titles of each and all are generally cited, the first *aṅga* is not called *sāmāyika*, but *ācāra* (e. g. also *aṅga* 5,20,8) ; the latter name is found in the MSS. and elsewhere up to the present day. This direct variation between the two forms of denotation is peculiar and surprising, but may perhaps be explained as follows : The word *sāmāyika* was perhaps originally a synonym of *ācāra*. I derive⁵⁴ it from *samaya* and hold that it is equivalent to the Brahmanical *sāmāyācārika* (see M. Müller, *Hist. Anc. S. Lit.* p. 206 fg.) which here appears probably [244] in the term *sāmāyāri* (see *Uttarajjh.* 26). This may be regarded as a counterpart of *sāmāyācārika*. In *upāṅga* 1 at the end of the first part, the *dharma* of Mahāvīra is designated in a general way as *sāmāia* or as *agārasāmāie dhamme* and *aṇagārasā*^o. The use of the word in this universal signification in a legend is attested for Mahāvīra's predecessor Pārśva ; see *Bhagav.* 2, 184. Besides this wider signification there was developed a second more restricted use (see the

⁵³ *Sāmātiga-m ādiyāi i. e. sāmāyikādini.* see *Bhagav.* 2, 281-3. 300. *up.* I, 31 remains an exception (Leumann, p. 44)

⁵⁴ Cf. *Pāṇ.* 5, 4, 34 where in the *gaṇa*. *samaya* and *samāyācāra* are found, also *sāmāya* (var. 1) ; the form *sāmā*^o, might be regarded as an intentional differentiation for *sāmā*^o ; cf. the *ākṣtigāṇa*, *anuśatika* as also *samgrāhika*, from *samgraha*, in Abhayadeva on *aṅga* 4, who even uses *svasāmāyika* as the *adj.* to *svasamaya*. The Jains themselves affect several etymologies, and generally regard *sama* as the first member of the compound. See also *Bhag.* 2, 186.

reference just quoted) viz.—the first member of the six so-called *āvaśyakas*⁵⁵ i. e., necessary observances, the treatment of which forms the chief subject of the *Anuyogadvāra-sūtra* and of the *sūtra* text, on which the *Āvaśyakanijjuttī* is based. In both these works and in the *Nandī*, which in turn also makes special mention of the six *āvaśyakas* with *sāmāya* at the head, the *duvālasaṅga gaṇipīḍaga* with *ācāra* at the head is principally spoken of. Consequently it is easy to conjecture that the use of the word *sāmāyika* occurring here in its pregnant sense as the title of the first *āvaśyaka*, has been the cause of the dropping of this denotation for the first *aṅga* (in order to avoid any misunderstanding⁵⁶), and the reason of the choice of the title *ācāra* for this *aṅga*, [245] a title which is perfectly clear.⁵⁷ Further more transitional stages may be found. *Āvaśy. nijj.* 2, 14 we read *sāmāia-m-āiaṃ suanāṇaṃ jāva bimḍusārāo*. Here the first *aṅga* is still entitled *sāmāia* although twelve *aṅgas* are treated of; *bimḍusāra* is the title of the fourteenth *pūrva* or of the concluding section the third part⁵⁸ of the twelfth *aṅga*. In *chedas* 2, 3 the same is said of the *duvālasaṅgaṃ suyanāṇaṃ*: that it is *sāmāiya-m-āi logabimḍusāgara* (*sāra* !) *payyavasāṇaṃ*.^{59*}

If now the passages, in which eleven *aṅgas* with *sāmāyika* at their head are spoken of, are older than those in which reference is made to twelve *aṅgas* with *ācāra* at their head, it becomes self-evident that the twelfth *aṅgaṃ* has been united to the other eleven as a secondary addition. According to tradition and to the actual state of the case, the twelfth *aṅgaṃ* did probably not long assert this secondary position which it had acquired; and at present at least is no longer extant. Doubtless it was lost long ago (cf. page 213). From this circumstance alone we may conjecture that there existed a species of oppositions, an actual incongruity between it and the other eleven *aṅgas*, which led to its loss. For the confirmation of this assertion we still have proof. In both the works, which we have just found to be the two principal witnesses for the existence [246] of the *duvālasaṅgaṃ gaṇipīḍagaṃ*, viz. in the *Anuyogadv.* and in the *Āvaśy. nijj.*, the twelfth *aṅgaṃ* under

⁵⁵ These form the first of the ten groups of the *sāmāyārī*, see *Uttarajjh.* 26.

⁵⁶ It is very peculiar that in *Āvaśy. nijj.* 2, 8 *sāmāia* appears as the title of the first *āvaśyaka* and only six verses later on in 2, 14 as title of the first *aṅga*.

⁵⁷ The change may have been favoured by the union of both words in the Brahmanical term *saṃyācāra*.

⁵⁸ Both the following parts are herewith completely ignored.

^{59*} On the authority of such passages the *pravacanam* is explained by *sāmāyikādi bimḍusāraparyāntam* in later works, e. g., in the commentary to Dharmaghoṣa's *Jitakalpa*; also in the *Nandī-ṭīkā*, see ed. of the *Nandīs.*, p. 390.—L.

its title *diṭṭhivāa dr̥ṣṭivāda*, is placed in direct opposition to the other eleven *aṅgas*, which are there included in the collective title of *kāliyaṃ suaṃ kālikam śrutam*. This occurs in the *Anuyogadv.*, in the section *parimāṇasaṃkhā*, where the means are explained by which the sacred text is assured through counting its constituent parts. Common subdivisions are ascribed to both its above mentioned parts, but for the chief sections the titles *uddesaga*, *ajjhayaṇa*, *suakhaṃdha*, *aṅga* are given to the *kāliasua*, the titles *pāhuḍa*, *pāhuḍiā*, *pāhuḍapāhuḍiā*, *vatthu* however to the *diṭṭhivāa*. According to this (and the other statements in reference to the division of the *diṭṭhivāa* are in agreement herewith) there existed between both these groups of texts a fundamental difference in the designation of their chief divisions. This may probably be referred to a different origin or to a different treatment of the subject matter of both.^{60*} In the *Āvaśy. nijj.* 8,54 two other texts are mentioned (*isibhāsiyāi* and *sūrapannatti*) besides *kāliasuam* and *diṭṭhivāa*. Of these the first is lost, the second has found lodgment among the existing *upāṅgas*. Its agreement with the *diṭṭhivāa* in its division into *pāhuḍa*, leads us to conclude that it must have some connection with it. Finally of special importance is a notice, found but a short distance from this in the same text (8,40), according to which [247] up to the time of Ajja Vayara, that is, of Vajrasvāmin, *apuhatte* (*apṛthaktvam*) *kālīaṇuo-assa* existed, and the *puhattam* (*pṛthaktvam*) "*kāliasua diṭṭhivāe ā*" had found entrance later on : *teṇāreṇa, tata ārataḥ*.

For the present at least it is quite uncertain how we are to understand this peculiar notice, or how we are to bring it into harmony with the position, which Vajra holds elsewhere in tradition, that is, as the last *daśapūrvin*—knower of (merely) ten *pūrvas*. After him there were only *navapūrvins*, and the knowledge of the *pūrvas* gradually decreased until it finally ceased altogether (p. 213). We can determine at least *this* with certainty—that a thorough-going difference existed between *aṅga* twelve and the other eleven. The hostility of the great Bhadrabāhu, who is held to be the real representative of the *dr̥ṣṭivāda*, to the sacred Saṃgha is apparent from other sources and from the late notice in Hemacandra's *Parīṣiṣṭaparvan* (above, p. 214).⁶¹ The reason for

60* In the tradition referred to on page 215 the priority of the *pūrvas* over the *aṅgas* is claimed. Their position in the last *aṅga*, at the conclusion of the others, is however not in harmony with this claim. The title *pūrvas* has rather reference in the last instance to the contents. See below on *aṅga* 12—It must however be taken into consideration that the old accounts on the rise of the Jain schisms mention only the *pūrvas* and not the *aṅgas*; see my paper "*Die alten Berichte von den Schismen der Jaina*," *Ind. Stud.* Vol. XVII. pp. 107 and 112.—L.

61 If Bhadrabāhu appears here, and elsewhere, in the tradition, as the last teacher of the 14 *pūrvas*, which form an integral part of the *dr̥ṣṭivāda*, and if with his pupil

this enmity can be clearly discerned in the statements, which have been preserved in reference to the twelfth *āṅga*. It may be permitted here to refer to the discussion of the same later on. According to these statements, the first two of the five parts in which it was presumably divided, dealt with the views (*dr̥ṣṭi*) of the heterodox sects, the *ājīviya* and the *terāsia*⁶² besides treating of other subjects. [248] The name *dr̥ṣṭivāda* may perhaps be explained by reference to this fact. The third part consisted of the so-called 14 *pūrvas*, the contents of which was probably not in entire harmony with the sect of the Śvetāmbaras, which had gradually arrogated to itself the position of being the representative of orthodoxy. This then is perhaps the reason for the loss of the twelfth *āṅga*.

The remaining extant eleven *āṅgas* by no means represent a unit since they fall into several groups, the single members of which are marked by certain formal peculiarities, which prove a connection closer in the case of some than in that of others.

The first of those groups is formed by *āṅgas* 1-4, all the larger divisions of which close with the words *ti bemi, iti bravīmi*; and according to the Scholia, Sudharman, Mahāvīra's pupil, is regarded as the one who gives utterance to this formula. The prose portions begin with the formula; *suyam me āusam! teṇam bhagavayā evam akkhāyam*. "I have heard, O long-lived one! Thus has that saint spoken." Sudharman is the speaker, according to the Scholia. In this formula,⁶³ which characterizes the contents as the oral transmission of the utterances of Mahāvīra, a scholar of Sudharman, *i. e.* Jambū, is the one addressed. This introductory formula is found also in other texts of the *Siddhānta* at the commencement of the prose sections; and with this the closing formula *ti bemi* is generally connected. From this it appears to me that an immediate connection of these portions with the first four *āṅgas* is here *eo ipso* indicated, in so far as in all probability [249] all bear the traces of a unifying hand. In regard to the especial connection of *āṅgas* 1-3 with one another, this fact deserves mention that in *āṅga* 4, 57 they appear as a group which belongs by itself or as the 'three

in the 14 *pūrvas*, Sthūlabhadra, the mere knowledge of the last four *pūrvas* is said to have vanished, this is in no greater agreement with the information derived from the *Siddhānta* itself (see above, p. 215) than with the above statements in reference to Vajra's activity in the case of the *diṭṭhivā*. See above, page 215.

62 The traditional date for the foundation of this sect—544 after Vira is exactly 374 years later than the date which is set for Bhadrabāhu the supposed last teacher of the 14 *pūrvas*—(*kālasatts.* v. 37).

63 This is explained in very different ways.

gaṇipīḍagas" (*ācāryasya sarvasyabhājanāni*) κατ' ἐξοχῆν. *Aṅga* 4 is nothing but a continuation of *aṅga* 3, and in the very beginning is styled to be "the fourth *aṅga*".

A second group is formed by *aṅgas* 6-9 and 11, which in a common introductory formula refer on the one hand their contents directly to Suhamma or Jambū, and on the other are shown by other statements to have been united by one hand. See the remarks at the commencement of *aṅga* 6.

Aṅgas 7-9 appear to be connected by an especially close bond.

The fifth *aṅga* and the existing redaction of *aṅga* 10 are not embraced in either of these groups. *Aṅga* 10 belonged originally to the second group. It exists in a form demonstrably later and is composed in another dialect (Nom. Sing. in *o*). The fifth *aṅga* takes a separate position, and begins in a very peculiar way. It possesses however one point of similarity with *aṅga* 6 ; *kārikās*, which state the contents of what is to follow, are found with each larger section. These sections do not have in the case of this *aṅga* the title *ajjhayaṇa*, but are called *saya*, *śata*. The title of the *aṅga* itself has some connection with the titles of *upāṅgas* 5-7, and this fact makes plain that there is an inner connection between them.

That the reader may obtain a ready survey, I add the statements in reference to the extent of each of the *aṅgas* which are found [250] in the MSS. of each at the end. As stated above, page 231, the texts are divided into hundreds and thousands of *granthas*, i. e., groups of 32 syllables, and these are marked at the proper place (either by thousands or by five hundreds) or the collective number of the *granthas* is stated at the end. As a matter of fact the statements of the MSS in reference to the number vary very frequently ; which is to be referred to the greater or smaller number of omissions which have been made therein. We shall refer further on, under *aṅga* 4, to this matter again. The following are the numbers in questions :

1,2554 gr., - 2,2300, - 3,3750, - 4,1667, - 5,15750, 6,5375,-7,812,-8,890, -9,192,-10,1300,-11,1316.

In the case of several *aṅgas* at the close there are special statements in reference to the number of days necessary for the study or for the

recitation of the *aṅga*—see *Bhagav.* 1,377-8, a subject which is treated of at great length in the *Vidhiprapā*.⁶⁴ I now proceed to an examination of each of the *aṅga* texts.

I. The first *aṅga* has, in its existing form, the name *āyāra*, *ācāra*, or *āyārapakappam*⁶⁵ and treats [251] in two *suakkhamdhas*, *śrutaskandas* of the manner of life of a *bhikkhu*.⁶⁶ The first *śrutask.*, *baṁbhacerāim*, *brahmacaryāṇi*, contains at present eight *ajjhayaṇas* with 44 *uddesagas*, the second : 16 *ajjh.* and 34 *udd.* It is however definitely stated that the first *śrutask.* contained previously not 8 but 9 *ajjh.* and the whole *aṅga* consequently not 24, but 25 *ajjh.* and not 78, but 85 *udd.* Cf. especially in *aṅga* 4 § 25 and § 85 and the detailed *re'sume'* of the 12 *aṅga* found both there and in the *Nandī*. In § 25, where the titles of the 25 *ajjh.* are enumerated one by one, we find the name *mahāparinnā*, belonging to this *ajjh.* which is no longer extant placed in the ninth place between 1, 8 and 2, 187* ; and the same circumstance may be noticed as occurring in *Āvaśy.* 16,112 fg. More exact information is found in the *Vidhiprapā* according to *Āvaśy.* 8, 46-49. Here we find that Vajrasvāmin (presumably 584 *Vīra*) extracted⁶⁸ from it the *āgāsagāmiṇī vijjā* ; and from the fact that it contained exaggerations (? *sāisayattanēṇa* ; according to Leumann, on account of the excellence of this extract) it was lost, or rather continued to exist only in the *nijjuti*. It was the opinion of Śīlāṅka (A.D. 876) that it occupied not the ninth but the eighth place.⁶⁹ This latter statement is incorrect,^{70*} for [252] in the existing commentary of Śīlāṅka⁷¹ the

64. The names of the single *ajjhayaṇas* and the number of the *uddesagas* etc. are specifically enumerated in the *Vidhiprapā* : *aṅga* 1, 50 days ; 2,30 ; 3,18 ; 4,18 ; 5,77 (a second statement, it seems, allots 6 months 6 days) 6,33 ; 7,14 ; 8,12 ; 9,7 ; 10,14 ; 11,24. In like manner the author examines and states the number of days necessary for certain work ; *āvassaya* (8 days), *dasaveālia* (15), *uttarajjhayaṇa* (39) *nisiha* (10), *dasākappavavahāra* (20 or 22), *mahānisiha* (45). A recapitulation "in 68 *āryās*" concludes the discussion ; *jogavithāṇaṁ nāma payaraṇaṁ*.

65 See above. p. 223, 224 ; this is to be studied in the third year after the *dikṣā*.

66 Teaching sacred observances after the practice of Vāsīṣṭha (!) and other saints, Wilson. Sel. works 1,284 ed. Rost.

67* According to Malayagiri and the Prakrit authority quoted by him (*Nandīs.* p. 425) between 1,7 and 1,8 (*ohāṇas.*)—L.

68 From this it seems as if its contents touched upon the subject of magic. Was this the cause of its removal ? Cf. the analogous case in *aṅga* 10. According to the *Gaṇadharasārdhaśata* V. 29 (see p. 371) Vajrasv. borrowed the *āyāsag. vijjā* from *sumahāpainna puvvāu* rather than from the ninth *ajjh.* of the first *śrutask.* of *aṅga* 1.

69 *navamajjhayaṇaṁ vocchinnaṁ, taṁ ca mahāpārinnā itto kira āyāsagāmiṇī vijjā Vajrasāmiṇā uddhariyāsi tti sāisayattanēṇa vocchinnaṁ nijjuttimātraṁ ciṭṭhai ; Śīlāṅkāyariyamaṇa puṇa eyaṁ, aṭṭhamāṁ, vimukkhajjhayaṇaṁ sattamaṁ, uvahāṇasuyaṁ navamaṁ ti.*

70* It would suit if Malayagiri were concerned, see the last asterism note.—L.

71 In the opening of *ajjhayaṇa* 7 we read : *adhunā saptamādhyaṇasya mahāparijñā-*

mahāparinnā, which at and probably long before his time had been lost, is placed, not between 1, 7 and 1, 8, but between 1, 6 and 1, 7—that is to say in the seventh place. In the *Vidhiprapā* there is probably a confusion with Abhayadeva, in whose commentary on *aṅga* 4—as also in the anonymous comm. on the *Nandī*—the *mahāparinnā* keeps, it is true the eighth place. The *nijjuttī* then, which manifestly was still extant at the time of Jinaprabha, is probably identical with that *nijj*, of which the author of the *Āvaśy. nijj.* declares (2,5) that he is himself the composer; and which served specially as a basis to the comm. of Śīlāmka. The scholia everywhere preserve a knowledge of the ninth chapter. Furthermore the comm on *chedas*. 1 in its opening still mentions nine *bambhacerāṇi*.

The titles of the 8 extant *ajjh.* of the first *śrutaskandha* (V = *Vidhiprapā*) are :

1. *satthaparinnā*, *śāstraprajñā*, with 7 *udd.*; in *udd.* 1 *jīvatvaṃ*, *jīvāstitvaṃ sāmānyena*, in 2-7 *viśeṣeṇa pṛthivikāyādyastitvaṃ*. There are many references of a polemical nature to the Śākyas, or Bauddhas, in 2,3, according to the scholiast.

2. *logavijaya*, *lokaśāravijaya*, with 6 *udd.*; *mokṣāvāptihetubhūtaṃ cāritram*.

3. *siosañijjam* (*siūsī°*), *śītoṣṇīyam*, with 4 *udd.*; *pratilomānuloma-pariṣahāḥ*.

4. *sammattaṃ*, [253] *samyaktvaṃ*, with 4 *udd.*; *samyagvādaḥ*, *mithyāvādabhūtatīrthika-matavicāraṇā*.

5. *logasāra*; in *aṅga*. 4, 25, in *Āvaśy. nijj.* and in the schol. on *Nandī*: *āvaṃti*, according to the words of the commencement,⁷² with 6 *udd.*; *saṇīyamaḥ*, *mokṣaśca*, *munibhāvaḥ*.

6. *dhūyā* (*dhūyaṃ V*), *dhūtā*, with 5 *udd.*; *nijakarmaśārīropakaraṇa... vidhūnanena niḥsaṃgatā*.

7. *vimoha*, *vimokṣa* (?) with 8 *udd.*; *samyag niryāṇaṃ*.

8. *ohāṇasuyam* (*uva° V*), *upadhānaśrutam*, with 4 *udd.*; treats of Vīra Vardhamānasvāmin who himself practised the course enjoined in *ajjh.* 1 to 7.

khyasyā'vasaras, *tacca vyavacchinnam iti kṛtvā 'tilaṃghyā 'ṣṭamasya sambandho vācyah*.

⁷² *āvaṃti logasāraṃ vā*, in the *Vidhiprapā*.

This first *śrutask*, is exceedingly difficult to comprehend and belongs, as Jacobi, from whom we expect an edition,^{73*} informs me in a letter of March 14th 1880, "without doubt to the oldest portions of Jaina literature". Even the commentaries "very often do not understand the text, since from pure force of explanation they fail at reaching any explanation of the sense. The restorations, which must frequently be made, are in fact prodigious."

This shows that we have to do with the method of explanation found in the later Brahmanical *sūtras*⁷⁴ (treating of ritual, grammar, philosophy), the difficulty of which is here increased from the fact that Prakrit is the language used, and that the MSS. are uncertain. The second *śrutaskandha* is characterized by the epithet attached to it : *agre śrutaskandha* (*agre* having the meaning of "later" here) as a species of supplement to the first. This is in harmony [254] with the peculiar designation of the four sections of which it consists according to the scholia, viz. : *Cūlā*, i. e., "pudding", "excrecence", used figuratively here : *uktaśeṣānuvādinī cūḍā*. The first is formed by *ajjh.* 1-7, the second by *ajjh.* 8-14, the third by *ajjh.* 15, the fourth by *ajjh.* 16. The scholia state that a fifth *cūlā* belongs to these, which is called *niśīthādhyayanam*,⁷⁵ being no longer reckoned as a part of the *ācāra* but placed among the *chedasūtras* as the first of them.⁷⁶ It belonged however to the *ācāra* at the period of *aṅga* 4,25, where the *niśīhajjhayanam* is expressly designated as "25th *ajjh.*", of the *ācāra* i. e. as the last of the 25 *ajjh.* enumerated there.⁷⁷ The impression is made upon us as if this *ajjh.* alone was called *cūliyā*. The *ācāra* is there expressly designated as *sacūliyāga*, but in § 57, where only 24 *ajjh.* are ascribed to it, the three *aṅgas* (1-3) which are there treated of, are designated as *āyārācūliyavajja* ; a statement which as far as I can see, is to be explained with tolerable certainty only in the above way.⁷⁸ Also [255] at the time of

73* This has appeared as one of the publications of the Pali Text Society, 1882 ; Jacobi has also translated the text and prefaced it by a most valuable introduction in Vol. XXII. *Sacred Books of the East*.—L.

74 The chief representatives being Kātyāyana (*śrautas.*), Pāṇini, Bādarāyaṇa, Jaimini.

75 Or *niśīthā*° ; *ācāravikalpo niśīthaḥ sa pañcamī cūḍe 'ti* fol. 209a. So also *pañcācūla* as designation of the *ācāra* in the beginning of the *Niśīthabhāṣya*.

76 The fourth *chedasūtram* is closely connected as regards its contents with *aṅga* 1 ; and in *aṅga* 3,10 it is cited under the title of *āyāradasāu*.

77 The first *cūlā* must be reckoned as having 6, not 7, *ajjh.*, otherwise there would be in all 26 and not 25 *ajjh.* ; as a matter of fact 26 names are adduced, *mahāparinnā* in the ninth place. Perhaps *sajjeriyā* counted as but one *ajjhayaṇa*.

78 Abhay., it must be confessed, understands by *ācārācūlikā* : *sarvāntimaṃ adhyayanam vimuktyadhyayanam, niśīthādhyayanasya prasthānām! araratvene 'hā nāśrayaṇāt (!)* ; the latter statement is however in too direct contrast to § 25.

the *Āvaśy. nijj.* 16,114, the *nisihajjh.* was still regarded as a part of the *ācāra*, and in fact plays a greater role there than in *aṅga* 4,25. It is counted as having 3 *ajjh.* so that not 25 but 28 *ajjh.* enumerated there.⁷⁹ Even the *Vidhiprapā* still designates the *nisihajjhayaṇam* as the *paṃcamī cūlā* of the second *śrutaskandha*.

It consists manifestly of different constituent parts, which originally existed independently of each other, but at a later period were brought into conjunction. They begin almost always with the same formula : *se bhikkhū vā bhikkhunī vā abhikaṃkhe...*

In the *Nandī*, the *aṅgacūliyā* is expressly enumerated among the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts. This is not in harmony with the position of our *cūlās* either at §§ 25,57,85 of *aṅga* 4 nor with the detailed treatment of the 12 *aṅgas* in *aṅga* 4 nor in the *Nandī* itself, since there the second *śrutask.* with its *cūlās* is invariably regarded as a part of *aṅga* 1. In *aṅga* 3, 10 the *aṅga-cūliyā* is mentioned as third *ajjhayaṇam* of the *saṃkheviya dasāu*. Consequently reference is made to a text entirely different from these *cūlās*.

The 7 *adhyay.* of the first *cūlā* have the following titles :

1. *piṇḍesaṇā* ; *piṇḍaiṣaṇā* ; with 11 *udd* ; "collection of the necessities of life" (see *Dasaveāl.* 5) or "rules for eating".
2. *sejjā*, *śyyā* with 3 *udd*. ; "couch".
3. *iriyā*, [256] *īryā*, with 3 *udd*. ; "conduct of the Śramaṇa when he goes out *piṇḍa-vasaty-artham*".
4. *bhāsajjāyā*, *bhāṣājātāṃ* with 2 *udd.*, "what he has to say and what not to say".
5. *vatthesaṇā*, *vastraiṣaṇā*, with 2 *udd*. ; *vastragrahaṇavidhiḥ*.
6. *pādesaṇā*, *pātraiṣaṇā*, with 2 *udd.*, "vessel for the *piṇḍa*".
7. *uggahapaḍimā*, *avagrahapratimā* with 2 *udd*. ; on possession in general.

The second *cūlā* likewise embraces seven *adhyayanas*, each of

⁷⁹*bhāvaṇa vimutti*||113|| *ugghāyam aṇugghāyam āruvaṇā tiviham o nisiham tu ia aṭṭhāvisaviho āyārapakappanāmo a*||114||. Here we find the correct number of *adhyayanas* for both *śrutask* ; for *śrut.* 1, 9, for *śrut.* 2, 16.

which has only one *udd.*, whence its peculiar name ; *sattikka*, *sattikkaya*, explained by *saptaikaka*.⁸⁰ They existed in conjunction with one another originally, and formed a whole before they were placed here.⁸¹ Their names are :

8. *ṭhāṇasattikkayam*, *sthānasaptaikaka*.
9. *niṣihyā*, *niṣīthikā* (also *niṣī°*) ; begins : *se bh. vā bh. vā abhikamkhe niṣihyaṃ gamaṇāe*. Very brief.
10. *uccāra-pāsavaṇa* (°*prasravaṇa*).
11. *saddasattikkaa*, *śabda°*.
12. *daṃsaṇa*, *darśana* ; *rūvasattikkayaṃ V*.
13. Without any specific title, accord. to V. *parakiriyāsattikkayaṃ* ; *rāgaḍveṣotpattinimittapratīṣedhaḥ*.
14. Without any specific title (*saptamaḥ saptaikakaḥ*), according to V. *annonnakiriyāsattikkayaṃ* ; *anyonyakriyā niṣidhyate*.

Since it appears that here in the second (ninth) *ajjh.* the same subject is briefly treated of as in the fifth *chūḍā*, see page 254, [257] the latter must be regarded as an amplification. The constant explanation of the word is deserving of special mention : *niṣīha*, *niṣihyā* explained by *niṣītha* (*niṣī°*), *niṣīthikā*. From this one might readily be led to assume that by this explanation *conduct at night*, or *couch for the night* was intended ; and the introductory words (see above) are capable of being so explained. According to the scholiast, however, the contents appear to be of a different nature : *tasyāṃ svādhyāyabhūmau* (as it is described in *ajjh.* 8) *yad vidheyaṃ yacca na vidheyaṃ*. The use of these two words in other passages, especially in the *Āvaśy. Nijj.*, and the contents of the first *chedasūtra* itself which bears this name (see later on), point rather to *niṣedha* than to *niṣītha*. In the traditional conception as *niṣītha* we have to deal with a direct misunderstanding, which is without prejudice to the remaining points of identity between *niṣīha* and *niṣītha*.

The third *cūlā*, *bhavaṇajjhayaṇam V*. with but one *udd.*, has

⁸⁰ *saptai'kakāni ekasarāṇi, uddesakarahitāni*.

⁸¹ The following two *cūḍas* too, have only one *udd.* each and in this respect are exactly like the *sattikkaya*. They have, however, not been drawn into unison with the *sattikkaya* but remain independent.

reference to the observance of each of the 5 *bhāvanāh*, as conditions of the five *mahāvratas* ; and, as an introduction, gives the legends of the birth etc. of their teacher Mahāvīra.

The fourth *cūlā*, *vimutti*, also having but one *udd.*, consists of only eleven *jagati*-verses.

The table of contents of *aṅga* 1, found in *aṅga* 4, and in the *Nandī* is as follows : *se*⁸² *kiṃ taṃ āyāre ? āyāre ṇaṃ samaṇāṇaṃ niggaṃthāṇaṃ āyāragoyare*⁸³ *viṇaya-veṇaiyaṭṭhāṇa*⁸⁴ *gamaṇacamaṇa-pamāṇa-jogajum-janabhāsāsamitigutti* *seyyo-’vahi*⁸⁵ *bhatta-pāṇa-uggama-uppāyāṇesaṇā-visohi-suddhāsuddha-gaṇa*⁸⁶ *vaya-niyama-tavo’ vahāṇa-suppasattham āhijjai* [258] *se samāsau paṃcavihe pannatte : taṃ jahā : nāṇāyāre dāsaṇāyāre carittāyāre tavāyāre vīriyāyāre*. From this we derive but little information concerning details or for the grouping of the contents. Following upon the table of contents are statements in reference to the division into 2 *suyakkh*, 25 *ajjh*, etc ; this is also the case with the following *aṅgas*.

I have before me a commentary on *aṅga* 1, which was probably composed Śaka 798,⁸⁷ A. D. 876, and which at the end of the first part is designated as *Nirvṛtakulīnaśrī Śālyaghāryeṇa*^{88*} *Tattvādityāparanāmnā Vāharisādhushahāyena kṛtā* ; at the end of the second part as *ācāryā Śīlāṃkaviracitā*. This commentary is also a commentary on Prakrit *niryukti*,⁸⁹ composed in the *āryā* measure.

In the opening the author refers to other works and to a *śāstra-parijñāvivaraṇaṃ Gandhahastikṛtam*, the *sāra* of which he claims to

⁸² For this *se*, which corresponds to the *sa* of the *Sat. Br.*, see *Ind. Streifen*, 3, 391.

⁸³ *Goara N.*

⁸⁴ Instead of *thāna°* to *āhijjai N.* has merely : *sikkhābhāsābhāsācaraṇa-karaṇajāyā-māyāvitti (yatrā, mātṛa, vṛtti)*.

⁸⁵ *sāyyā upadhi*.

⁸⁶ *śāyyādīnām udgamādiviśuddhyā suddhānām asuddhānām ohagrahaṇam*.

⁸⁷ According to *Z. D. M. G.* 33, 478, it was composed Śamvat 550 ; but see *Kl.* 247b, where it is noted that the verse, which contains the date is added after the ‘colophon of the MS.’ and consequently ‘of no great weight’ in all probability. It is as follows : ‘*Sakaviṣṭay kā’ātī (°lāt !)* *saṃvatsarasāteṣu saptasu/aṣṭānavatīṭ-(navaty adhikeṣu vaiśākhaśuddhapāṃcamyām/ācāraṇikā kṛte ti*.

^{88*} Misreading for *Śīlācāryeṇa*.—L.

⁸⁹ Doubtless the same *niryukti* as that composed by the author of the *Āv. nijj.* (see ante, p. 252).

have excerpted. He states furthermore⁹⁰ that the *arhadvacanānuyoga*⁹¹ is divided into four groups : *dharmākathānuyoga uttarādhyayanādikaḥ*, *gaṇitānuyogaḥ sūryaprajñāptiyādikaḥ*, *dravyānuyogaḥ pūrvāṇi sammatyādikaḥ*⁹² *ca caritrakaraṇānuyogaś cā cārādikaḥ*⁹³ ; the last is *pradhāna-tamaḥ*, *śeṣāṇām tadarthatvāt*. These statements are in all essentials a reproduction [259] of those in *Āv. niḥj. 8,54* where *uttarādhy.* is represented by *isibhāsiyām*, which the commentator however explains by *uttarā*⁹⁴ ; see on *aṅga 4,44*.

II. The second *aṅgam*, *śuyagaḍa*, *sūtrakṛta* destined for the fourth year of study, see p. 223f. likewise treats in two *śrutaskandhas* (of which the first is composed in *ślokas* and other metres,⁹⁴ the second in prose with the exception of a small portion : *ajjh. 5,6*) of the *sādhvācāra*, the right course of action ; and is at the same time chiefly polemical in character.⁹⁵ According to *aṅga 4* and *Nandī*,⁹⁶ 363 heterodox opinions *annadīṭṭhiya* (*aṅga 4*, *pāsaṇḍiya N*) are here combated ; viz. : those of 180 *kiriyaṇvāi*, *kriyāṇvādin*, 84 *akiriyaṇvāi*, *akriyāṇvādin*, 67 *annāṇiyavāi*, *ajñāṇika*, 32 *veṇaiyavāi*, *vainayika*.^{97*} In consequence of this the commentary frequently cites the names of Cārvāka, Śākya, Bauddha, Sāṃkhya, Vaiśeṣika, as those who are to be understood by the *ege* cited in the text as opponents. These are also referred to in the text as *jāṇayā*, explained in the comm. by *paṇḍitammanyā Bauddhāḥ*. But as the root *jñā* is elsewhere used by the Jains chiefly in a good sense,⁹⁸ I should at least give expression to the conjecture that by these *jāṇayā* the Vaideha king Janaka was meant,^{99*} [260] concerning

90 The following passage is found also in Śānticaṇḍra on *up. 6*, according to which Śīlāṃkācārya commented also upon the second *aṅga*, cf. Kl. 247b.

91 *sūtrād anu paścād arthasya yogo anuyogaḥ. sūtrādhyayanāt paścād arthakathanam.*

92 ? likewise *Śāntica*. ; by this the rest of the contents of the *dīṣṭivāda* is perhaps referred to which treated partly of the different *dīṣṭis* or *sammatis*.

93 *‘acārāṅgādikaḥ Śāntica*.

94 *vaitāliya*, *triṣṭubh*, but not *āryā*.

95 *iha hi pravacane catvāro ‘nuyogāḥ* (see p. 258) : *caranākaraṇānuyogaḥ dravyā° dharmakathā°*, *gaṇitā°* : *tatra prathamam śrīmadācārāṅgam carana°*, *gaṇprādhānyena vyākhyātam*, *athe dam śrīśūtrakṛtākhyam dvitīyaṅgam dra° gaṇprādhānyena vyākhyāyate* ; *sūtram svapara samayasūcanam kṛtam yena tat sūtrakṛtam*.

96 Cited from this as well as from other sources in the introduction to Malayagiri's Comm. on the second *upāṅga* and in many other places.

97* It is a most curious fact that a Tibetan text quoted by Schiefner. *Ind. Stud.* Vol. IV. p. 335 exhibits also an enumeration of 363 heterodox opinions. As in Buddhist texts this number is not found anywhere (as far as I am aware) it might be that one day Tibetan translations of Jain texts should turn up.—L.

98 cf. also the designation of their founder under the name of Nāyaputta, cf. p. 261.

99* Jānaka from Janaka, as Bauddha from Buddha. Another explanation of the term

whom and his guru Yājñavalkya all sorts of statements are preserved in the legends of the twelfth book of the *Mahābhārata*, representing either the king or both the king and his guru as having affiliations with Buddhism. See *Ind. Stud.* 1,482.¹⁰⁰ Jacobi, whom I consulted in the matter, proposed (April 6th, 1880) that *yānaka* (cf. *hīnayāna*, *mahāyāna*) might be thought of in connection with *jānaya*.

The titles of the 23 *ajjhayanas* of the *sūtrakṛta* are enumerated in the fourth *aṅga* § 23 (=S) in their present order; also in *Āvaśy.* 16, where, however, the sixteen *ajjh.* of the first *śrutaskandha* are apparently placed after seven *ajjh.* of the second *śrut.* In v. 65, 66 in the first place the first sixteen are enumerated by themselves and in v. 102 the seven others by themselves; but after *nālaṇḍam*—the last one—we read *solasāṁ ca tevīsāṁ*. It is, to be sure, not impossible that these words *solasāṁ ca* are a mere reference to the earlier enumeration in v. 65, 66; but, at any rate, we should have expected that this reference would occur before the first of these seven names and not after the seventh. Also in the *Vidhiprapā* (= V), the names are singly enumerated; they are:

a. First *śrutaskandha*.

1. *samaya*, with 4 *udd.*, 89 vv.; *bhūtavadādimataṁ nirākriyate*; *udd.* 1 closes: *Nāyaputte Mahāvīre* [261] *evam āha Jiṇottame tti bemi* ||27|| H. Jacobi (*Kalpas.* p. 6.) is the first scholar who identified the name of Mahāvīra¹⁰¹ occurring here, with Nigaṇṭha Nātaputra (or Nigaṇṭha-

jānaya applied to the Bauddhas may perhaps claim more attention than the one ventured in the text by Prof. Weber. We know that the founders of religious systems in India as well as elsewhere were as a rule called by *epitheta ornantia* (such as *buddha jina mahāvīra* &c. &c.) Two of these epithets as applied to Śākyamuni or in fact to the Bauddhas in general in Buddhist texts are *janaka* and *pricchaka* i.e. "knower" and "asker" (see for instance *Divyāvadāna.* ed. Cowell and Neil, pp. 184 & 290; by the editors rendered by "general interrogator" !!). Most probably those two epithets refer to the supposition pervading not only Buddhist but also Jain texts that the founder of the religion knew everything, but nevertheless, when conversing with any one, asked as if he knew not. Now it might well be that the Jain author of the above metrical passage of *aṅga* 2 chose in metre—as he would perhaps not have done in prose—a term not very common but still perfectly clear to his contemporaries for referring to his adversaries of Buddha's party, the terms *janaka* and *pricchaka* being not found (as others are e. g. *buddha jina* &c) with reference to Mahāvīra in either of the two literatures, of Bauddhas and Jainas.—L.

¹⁰⁰ The legend of the six false teachers found in the Buddhist texts, (see my *Vorles. über ind.* L-G. 304 (249,1) Burnouf *Lotus*, p. 485, Weber's *Ind. Streifen.* 3,504), is told of Janaka and Yājñavalkya. For the peculiar use of the word Videha or *vid eha* among the Jains, (see page 261n) the reader is referred to *Bhagav.* 2,305, and to my treatise on the *Satr. Māh.* p. 20.

¹⁰¹ According to the legend Vīra first descended into the womb of the Brāhmaṇi

nātha, "fils de Jñāti". Burnouf, *Lotus*, p. 450, 486) who is mentioned in the Buddhistic legends as a contemporary of Ajātaśatru or of Buddha. A reference similar to that given here is found in 3 (cf. 5 and 6). See my remarks on *aṅga* 10.

2. *veyāliya*,¹⁰² *vetāliya* °liya V, *vaidārika*, with 3 *udd.*, 76 vv. ; *yathākarma vidāryate*. It begins *sambujjhaha ; kim na bujjhaha ? sambohi puna pecca dullahā*. This *ajjh.* is not referred by the Scholiast to Vīra, but is characterized as a teaching of Rṣabhasvāmin to his sons ; with which statement the conclusion of the third *udd.* is however not in harmony. This chapter is composed in the metre called *vaitāliya* by Piṅgala (*chandas* 4,32) and by Varāhamihira (104,55). In my opinion great importance must be attached to this circumstance. It is very probable that the similarity of this name with that of the title of our chapter is to be explained by the assumption that the metre had taken its name from the text in that metre. This designation would not only be a direct testimony [262] to the existence of this text at the time of Piṅgala and of Varāhamihira, but also—inasmuch as it rests¹⁰³ upon a representation of the Prakrit word *veyālia* in Sanskrit which was liable to be misunderstood, or upon an incorrect spelling with inorganic *t*—might be regarded as a proof that even at that early period the title of this chapter had been handed down in this incorrect form. Both of these probabilities are of extreme interest. We must here notice that Varāhamihira expressly cites Māgadhi as a "Prakrit" synonym of *vaitāliyam*—see *Ind. Stud.* 8,295—from which we may with probability infer that a direct reference is made to the language of our text or to the language of Buddha.¹⁰⁴ Of interest, furthermore, is the fact that on 2, 1, instead of *māhaṇa* (= *brāhmaṇa*) used in a good sense—which is a proof of the antiquity of the text—, the scholiast mentions the various reading *je viū* (*vidus*), *yo vidvān*. The latter is probably an intentional change of a secondary nature or per-

Devānandā, wife of the Brāhmaṇa Usabhadatta (Kodālasagotta), in Kundaggāma ; thence into the womb of the khattiyānī Tisālā, wife of the khattiya Siddhattha (Kāsavagotta), of the race of the khattiya called Nāya, in the same place, Vīra is therefore called their son. Cf. also (see page 263) the statements of Abhayadeva : Viśālā Mahāvīra-janani ! He is designated both as Nāe Nāyaputte Nāyakulacandē and as Videhe Videhajacce (Kalpas § 110).

¹⁰² With inorganic *t* : *vetāliamaggam āgao* at the conclusion of *udd.* 1 is explained by *karmanām vaidārikam vidāraṇasamarthaṁ mārgam*. *veyālia* in the name of the *dasave*° is explained quite differently.

¹⁰³ The derivation from *vetāla* (*Ind. Stud.* 8,168,178) would then be overturned.

¹⁰⁴ Buddha seems to have made use of this metre, since it is used in the *Dhammapada*, etc.

haps a removal of the original. At the conclusion of *udd. 3*, which is composed in prose, we read : *evam śe udāhu aṇuttaramāṇī aṇuttaradaṃsi aṇuttaranāṇadaṃsaṇadhare arahā Nāyaputte bhagavaṃ Vesālie viyāhie (vyākhyātavān) tti bemi*. The scholiast illustrates Jñātaputra strangely enough by Vardhamānasvāmī Rṣabhasvāmī vā and explains *Vesālie* in the first case (*i.e.* when Jñātaputra means Vardham) by Viśāla-nagaryām, in the second (*i.e.* when Jñātap. means Rṣabha) by *vaiśālikaḥ (viśālakulod-bhavatvāt)*. In any case this epithet, which is probably a nominative, is of extreme interest in this connection. Abhayadeva, too, [263] on *Bhag. 2,1,12,2* explains *Vaiśālika* by Mahāvīra and in fact as a metronymicum(!) : Viśāla Mahāvīrajananī. The *Vesāliya-sāvaga* appear elsewhere in the Jaina legends, but—and herein is to be found a divergence from the Buddhist legend—in a favourable light see *Bhagav. 2,197.249* ; 1,440.

3. *uvasaggaparinnā, upasargaparijñā* with 4 *udd.*, 83 vv. ; *pratikūlāḥ* and *anukūlāḥ upasargāḥ, taiś cā 'dhyātman viśādaḥ*.

4. *itthiparinnā, thiṇa° V, strīparijñā*, with 2 *udd.*, 53 vv. ; *strīpari-ṣaho jeyah* ; conclusion in prose : *icc evam āhu se Vire dhuyarae .. tti bemi*.

5. *narayavibhatti, niraya V, narakavibhakti* with 2 *udd.*, 52 vv. ; *strīvaśagasya narakapātaḥ tatra ca yādṛśyo vedanāḥ*. "I asked the *kevalia mahesi*"—thus the author, according to the scholiast : Sudharmasvāmin begins his recital. "Thus questioned by me, *Kāsave āsupanne (āsu-prajñāḥ) i. e. Vīra*, spoke."

6. *Viratthao, Mahāvīrastava*, with 29 vv. ; it begins : "The *samaṇas* and *māhaṇas*, the *agārins* and the *paratitthiyas* (*Śākyādayaḥ*) asked about the doctrine and life (*nāṇaṃ, dāmaṇaṃ, silaṃ*) of the *Nata*."

7. *kuṣīlaparibhāsiyaṃ °bhāṣā V, kuṣīlaparibhāṣā*, with 30 vv. ; *sarve jīvāḥ sukhaiṣiṇaḥ*.

8. *vīriyaṃ* with 26 vv. ; of *bāla* and of *paṇḍiya* ; in v. 25 *buddhāḥ* in a good sense = *jñātatatvās*.

9. *dhmmo* with 36 vv. ; in v. 1 *māhaṇeṇa maimayā, brāhmaṇeṇa matimatā* referred by the Schol. to *Vīra*. It concludes : *goravāṇi ya savvāṇi nivvāṇaṃ saṃdhae*¹⁰⁵ *muṇi tti bemi* [264].

10. *samāhi, samādhi*, with 24 vv. ; it concludes : *no jīviāṃ no maraṇā 'bhikaṃkhī carejjā bhikkhū valagā vimukko tti bemi* ; in place of *valagā* we find in 12,22, 13,23, where the same conclusion recurs : *valayā*, and

¹⁰⁵ Or, simply 'the learned'.

in the schol. *valayam* is explained by *bhāva-valayam*, *māyā saṁsāraḥ*. If this reading is correct, perhaps Vedic-*valaga* might be thought of.¹⁰⁶

11. *Maggo, mārga*, with 36 vv., ; in v. 1 *māhaṇeṇa matīmatā* as in 9,1.
12. *samosaraṇam*, *samava*°, with 22 vv. ; *kumārgatyāgaḥ* ; four *samavasaraṇāni paratīrthikābhyupagamasamūharūpāni*, i.e. the 180 *kiri-yāvāi* etc. (see p. 259,266).
13. *ahataham*, *yathātatham* (hence by the ampliative *ika* or *ya* also) *āhattahie*, *āhittihie*, *āhattahijjam* ; *avitaha* (*Āv*), with 23 vv. ; *samyak-caritram*.
14. *gaṁtha* (*gaṁdho* V), *grantha*, with 27 vv. ; *grantham dhanādikam tyaktvā*.
15. *jam-aīam*, *yam atītam* (according to the opening words), or *ādāniyam* ; with 25 vv.
16. *gāhā* or *gāthāṣoḍaśakam* ;¹⁰⁷ despite this name, a prose explanation of the names *māhaṇa*, *samaṇa*, *bhikkhu*, *niggamtha* and their identical signification (*ekārthā*).

b. Second *śrutaskandha*.

1. *puṇḍarie*, °*riyam* V, *puṇḍarika*.¹⁰⁸ Comparison of the *bhikkhu* with a lotus flower in the middle of a pond ; it begins (see above, p. 248) : *suam me āusam*, *teṇam bhagavayā* [265] *evam akkhāyam* ; *iha khalu puṇḍariya nāmaṁ ajjhayaṇe*, *tassa ṇaṁ ayaṁ atṭhe pannatte*. This introductory formula, the second part of which occurs again in *aṅga* 6 *et seq.*, is repeated with corresponding modification in *ajjh.* 2-4. All four *ajjh.* are in prose.

2. *kiriyaṭṭhāṇam*, of the 12 or 13 *kriyāsthāna*.

3. *āhāraparinnā*, °*parijñā*. In the schol. a variant of the scholars of Nāgārjuna is adduced with the words *Nāgārjunī(ya)s tu paṭhamti*. *Nāgajjunavāyaga*, or °*nāyaria*, °*narisi*, is mentioned with great honour in the opening of the *Nandī* and of the *Āv.*, in the list of teachers v. 39, 40, 45, and in fact as separated by three gradations merely—

¹⁰⁶ *mokṣam saṁdadhyāt*.

¹⁰⁷ cf. also the manner of death *valayamayakam*, *up.* 1.70, "death by magic arts ?" Little can be made out of the commentaries. See the excellent glossary of Leumann which reaches me, May 1883, while these sheets are in the press.

¹⁰⁸ *gāthāṣoḍaśākhyam ṣoḍaśam adhyayanam*. In V., *gāthāsolasagonāmagaḥ*.

Bhūadinna, *Lohicca* and *Dūsagaṇi*—from the author himself, whom the scholiast calls *Devavācaka* = *Devarddhigaṇi*, *Jacobi*, *Kalpas*. p. 15n.

4. *paccakkhāṇakiriyā*, *pratyākhyānakriyā*.

5. in S. *Āv*. V. *aṇagāraṃ* (°*rasuya* S.) ; here however correctly *aṇāyārasutam*, *anācāraśrutam*, in 34 vv. ; it opens as follows : *ādāya baṇbhaceraṃ ca āsupanne (āsuprajñāḥ paṇḍitaḥ) imaṃ caraṃ | assim (asmin) dhamme aṇāyāraṃ n'āyareyyā kayā i vi ||*

6. *Addaijjaṃ Ādrakiyaṃ*, in 55 vv. A sermon of *Ādraka*, the son of a merchant who, according to the scholiast, from the sight of a picture of Jina sent to him as a debt of gratitude by *Abhayakumāra* (the son of the king *Sreṇika* of *Rājagṛha*), obtained *jāṭismaraṇam* and turned to *pravrajyā* so as to receive the *pratyekabuddha* dignity, etc. The sermon appears to be addressed to *Gośāla*. In the last verse : *buddhassa āṇāe imaṃ samāhiṃ (tattvajñasya śrī Virasya ājñāyām...)*, *buddha* is used directly as a name of *Vīra*. [266]

7. *Nālaṃdaijjaṃ*, °*dā* V., *Nālaṃdiyaṃ*,¹⁰⁹ in prose ; (*śrāvaka* *vidhiḥ*).¹¹⁰ Legend of *Udaya* (*Udaka*) *Peḍhālaputta* *Metajja*,¹¹¹ a *Pāsāvaccijja*, *Pārśvāpatyīya*, i.e. scholar, or follower of *Pārśva*, whom the *bhagavaṃ* *Goyama* (*Indrabhūti*) leads to *Mahāvīra*, after he has heard the same from the *Kumāravuttiya* (*Kumāraputrīya*), *nāma samaṇā niggaṃthā*. *Udaya* thus¹¹² leaves the *cāujjāma dhamma* of *Pārśva* and accepts the *pañcamahavvaiyaṃ sapaḍikkamaṇaṃ dhammam* of *Mahāvīra*.

The table of contents in *aṅga* 4 (or *Nandi*) is as follows : *kiṃ taṃ sūyagade ?*¹¹³ *sūyagade naṃ sasamayā sūijjamti parasamayā s. sasamayaparasamayā s., jivā s. ajivā s. jivājivā s., logo s. alogo s. logālogo s.*;¹¹⁴ *sūyagade naṃ jivājivā*¹¹⁵ *-punna-pāv-āsava-saṃvara-nijjara-baṃdha-mokkhāvasāṇā payatthā sūijjamti ; samaṇāṇaṃ acirakālapavvaīyāṇaṃ kusamayamohamatimohiyāṇaṃ saṃdehajāya-sahajabuddhi-pariṇāma-*

¹⁰⁹ cf. *aṅga* 6,1,19.

¹¹⁰ Named from *Nālandā*, a suburb (? *bāhrikā*) of *Rājagṛha*.

¹¹¹ In the preceding 22 *ajjh. sādhy-ācāraḥ prarūpitaḥ*.

¹¹² *Medāryagotreṇa* schol. ; I conjecture that this is a misunderstanding for *Mevārya*—see above, p. 235 *Metārya* is regarded as the tenth scholar of *Mahāvīra* ; see Hem. v. 32.

¹¹³ s. *Bhagavatī* 2,185 and *Jacobi*, *ante*, Vol. IX. p. 160.

¹¹⁴ *sūcanāt sūtraṃ, sūtreṇa kṛtaṃ tat sūtrakṛtaṃ*.

¹¹⁵ In N. we first read *loe*, *aloe*, *loyālog*, then *jivā aj. j.* lastly *sasamae* p. *sasamaapara-samae* ; so also in the following *aṅgas*. The verb is in each of the nine instances in the plural ; *sūijjamti*. The triads ; *jivājivājivāṃ (jivā ajivā. jivājivā) loka'loka. lokaḥ (lokālokaḥ)*, *sat asat sad-asat* are assigned specially to the *Terāsiyas*, *Trairāsiḥ*, by *Abh.* on *aṅga* 12,1.

*samsaiyāṇam*¹¹⁶ *pāvakaramaliṇamaiguṇavisohanattham*, *asiyassa kiriyāvāi-sayassa, cāurāsie akiriyāvāiṇam, sattatthie annāṇiyavāiṇam vattisāe veṇaiyavāiṇam, tiṇham tesatthāṇam annadiṭṭhiya*¹¹⁷ *sayāṇam būham*¹¹⁸ [267] *kiccā sasamae thāvijjai*,¹¹⁹ *nāṇadiṭṭhāṃta*¹²⁰ *vayaṇā nissāram suṭṭhu darisayaṃtā vivihavitttharāṇugamaparamasabbhāva-guṇavisiṭṭhā mokkhapa-hodāragā*¹²¹ *udārā annāṇatam 'amdhakāraduggesu divabhūyā sopāṇā ceva siddhisugaigharuttamassa*¹²² *nikkhobhaṇippakampasuttatthā*.¹²³

I have before me the commentary of *Harṣakula*¹²⁴ from the *Tapāgaccha*. It was composed "varṣe 1583," but not after *Vīra*, but after *Vikrama*, i.e. A.D. 1527.¹²⁵ The origin of the *Tapāgaccha* dates from *Vīra* 1755.

III. The third *aṅgam*, *thāṇam sthānam* : an enumeration arranged in categories designed for the instruction of the more advanced and in fact for the eighth year of their instruction.¹²⁶ The categories comprise successively subjects or conceptions conceived as one, two, and so on up to ten. Hence the whole text consists of 10 *ajjhayaṇa*, which are called *ekasthāna*, *dvisthāna*, etc. ; *ajjh.* 2-4 each contain 4 *udd.*, *ajjh.* 5 three *udd.* the rest of the *ajjh.* have no such sub-division, and exist as *egasarāṇi* (V) of one *udd.* each.

From the miscellaneous contents of this compendium I extract the following : the *nakṣatras* : *addā, cittā, sāti* [268] are designated as *egatāre*, and then the number of the stars of the other *nakṣatras* is enumerated.¹²⁷ In an enumeration of the divisions of time in 2, 4—

¹¹⁶ *jivāṇi*° to *visohanattham* is omitted by N.

¹¹⁷ *saṃdehajātāśca sahaṇabuddhipariṇāmasaṃsayitāśca ye*.

¹¹⁸ *pāsamḍiya* N.

¹¹⁹ *pratikṣepam*.

¹²⁰ °*vijjāṃti* N.

¹²¹ *nāṇā*° etc. omitted in N.

¹²² *mokṣapathāvatāraka*.

¹²³ *gṛhottamasya*,

¹²⁴ *sūtram cārthas ca niryukti-bhāṣya-saṃgrahani-vṛtti-cūrṇi-pañjikādirūpa iti sūtrārthaḥ*.

¹²⁵ We have a commentary to the fourth *pāinna* by a certain *Harṣakuśala*.

¹²⁶ The statements in reference to genealogy at the end are in agreement with *Dharma-sāgara's Gurvāvali* of the *Tapāgaccha*, of the members of which patriarchs 44, 52-57 are mentioned ; so that between 53 and 54 a *Jagaccandramuni* is referred to. See Kl. p. 257ab.

¹²⁷ *tatra bhavyasya mokṣābhilāṣiṇaḥ sthitagurūpadeśasya prānino'stavarṣapra-māṇapravrajyā-paryāyasyai 'va sūtrato 'pi sthānāṅgam deyam*, *Abhayadeva* ; see above p. 223, 224.

beginning with *āvaliyā* and reaching to *śisapahelia*,¹²⁸ *pallovama śāgarovama*, *osappiṇī*, *ussappiṇī*—the *yuga* is inserted between the year and the century as intermediate gradation and the quinquennial *yugam* is thereby still used as a means of calculation. On the other hand, we have here the same enormous extension of periods of time, which we find in *upāṅga* 6 (*Jambūddivapannatti*) and in the *Anuyogadvārasūtra*; see *Bhagav.* 1, 427,¹²⁹ though the latter works contain some modifications not present here. The existence of the above-mentioned *upāṅga* is furthermore recognised directly in 4, 1 : *cattāri pannattīu aṅgabāhīriyāu paṁ (nattāu), taṁ (jahā) : Caṁḍapannatti, Sūrapannatti, Jambūddivapannatti, Divasāgarapannatti*. The three *pannattis*, which are here mentioned in addition, occur again in 3, 1 : *tāo pannattīu kāleṇaṁ ahijjanti, taṁ : Caṁḍapannatti, Sūrapannatti, Divasāgarapannatti*. Here and in 4, 1, are found the titles of *upāṅga* 7, 5, 6, in 3, 1, those of *up.* 7, 5; to which in both cases the *divasā* is joined, which, though not an independent member of *Siddhānta*, appears however as a section of the third *upāṅga*. That we have here to deal with the *upāṅgas* respectively named so and not merely [269] with homonymous doctrines, is proved by one circumstance especially; that besides the above-mentioned enumeration of the periods of time, the *abhijit* series of the *nakṣatras*, which belongs to these works, is here already known—see *ajjh.* 7 near the end.¹³⁰ And even if the direct mention of *upāṅga* texts is in this case doubtful because such mention in the *aṅgas* does not occur in the text, but in the insertions at the hand of the redactor, in this case the designation (in 4, 1) of the four texts as *aṅgabāhīriya* is so distinct and so points to their actual existence apart from the *aṅgas*, that all doubts are put at rest. How far the existing texts of *upāṅga* 7, 5, 6, are meant by this, is, as we shall soon see, still an open question. One circumstance is worthy of note : the order of names here is different from that of the existing texts; and the fourth name is equivalent merely to a part of the third *upāṅga* and not to the *upāṅga* itself.

We find in chapter 10 a second and more important statement or mention of texts existing apart from the *aṅgas*. In that chapter are specified not merely the names [270] of ten *dasāu* (i.e. texts containing ten *ajjhayaṇas*), but also the names of each of the 10 *ajjh.* Among

¹²⁸ See my treatise on the *nakṣatras*, 2,381. *Ind. Stud.* 9,448,10,293. According to the schol. we have here to do with the *kṛttikā* series cf. *Bhag.* 1,373,441. The names of the *nakṣatras* appear here invariably in their secondary form; *dhaniṭṭha*, *bhaddavayā*, etc. The name of the *ahibudhnyā* is (2,3) corrupted into *vividhā* (see *Ind. Stud.* 10,296).

¹²⁹ A number of 194 places ! *tasyāṁ caturnavatyadhikāṁ aṁkāsthānaśataṁ bhāvati*.

¹³⁰ According to Leumann's communication this occurs also in *aṅga* 5,5,1. 6,7, 25,5.

these are the names of four *aṅgas* (7-10), references to a fifth (11), and the name of the fourth *chedasūtra*; the other four names have in our *Siddhānta* no place whatever (*asmākam apratītāḥ*, *Abh.* fol. 285a).

At the head stand the *kammavivāgadasāu*; by this name the eleventh *aṅga* is meant—*vivāgasue*, *vipākaśrutam*; it contains, however, not merely 10 but 20 *ajjah*.; and the names adduced here as being those of the ten *ajjh*. are found only in part in *aṅga* 11. Two of them, at least, are exactly the same (1,4) and three partly so (6-8); so that we cannot gainsay that there is some connection¹³¹ between these *dasāu* and *aṅga* 11. The names of the ten *ajjah*. here are: *Miyāputte*¹³², *Guttāse*¹³³, *aṁde*¹³⁴, *Sagaḍe* 'ti ā vare¹³⁵ māhaṇe, *Naṁdisene*¹³⁶ ya, *Sorie*¹³⁷ ya, *Udumbare sahasuddāe āmalae*¹³⁸ *kumāre Lecai* 'ti ya. It is well to be noted that in *aṅga* 4 (§ 43) too a text entitled *kammavivāya* is mentioned, [271] though 43 *ajjh*. are ascribed to it; and in the *Kalpa-sūtra Jinacar.* (§ 147) 55 *ajjh*. are attributed to the *pāvaphalavivāyāim* alone; this was a subject which invited repeated working over!

The titles of *aṅgas* 7-9 appear as *dasāu* 2-4; and complete agreement exists in reference to the *uvāsagadasāu* (*aṅga* 7), even as regards the names of the ten *ajjhayanās*. The eighth and ninth *aṅga*, the *aṁtagaḍa-dasāu* and the *aṁuttarovavātiyadasāu* have here however only ten *ajjh*. allotted them, whereas in the *Siddhānta* they have 93 or 33. The names of the ten *ajjh*. are for *aṁtagaḍad*: *Nami Mayamge Somile Rāma-*

¹³¹ *mahānakkhatte sattatāre paṁ tam : abhitiāiyā naṁ satta nakkhattā puvvadāriyā paṁ tam : abhi, savane, dhañiṭṭhā, sattabhisayā, uttarabhaddavayā, revatī : assiniyādiyā naṁ satta nakkhattā dāhiṇadāriyā paṁ, tam : assinī, bharaṇī, kattiya, rohinī, magasira, addā, pumavvasu ; pussatiyā naṁ satta nakkhattā avaradāriyā paṁ, tam ; pusse, asilesā, mahā, puvvāphagguṇī, uttarāphagguṇī, hattho, citta ; sātīyādiyā naṁ satta nakkhattā uttaradāriyā paṁ, tam : sātī, viśāhā, anurāhā, jeṭṭhā, mūlā, puvvā āsādhā, uttarā āsādhā, cf. *Naks.* 2,377n, *Ind. Stud.* 10,304, and see my comments on *aṅga* 4, 7.*

¹³² *Abh.* identifies them directly with the first *śrutaskandha* of the eleventh *aṅga* and represents the names and the contents of the single 10 *adhy.* as being all in harmony with the contents of the 10 *adhy.* found there.

¹³³ *Mṛgā*, wife of *Vijaya*, king of the city *Mṛgagrāma*.

¹³⁴ *gās trāsītavān iti Gotrāso...idam eva co'jjhitaka nāmnā Vipākaśrute ujhitakam ucyate.*

¹³⁵ cf. *aṅga* 6,1,3...: *kukkuṭādyaneḥkavidhāṁḍakabhāṁḍavyavahāriṇo...*; *Vipākaśrute cā 'bhaggasena iti 'dam adhyayanam ucyate.*

¹³⁶ *śakaṭam iti cā' param.*

¹³⁷ *Vipākaśrute ca Naṁdivardhanaḥ śrūyate.*

¹³⁸ *Saurika.*

gutte^{139*} *Sudaṃsaṇe ceva/Jamālī ya Bhagālī ya Kimkamme Pillate ti ya, Phāle Aṃbaṭṭhaputte*^{140*} *ya 'em (evam) ete dasa āhiyā || Among these I can discover but one name, Bhagālī, which shows any connection with aṅga 8,4,2 (Mayālī) ; or perhaps we may extend the number to two names connected with 9,3,4,5 Pellae, Rāmaputte. The names of the ten ajjh. of the aṇutī° are, Isidāse ya Dhanne ya Sunakkhatte kattite (kārttika) ti ya | Saṃdhāṇe Sālibhadde ya Āṇaṃde Teyalī*^{141*} *ti ya | Dasannabhadde Aimutte em ete dasa āhiyā || Among these are at least three names which recur in aṅga 9, 3, 1-3.*

It is perfectly manifest that the author of aṅga 3 possessed entirely different texts of aṅgas 8,9, than those in our possession. The same holds good in the case of aṅga 4, since it ascribe to these aṅgas only ten ajjh. each. See below. The means made use of by Ābhayadeva to reconcile this discrepancy are very simple. He says, on aṅga 8, after [272] recognizing the fact of the discrepancy : *tato vācanāmtarāpekṣayānī* ('kānī ?) *'mānī' ti sambhāvayāmo, navajanmāmtaram apekṣayai 'tāni bhaviṣyanti 'ti vācyāṃ, janmāmtarāṇaṃ tatā'nabhidhiy'mānatvād iti*—and likewise on aṅga 9 : *tad evaṃ ihā'pi vācanāmtarāpekṣayā adhyayanavibhāga ukto, na punar upalabhyamānavācanā-pekṣaye 'ti*. His statements in reference to the stories themselves are given with tolerable detail on aṅga 9.

As the fifth member of the ten dasāu the āyāradasāu are enumerated. The names cited for the ten ajjh. belonging to these are identical with those of chedasūtra 4. This therefore proves that the latter is to be understood by the āyāradasāu.

As the sixth of the dasāu texts the Paṇhāvāgarāṇadasāu are named. This is to be sure the name of the tenth aṅga, which is also divided into 10 dāras but not into 10 ajjh. The names of the ten ajjh. quoted here show very plainly that here, as in the case of aṅgas 8, 9, the author had quite a different, and in fact an older,

^{139*} *sahasuddāe* A (with *h* fallen out), *sahasuddāhe* B ; *sahasā akasmād uddāhaḥ prakṛ-ṣṭodāhaḥ sahasrāṇaṃ vā lokasyo 'ddāhaḥ sahasroddāhaḥ āmalae tti raśruter laśrutir ity āmarakaḥ samastyena mārīr...*

^{140*} *Rāmaputra*, with the Digambaras, see the *Tattvārthavārttika* in Prof. Peterson's *Second Report*, p. 157. Also the existent Śvetāmbara text presents *Rāmaputte*, see below p. 324.—L.

^{141*} Thus B. *Avvaddha*° A. With the Digambaras we find (1. c) *Yamālī kavalika- niṣ-kambala-pāl-Āmbaṣṭaputra*. In some better MS the first name might turn out to be *Yamālī* and in the second some name corresponding to *Bhagālī* may be hidden.—L.

text before him than the one we now possess. These names are in agreement with the name of the *aṅga* itself, whereas our text of this *aṅga* shows no connection with it. The names are : *uvamā*, *saṁkhā*, *isibhāsiyāim*,^{142*} *āyariyabhāsiyāim*, *Mahāvīrabhāsiyāim*, *khomagapasiṇāim*, *komalapasiṇāim*, *addāgapasiṇāim*, *aṁguṭṭhapasiṇāim*, *bāhupasiṇāim*. The names of *ajjh.* 6, 8, 9, 10, recur in that table of contents of *aṅga* 10 which is found in *aṅga* 4 (and *Nandī*) so that there the text which existed at the period of *aṅga* 3 and not our present text, is meant. Abhayadeva says, in so many words : *praśnavyākaraṇadaśā iho'ktarūpā na drśyamānte, drśyamānās tu pañcāśravapañcasamvarātmikā iti, ihoktānām tū' pamādinām adhyayanānām akṣarārthaḥ* [273] *pratīyamāna eve ti*.^{143*}

The names of the following four *dasāu* do not recur elsewhere. The names of the 10 *ajjh.* of *dasā* 10 are mentioned, not as parts of the *Siddhānta* but as belonging in or to it. In the seventh place appear the *baṁdhadasāu*, the 10 *ajjh.* of which have the following names : *baṁdhe*¹⁴⁴ *ya mokkhe ya deviddhī Dasāramāṇdale ti ya | āyariyavipaḍivattī' uvajjhāyavippaḍivattī' | bhāvaṇā vimottī sāsate kamme*. In the eighth place we find the *dogiddhidadasāu* (*dvigṛddhi*) with the following names.¹⁴⁵ *vāte vivāte sukhette kaṣiṇe tī ya | bāyālīsam suviṇā' tīsam mahāsuviṇā hāre*¹⁴⁶ *Rāmagutte ya eyam ee dasa āhiyā*.¹⁴⁷ In the ninth place the *dīha-dasāu* with following names : *camde sure ya sukke ya, Siridevī, Pabhāvaī | divasamuddovavattī, Bahu-putti, Māmdare ti ya | there 'Saṁbhuyavijae, there Pamha-ussāsanissāse*||. Abhayadeva points out here some connection with the *narakāvalikā* or *nirayāvalikā-śrūtaskandha*, i.e. *upāṅgas* 8-12.¹⁴⁸ Finally in the tenth place are the *saṁkheviyadasāu*¹⁴⁹ with the foll. names *khuddiyā vimāṇapavibhatti, mahalliyā vimāṇa* [274] *pavibhatti, aṁgacūliyā, vaggacūliyā vivāhacūliyā, Aruṇovavāe, Varāṇo-*

^{142*} *Taitalisuta iti yo jñātādhyayaneṣu (aṅga 6,1,14) śrūyate sa nā'yam tasya siddhi-gamaṇāśravaṇāt*. We have here in all probability an intentional variation.

^{143*} This text is treated in greater detail on *aṅga* 4 § 44. It has been discovered by Prof. Peterson, see his *Third Report*, p. 26 and 253.—L.

¹⁴⁴ *kṣaumatkādiṣu devatāvatāraḥ kriyata iti, tatra kṣaumatam vastram, addāgo ādarśaḥ*.

¹⁴⁵ *baṁdhādy-adhyānāni, śrautenā' rtthena vyākhyātavyāni*.

¹⁴⁶ *dvigṛthi (!) dasāś ca svarūpato 'py anavasitāḥ*.

¹⁴⁷ *var. ; hare, hāle*.

¹⁴⁸ These are but nine ; in a MS. belonging to Sir Mon. Williams, according to Leumann, *bāvattariṁ savvasuminā* are named in the tenth place. For the dreams cf. the *mahāsuviṇā* above. p. 224, also cited among the *anaṅgapavivāṭṭha* texts in the *Pāṭikās*. and in the *Vidhipr*.

¹⁴⁹ *dīrghadaśaḥ svarūpato 'navagatā eva, tad-adhyayanāni (kāni) cin narakāvalikā-śrūtaskandha upalabhyamte ; tatra camādravaktavyatā-pratibaddham camādrām adhyayanam, tathāhi : Rājagṛhe ; śeṣāni trīṇy apratīṭāni*.

vavāe (*Varu°* in the Schol, perhaps *Dhara°*) *Garulovavāe*, *Velamdharovavāe*, *Vesamaṇovavāe*. All these names recur in the *anāṅgapaviṭṭha* list of the *Nandī* (*Pākṣikas*, *Vidhipr.*). We have seen above, p. 223, 224, that the five *ajjhayaṇaṣ* beginning with *khuddiyavimāṇa* are designed for the eleventh year of study, the five¹⁵⁰ *ajjha* which begin with *aruṇovavāa* for the twelfth year of study. From this two facts are plain : first, that they still existed at the date of composition of the *versus memoriales* in question, secondly, that they were of great importance in so far as their study is made to occur after that designed for *aṅga* 5 i. e. the tenth year. By *vivāhacūliyā* (*vyākhyā bhagavatī*, *tasyāś cūlikā*) we may remark in passing, we are to understand one or more of those supplements to *aṅga* 5, all of which now appear to have been incorporated in that *aṅga*.

We cannot doubt that all the texts mentioned above were thus constituted at the period of the existence of *aṅga* 3. Hence the extreme interest of this detailed presentation of the subject. It is only as regards *aṅga* 7 and *chedasūtra* 4 that this account is in entire agreement with the existing text of the *Siddhānta* ; in all other particulars this account is either widely different or has reference to texts,¹⁵¹ which are not found in the *Siddhānta* at all. The proof here given of the fact that from the mention of a work in one place or another there does not [275] follow the identity of the then existing texts with the present (though in reality proof of a fact that is self-evident) is nevertheless not out of place in the present case, since it has become so customary in these days to draw from the titles of Chinese, etc., translations of Buddhistic works conclusions in reference to the existence of the latter in their present form. The proof here carried out in reference to *aṅga* 8 to 10 is intended as a reminder that greater caution must be used in the future. (See *Ind. Stud.* III. 140).

Of great interest is furthermore the enumeration in *ajjh.* 7 of the names of the seven schisms¹⁵² together with those of their founder and of their localities : *evam ceva samaṇassa bhagavato Mahāvīrassa titthammi satta pavayaṇaninḥagā paṃ tam : bahurayā, jīvapadesiyā, avvattiyā,*

¹⁵⁰ *saṃkṣepikā daśa apy anavagatasvarūpā eva, tad adhyayaṇānām punar arthaḥ : khuddīe tyādi, ihāvalikā-praviṣṭetaravimānapravibhajanam yatra 'dhyayane' tad vimānapravibhaktiḥ, tac caī 'kam alpagraṃthārtham ; tathā' nyan mahā-granthārtham.*

¹⁵¹ This first 5 of the preceding ten *ajjh.* are doubtless meant by this statement. At least in the *Nandī* they preserve the same order of succession.

¹⁵² These texts may be concealed, i. e., absorbed by larger texts—a conjecture which is very probable e. g. in the case of the *vivāhacūliyā*. See above.

śamucchettiyā, dokiriyā, terāsiyā, avaddhiyā (!) ; eesi nam sattañham pavayaṇaninhagāṇam satta dhammāyariyā hotthā, tam : Jamāli, Tisagutte Āsāḍhe, Āsamitte, Gaṃge, Calue, Goṭṭhāmāhile ; eesi nam paṇam satta uppattinagarā hotthā, tam : Sāvatti, Usabhapuram, Seyabiyā, Mihilā, Ullagātiram, puram Aṃtaramji, Dasapura(m) niṇhaga-uppattinagarāim. According to 'Āvasy. nijj. 8, 61, 88, the last of these schisms occurred in the year Vira 584 ; from this we may derive some basis for chronological determination.^{153*} See Jacobi, *Kalpas*, p. 15.

An exact examination of this important text is a great desideratum, since in it are contained a large number of significant [276] statements and data. It constitutes a perfect treasure-house for the correct understanding of innumerable groups of conceptions in distinguishing which from one another the pedantic formalism of the Jains was wont to run riot.

The table of contents in *aṅga* 4 and *Nandī* (N) reads : *se kiṃ tam ṭhāne ? ṭhāne nam sasamayā ṭhāvijjamti parasamayā sasamayaparasamayā ; jivā ṭhāvijjamti ajivā jivājivā ; logo alogo logālogo ṭhāvijjamti ;*¹⁵⁴ *ṭhāne nam davva-guṇa-khetta-kāla-pajjavapayatthā nam selā salilā ya samudda-sūra-bhavaṇa-vimāṇa-āgaraṇadīo nidhayo purisajāyā*¹⁵⁵ *sarā*¹⁵⁶ *ya gottā ya joisaṃvālā*¹⁵⁷ *ekaviham vattavvayam duviham jāva dasaviham vattavvayam jivāṇa poggalāṇa ya logaṭṭhāim ca nam parūvaṇayā āghavijjai.*¹⁵⁸

The commentary is by Abhayadeva, who both here at the end and elsewhere is frequently called *navāṅgivr̥ttikāraḥ*. Commentaries to *aṅgas* 3-11 are ascribed to him ; and we have one from his hand on *upaṅga* 1.

He calls himself a scholar of Jineśvarācārya¹⁵⁹ and of Buddhisāgara

^{153*} cf. *Kup.* 794 (4) where the words "in connection with *Ayvarakkhia* and *Pūsa-mitta*" belong to the last line after *goṭṭhāmāhila* ; see *Av. N.* 8, 89.

¹⁵⁴ The Jain records on the above seven schisms have been translated into German by Leumann, *Ind. Stud.* XVII., p. 91-135.—L.

¹⁵⁵ In N, we read *jivā ajivā jivāj.* at the beginning ; then follows *loe aloe loyāloe* ; and *sasamāe p. sasamayaparasamāe* forms the conclusion, (as also in the case of *aṅgas* 4 et. seq.) ; the verb is *ṭhāvijjamti* in each one of the nine cases—i. e. in the plural.

¹⁵⁶ *Purisajāyā tti puruṣaparakāra unnataprāṇatādibhedah ; pāthāmtareṇa pussajoga tti upalakṣaṇatvāi puṣyādīnakṣatṛāṇām cāmīreṇa saha paścimāgrimobhaya-pramāḍādiko yogah.*

¹⁵⁷ *svarās ca ṣaḍjādayo.*

¹⁵⁸ °cālā B C. ; *jyotiṣaḥ tārārūpasamvālanāni (cāl° ?).*

¹⁵⁹ N has instead of *ṭhāne nam davva°* the following : *ṭamkā kāḍa selā sihariṇo' pabbhārā kuṇḍāim guhāo āgarā dahā naio āghavijjamti ; ṭhāne nam egāiyāe eguttariyāe vuddhīe dasaṭṭhānavavaddhiyāṇam bhāvāṇam paṭuvāṇā āghavijjamti.*

the younger [277] brother of the former. The present commentary was prepared by him Saṃvat 1120 (A.D. 1064) in Aṇahillapāṭaka with the help of Yaśodevagaṇi, a scholar of Ajitasinhācārya for a *paṇḍitaparśad*, conducted by Śrī-Droṇācārya. According to Dharmasāgara's *Gurvāvalī*, the '*navāṃgavṛttikṛt*', Abhayadeva died Samvat 1135, according to others 1139. See *Kl.* 248b. 253b. (12.30).

IV. The fourth *aṅgam*, *Samavāya*, "association, group, rubric", in one *ajjhayaṇa*, that consists of very heterogeneous parts. The contents of the first two-thirds is in general the same as that of the third *aṅga*, both being designed for instruction in the eighth year. See above. There is however the difference that the categories here exceed 10,¹⁶⁰ and continue by progression up to 100¹⁶¹, and then *per saltus* far exceed 100. Immediately following, but without any logical connection with this, is a detailed table of contents and extent of all the twelve *aṅgas*; then all sorts of statements which cannot be united into one class and which deal partly with doctrine, partly with hagiology and, if we may use the expression, history or legend. This third part is without doubt to be regarded as an appendix to the first part, and the whole as a supplement to the third *aṅga*; as in fact we learn from § 57 that *aṅgas* 1 to 3 were regarded as a connected unit. We have here a compendium of everything worth knowing, [278] a perfect treasure-house of the most important information which is of the greatest value for our understanding of the *Siddhānta*. Of especial significance are, in the first place, the statements of literary and historical content in § 1-100, in reference to the extent and division of the separate *aṅgas*, etc. (statements which were doubtless the principal cause of the addition of the full treatment of this subject); the mention of various celebrated Arhats of the past¹⁶² together with the number of their scholars (this was the cause of the addition of the concluding part); and the frequent reference to the lunar and *nakṣatra* computation of time and to the quinquennial *yugam*. The references to the *yugam* are exactly in the manner of the *jyotiṣa vedāṅga*, *kṛttikā*, etc., being the beginning of the series of the *nakṣatras*.

Aṅga 4 begins, after prefacing the customary introduction (*suyam me āusam, teṇam bhagavanteṇam evam akkhāyam*) with a fresh statement

¹⁶⁰ The founder of the Kharataragaccha; see the *paṭṭāvalī* at the end of the *Śābda-prabhedaṭṭikā* v. 2 (ms. or. fol. 813), and *Kl.* 248a (11).

¹⁶¹ In § 1-10 there are many statements which recur in the same form in *aṅga* 3.

¹⁶² They are counted up to 100 as first, second, third *samavāya* (or in the neuter *samavāyam* up to the hundredth).

in reference to the authorship of Mahāvīra : *iha khalu samañeṇaṃ bhagavayā Mahāvireṇaṃ* (then follows the regular *varṇaka* with about 40 attributes, among which are *Jiṇeṇaṃ buddheṇaṃ bohaeṇaṃ.....*) *ime duvālasaṃge gaṇipidaḥ*¹⁶³ *pannatte, taṃ jahā :* (then follow the names of the 12 *aṅgas*)¹⁶⁴ [279] *tattha ṇaṃ je se caṭṭhe aṃge samavāe ti āhie*,¹⁶⁵ *tassa, ṇaṃ ayam aṭṭhe...* In *aṅgas* 1-3 we do not find at the outset any such designation as first, second, third *aṅgam*.

I extract the following from the remainder of the *aṅga*. In § 1 repetition of the statements of the third *aṅga* in reference to the asterisms *addā, cittā, sāti* being called *egatāra*; further on the same statements are made about the remaining *nakṣatras*; in § 7 the 28 *nakṣatras* are divided into four groups, viz. : *kittiyāyā* (*°ādika*) in the East (*puvādāriyā*), *maḥāyā* in the South, *aṇurāḥāyā* in the West, *dhañiṭṭhāyā* in the North. After¹⁶⁶ the sentence *kittiyāyāyā satta nakkhattā puvādāriyā paṃ-(pannattā)* the words *pāṭhāntareṇa abhahiyā-diyā* (A, *abhīyāyā* BC) are inserted;¹⁶⁷ whereby, as the schol. explains, *abhijit., aśvinī, puṣya, -svāti* are indicated rather than the names in question. This insertion purposes to put the series of *nakṣatras*, first invented by the Jains and taught especially in *upāṅgas* 5, 7 (see *Ind. Stud.* 10,220, 304) in the place of the old *kr̥ittikā* series, which still maintained its validity at the time the fourth *aṅga* was first composed.¹⁶⁸ The new view had not yet received the authoritative stamp of orthodoxy. [280] We must however here notice that (cf. p. 269) in the third *aṅga* § 7 we find statements completely identical with those in this insertion. —In § 18 enumeration of the 18 kinds of writing usual for the *bambhī livi* (but not so correct as in *up.* 4 on which account I cite them there); § 18

¹⁶³ e.g. Kumtha § 27,81, Kumthu § 95 Pāsa § 38,70,350. Panami (Nami B. C.) § 39. Aritthanemi § 40, Nami § 41, Vimala § 44,56, Munisuvva § 50, Malli § 55,57, Usabha Kosālia § 63,83,89. Moriyaṇputta § 65. Suvhi Puppahadanta § 75,86. Bharaha § 77, Seyyasa § 80, Siyyaṃsa § 84, Siyala § 83,90. Maṇḍiyaputta § 83, Supāsa § 86,95,200 Ajjiya § 90, Imḍabhūti § 92, Caṇḍappaha § 93, Saṃti § 93, Sumai § 300, Sambhava § 400, Ajja § 450, Sagara § 450, Vāsupujja § 700.

¹⁶⁴ This word, which in § 57 is used especially for *aṅgas* 1-3 belongs of course to the *tipiṭaka* of the Pali texts, but has no reference to the number three. The designation of "basket" inclines one to think of its having been committed to writing. On the first mention of the name *tipiṭaka* see *Ind. Stud.* 5,26; *Vorles. Ind. Lit.*—G², 311, appendix, page 15.

¹⁶⁵ All of the preceding from *iha khalu* on gives an impression of secondary origin. This is the first occasion that we meet with the *varṇaka* of Mahāvīra.

¹⁶⁶ *āchyāta*, I assumed several years ago (see *Bhag.* 1,410,2,251) under the erroneous belief that this form belonged especially to the *Sūryaprajñapti* (see *Ind. Stud.* 10,254) that *āhia āhijai* were derived from the root *khyā* weakend to *khi, hi*, I should now prefer to regard them as a species of retrogressive formation from the common *āhamsu* (root *ah*),

¹⁶⁷ Thus in A; in BC before.

¹⁶⁸ The same case is found § 72.

atthinatthipavāyassa puvvassa (this is the fourth *pūrvam*) *aṭṭhārasa vatthū* ; in § 19 enumeration of the 19 *nāyajjhayaṇas*, i.e. of the 19 books of *aṅga* 6, in *kārikā* form ; in § 23 enumeration of the 23 *suyagaḍajjhayaṇas*, i.e. of those of *aṅga* 2 ; in § 25 enumeration of the 25 *ajjh.* of *aṅga* 1 ; *āyārassa bhagavao sacūliyaḍgassa*, the *mahāparinnā* being mentioned in the ninth place and the *nisihajjhayaṇa* being designated outright as “25th *ajjh.*” The latter is probably the *cūliyā* (see § 57 and p. 254) ; the designation as *bhagavant* is found also in § 85, c.f. also § 84 ; in § 36 enumeration of the 36 *ajjh.* of the *uttarajjhayaṇa*, i.e. of the first *mūlasūtra*, and in fact with a few insignificant variations of the names given here ; see below § 43 *teyālisam kammavivāgaajjhayaṇa paṇi (nattā)* ; the names are however not enumerated ; accord. to the schol. the 20 *ajjh.* of the eleventh *aṅga*, called *vivāgasūya* are hereby referred to, as also the 23 of the second (!) *aṅga*. Cf. page 270 in reference to the *kammavivāgaḍasāu* in ten *ajjh.* mentioned in *aṅga* 3, 10 ; § 44 *coyālisam ajjhayaṇā isibhāsiyā devalogacuyobhāsiyā paṇi (nattā)* ; both of these texts, at least under these names, are no longer extant.^{169*} I have found the *devalogacuyabhāsiyā* mentioned in this place alone ; the *isibhāsiyā* however are often mentioned. We have already come across them (see p. 272) in *aṅga* 3, 10 as third *ajjh.* of *aṅga* 10 (!). [281] In the *Nandī* they appear among the *aṇaṅgapavīṭṭha* texts ; the author of the *Āvaśy. nijj.* confesses that he (2, 6) is author of a *nijj.* to the *isibhāsiyā* too, and (8, 54), placing them in the second place, describes them together with *kāliasua*, *sūrapannatti* and *diṭṭhivā* as the four kinds of *aṇuoa* (see p. 258) ; Abhay. however here characterizes them as *kālikaśrutaviśeṣabhūtāni*. Haribhadra on *Āv.* identifies them, on one occasion (2, 6) with *pāinna* 7, on another (8, 54), he calls them *uttarādhyaṇāḍini* ! See above, p. 259. They appear also in connection with the *painnas*, embracing 50 (!) *ajjh.* in the *Vidhiprapā*, where their connection with the *Uttarajjhayaṇa* as *matām̐tara* is also referred to — § 46 *diṭṭhivāyassa naṃ chāyālisam māuyāpayā (māṭṭkāpadāni) paṇi (nattā)* *bambhie naṃ livi chāyālisam māuarakkhā (madurakarā BC. perhaps māuakkharā ? māṭṭ + akṣ°) paṇi*. In reference to the 46 *māuyāpayā* of *aṅga* 12 see below. By the “*lekhyavidhau 46 māṭṭkākṣarāṇi*” of the Scriptures are according to the schol., to be understood¹⁷⁰ *a* to *ha*, with the addition of *kṣa*, but with the omission of *jha-ḍa-ṭri (?) - ūm (?) - la (?)*.¹⁷¹ These statements are of the most remarkable character. The

^{169*} The schol. however regards the *abhijit* series as *siddhāntamatam*: he then adds: *tha* (in the text) *tu matām̐taram āsṛitya kṛttikāḍinibhaṇitāni : caṇḍraprajñaptau tu bahutarāṇi matāni darśitāni* (*Ind. Stud.* 10, 285).

^{170*} See however the last but one asterism note.

¹⁷¹ The *Pāṇinīyā śikṣā* counts 63 or 64 *varṇas* and (as is very remarkable) “both for Sanskrit and for Prakrit (!)” See *Ind. Stud.* 4, 348, 349.

number of 46 *akṣaras*, whether written signs or sounds (which can have reference to Sanskrit alone and not to Prakrit, since *kṣ* is included in the list), I am as yet entirely unable to explain^{172*}—§ 57 *tiṇhaṃ gaṇi-piḍagāṇaṃ āyāracūliyavajjāṇaṃ sattāvannaṃ ajjhayaṇā paṃ (nattā) āyāre* 24, *sūyagaḍe* 23, *thāṇe* [282] 10; here the first 3 *aṅgas* are taken together as a unit and called 'the three *gaṇiḍagāṇas*' *par excellence*. It is here worthy of note that only 24 *ajjh.* are ascribed to the *āyāra* after the separation of the *āyāracūliyā*; and in fact (p. 254) only the *nisihajjhayaṇaṃ*, which in § 25 is called the 25th *ajjh.*, can be meant by *āyāracūliyā*;—in § 59 fifty-nine day-nights (*rātimḍiya*) are allotted to each season of the lunar year; § 61 *paṃcasam vaccharassa ṇaṃ jugassa ridumāseṇaṃ miyyamānassa egasaṭṭhi udumāsā paṃ (nattā)*; see on this *Jyotiṣa* v. 31 (my treatise, p. 93);—§ 62 the quinquennial *yugam* has 62 full moons, 62 new moons; §—67 67 *nakkhattamāsā*; according to § 71, the winter of the fourth lunar year (in the *yuga*) has 71 *νυχθημερα*—*caūtthassa ṇaṃ caṃdasaṃvaccharassa hemaṃtāṇamekasattarīe rātimḍiyehiṃ vitikkamṭehiṃ*;—in § 72 enumeration of the 72 *kalās* which are essentially identical with those which recur in *aṅga* 6, 1, 119, *upāṅga* 1, 107 and elsewhere;¹⁷³ the repeated use of the word *lakkhaṇa* probably forms a literary synchronism with the *Mahābhāṣya* and the *Aiharvaparīśiṣṭas*. See *Ind. Stūḍ.* 13, 460, Burnell, *Tanjore Catalogue*, p. 9 fg.; the names are :

Lehaṃ 1, *gaṇiyaṃ* 2, *rūvaṃ* 3, *naṭṭaṃ* 4, *giyaṃ* 5, *vāiyaṃ* 6, *saragayaṃ* 7, *pukkharagayaṃ* 8, *samatālaṃ* 9, *jūyaṃ* 10, *jaṇavāyaṃ* 11, *porevaccam* (A. *kavvaṃ* B.C.)^{174*} 12, *aṭṭhāvayaṃ* 13, *dagamaṭṭiyaṃ* 14, *annavihiṃ* 15, *pāṇavihiṃ* 16, *leṇav*¹⁷⁵ 17, *sayaṇav* 18, *ajjapaheliyaṃ* (*ajjaṃ pa°* B.C.) 19, *māgahiyaṃ* 20, *gāhaṃ*¹⁷⁶ 21, *silogaṃ* 22, *gaṃdhajuttim* 23, [283], *madhusitthaṃ*¹⁷⁷ 24, *ābharāṇavihiṃ* 25, *taruṇīpaḍikammaṃ* 26, *itthilakkhaṇaṃ* 27, *purisal*. 28, *hayal*. 29, *gayal*. 30, *goṇal*.¹⁷⁸ 31, *kukkuḍal*. 32, *miḍhayal*. 33,

akṣaras, shows the 46 *māuyakkharā* ascribed in *aṅga* 4, 46 to the *bambhī livī*. In reference to their use see page 462. It is however doubtful whether the use of the latter (on page 462) represents an example of the *māuyakkharā*.

172* *tāni cā 'kārādini hakārāṃdatāni (°rāmtāni) sakṣa kārāni jha-ḍa-tri-ūm-lam (!)*. (Leumann proposes to me to read *ri, ri, li*; but what is the meaning of *jha* and *ḍa (!)* *ty eva (!)* *ity etadakṣarapaṃcakavarjitāni sambhāvyamte*.—The letters meant are indeed *ṛi, ri, li, li, and l*, see Weber's *Cat.* II, p. 408, n.-2—L.

173 See Paul Steinthal, *Specimen of the Nāyādh.* p. 29 and Leumann, *Aupapāt.* p. 77, where especial notice is taken of the variant readings here.

174* *Nāy.* has here *pāsayaṃ* and reverses the position of 12 and 13.—*The right name of the 12th *kalā* is no doubt *porekaccham-paurakṣṭiyam*.—L.

175 *Vilevaṇa Nāy.* with the addition of *vatthav*.

176 *Nāy.* adds *gītiyaṃ*.

177 Instead of 23, 24 *Nāy.* has *hiraṇṇajuttim, suvaṇṇaj, cunṇaj*.

178 Steinthal has *gaṇal°*.

*cakkal.*¹⁷⁹ 34, *chattal.* 35, *daṁḍal.* 36, *asil.* 37, *maṇil.* 38, *kāgaṇil.* 39, *cammal.*¹⁸⁰ 40, *caṁḍayal.* 41, *suracariyaṁ* 42, *rāhucariyaṁ* 43, *gahacariyaṁ*¹⁸¹ 44, *sobhākaraṁ* 45, *dobhākaraṁ* 46, *vijjāgayaṁ* 47, *maṁtag.* 48, *raḥassaḡ.* 49, *saṁbhāvaṁ* 50, *vāraṁ* (? *cāraṁ* BC) 51, *paḍivāraṁ* (*cāraṁ* BC)¹⁸² 52, *būhaṁ* 53, *paḍibūhaṁ* 54, *khaṁdhāvāraṁāṇaṁ* 55, *nagaramāṇaṁ* 56, *vatthumāṇaṁ* 57, *khaṁdhāvāranivesaṁ* 58, *nagaraṇivesaṁ* 59, *vatthunivesaṁ* 60, *isatthaṁ* 61, *charuppavāyaṁ* (*pagayaṁ* BC) 62, *āsasikkhaṁ* 63, *hatthisikkhaṁ* 64, *dhaṇuvedaṁ* 65, *harinaṇvādaṁ* (*hiraṇṇavāyaṁ* BC) 66, *suvaṇṇavādaṁ* 67, *maṇipāgaṁ* 68, *dhāupāgaṁ* 69, *bāhujuddhaṁ* 70, *daṁḍaj.* 71, *muṭṭhij.* 72, *aṭṭhij.* 73, *juddhaṁ* 74, *nijuddhaṁ* 75, *juddhātijuddhaṁ* 76, *suttakheḍḍaṁ* 77, *nāliyākheḍḍaṁ* 78, *vaṭṭakheḍḍaṁ* 79, *dhammakheḍḍaṁ*¹⁸³ 80, *camharevaṭṭaṁ* (! *pamhakheḍḍaṁ* BC) 81, *pattacheyyaṁ* 82, *kaḍaga* (*kaṇṇaga* BC) *cheyyaṁ* 83, *piṭṭagacheyyaṁ* 84, *sajīvaṁ* 85, *nijīvaṁ* 86, *saūṇaruyaṁ* 87, *iti.* Of these 87 names, 15 are to be removed, whether they are *pāṭhāmtaras* (see on No. 80), or interpolations. For the v. r. from *Nāy.* see below ; —§ 81 *Vivāhapannattīe* (in the fifth *aṅga*) *ekkā-sīm mahājummasayā* [284], (*mahāyugmaśatāni*) *paṁ* (*nattā*) ; —§ 84 *vivāhapannattīe* *ṇaṁ bhagavaṇe caūrāsīm payasahassā padaggeṇaṁ pannattā.* Later on in the course of our investigation we will recur to the fact that this statement in reference to the extent of the text is less by 100,000 *padas* than that of the present text. See § 85 and § 25 on the designation as *bhagavati*, which has remained the exclusive property of this text. —§ 85 *āyārassa ṇaṁ bhagavato sacūliyāgassa paṁcaśīm uddesa-ṇakālā* ; —§ 88 *diṭṭhivāyassa ṇaṁ aṭṭhāsīm suttāim paṁ tam* ; *ujjusuyaṁ, parināyāparināyaṁ, evaṁ aṭṭhāsīm suttāṇi bhaṇiyavāṇi, jahā 'Nandīe.'* This reference to the *Nandī*, by which any further enumeration has been spared, is very remarkable from the fact that the statements in it, a few pages further on, are found in exactly the same detail in the fourth *aṅga* itself at this very point, in the consideration of the contents and extent of all the *aṅgas*. This being the case the reference ought to have followed the collective statement found several pages further on in the same *aṅga*. We are therefore compelled to believe that the *Nandī* is the original source of information for this presentation, common to *aṅga* 4 and the *Nandī*, and that this presentation was

179 *Nāy.* omits 33, 34.

180 40-50 omitted in *Nāy.*

181 Are they to be regarded as planets or are they to be understood according to the fashion of the Ath. Paris. 53.54 ?

182 Instead of 51-57 there are in *Nāy.* the following 31 names ; *vatthuvijjāṁ, khaṁdhāra-māṇaṁ* 56, 53, 54, 51 (BC), 52 (BC) *cakkavūhaṁ* ; *garulavūhaṁ* ; *sagaḍavūhaṁ* ; 74-76, 73, 72, 70, *layājuddhaṁ* ; 61, 62, 65—67.77.79.78.81.82.85-87.

183 Omitted in BC, where we read instead *pāvāmtare* (*pāṭhāmtare*) *camha*,° by which *camha*° is manifestly designated as v. 1. to *pamha*°.

at a later period taken from the *Nandī* and inserted in *aṅga* 4 ; furthermore, this insertion must have occurred at a period succeeding that to which the above reference of the redactor belongs. Or have we merely to do with a later act of the scribes ? Were this the case, this act of theirs is at least very remarkable, if not unfortunately executed. There is, however, one difficulty in the way of the assumption that the *Nandī* is the ultimate source, viz. : there are all manner of differences between the treatment in the *Nandī* and that here, differences in which the *Nandī* does not always [285] contain the more ancient statements. See below. The fact that the table contents in N. is much shorter than that here makes, it is true, *eo ipso*, an impression of greater antiquity ; and N. offers in this table of contents many readings which are decidedly older and better.

We have now reached a point where we may discuss the *collective presentation* itself. It begins simply ; *duvālasaṅge gaṇipīḍage paṁ* (*natte*), *taṁ* : then follow the names of the 12 *aṅgas* and then the details in reference to contents, division and extent of each of the twelve. I insert here what I have collected from the statements in reference to division and extent, that the reader may obtain a general survey of the whole. I subjoin the v. r. from the *Nandī* (N) which, after what I have said above, may in the last instance claim priority over those of the *aṅga*.

1. *Āyāre*, 2 *suyakhaṁdhā*, 25 *ajjhayaṇā*, 85 *uddesaṇakālā*, 85 *samuddesaṇakālā*, 18 *payasahassāim payaggeṇaṁ*.

2. *Sūyāgaḍe*, 2 *suyakh.* 23 *ajjh*, 33 *udd.*, 33 *samudd.*, 36 *padasahassāim* (36,000) *padaggeṇaṁ*.

3. *Thāṇe*, 1 *suyakh.*, 10 *ajjh.*, 21 *udd.*, 21 *samudd.*, 72 *payasahassāim* (72,000) *payaggeṇaṁ*.

4. *Samavāe*, 1 *ajjh.*, 1 *suyakh.*, 1 *udd.*, 1 *samudd.*, *ege coyāle payasahasasse* (144,000) ; *saya* is omitted in the incorrect Berlin MS. of N., but accord. to Leumann is in the N. Ed.) *pay*.

5. *Viyāhe*, 1 *suy.*, 100 *ajjh.* with a residue (!) *ege sāirege ajjhayaṇa-saye*, 10 *uddesagasahassāim*, 10 *samuddesagasahassāim*, 36 *vāgarāṇasahasāim*, 84 (!) *payasahassāim* (84,000) *payaggeṇaṁ* :—the latter statement is found also in § 84—see above page 284—N, however, has : *do lakkhā aṭṭhāsii* (288,000) *payasahassāim*, which corresponds to twice the former steady increase in 1-4.

6. [286] *Nāyādhammakahāu*, 2 *suyakh*, 19 (A N Edit., 29 BCN) *ajjh*.¹⁸⁴ 10 *dhammakahāṇaṃ vaggā* (this omitted in N), 19 (A N Ed., 29 BCN) *uddesaṇakālā*, 19 (A N Ed., 29 BN), *samuddesaṇakālā*, *saṃkhejjāim payasayasahassāim* p. (*saya* omitted in N., also in Ed. ; 576,000 Schol.)—Between, 10 *dh. vaggā* and 19 (or 29) *udd*, we find inserted : in each *dhammakahā* 500 *akkhāiyā*, in each *akkhāiyā* 500 *uvakkhāiyā*, in each *uvakkhāiyā* 500 *akkhāiyā-uvakkhāiyā*, in all $3\frac{1}{2}$ *akkhāiyakoḍḍio*.¹⁸⁵ In N this statement from *dasadhammakahāṇaṃ vaggā* (inclusive) on, is at an earlier place in the description of the contents.

7. *Uvāsagadasāo*, 1, *suyakh.*, 10 *ajjh.*, 10 *udd. kālā*, 10 *samud°lā*, *saṃkhejjāi payasayasahassāim* p. (*saya* omitted in N, also in Ed. 1,152,000 Schol.)

8. *Aṃtagadadasāo*, 1 *suyakh.*, 10 *ajjh.* (N omits), 7 (8 N) *vaggā*, 10 (8 N) *ud°lā*, 10 (8 N) *samud°lā*, *saṃkhejjāim payasayasahassāim* p. (*saya* omitted in N, also in Ed. ; 2,304,000 Schol.).

9. *Anuttarovavāiyadasāo*, 1 *suyakh.*, 10 *ajjh.* (omitted in N Ed), 3 *vaggā*, 10 (3 N) *udd°lā*, 10 (3 N) *sam°lā*, *saṃkhejjāim payasayasahassāim* p. (*saya* omitted in N, also in Ed. ; 4,608,000 Schol.).

10. *Pañhāvāgaranāṇi*, 1 *suyakh.*, (45 *ajjh.* N), 45 *udd°lā*, 45 *samudd°lā*, *saṃkhejjāni payasayasahassāni* p. (*saya* omitted in N, also in Ed. ; 9,216,000 Schol.).¹⁸⁶

11. *Vivāyasue*, [2 *suyakh.* N], 20 *ajjh.*, 20 *udd°lā*, 20 *samud°lā*, *saṃkhejjāim payasayasahassāim* p. (*saya* omitted in AN, also in Ed. ; 18,432,000 Schol.).¹⁸⁷

12. [287] *Diṭṭhivāe*, 1 *suyakh*, 14 *puvvaṃ*, *saṃkhejjā vatthū*, *saṃkhejjā cūla* (*culla* N) *vatthū*, *saṃkhejjā pāhuḍā*, *s. pāhuḍapāhuḍā*, *saṃkhejjāu pāhuḍiyāu*, *saṃkhejjāu pāhuḍiyapāhuḍiyāu* *saṃkhejjāni payasahasāni*.

The most remarkable feature of the above is the statement in reference to the number of the words of each *aṅga*. According to

¹⁸⁴ *egūṇavisam* A. N. Ed, *ekonaviṃśati*, Schol. (also on N), *egūṇattisam* BCN.

¹⁸⁵ Cf. my remarks on *aṅga* 6 in reference to this remarkable number. We are led to expect a much higher figure. N. Ed. has *kahāṇagako* accord. to Leumann instead of *akkhāiyakoḍḍio*.

¹⁸⁶ *dvinavatir lakṣaṇaḥ ṣoḍaśasahasrādhikāḥ*.

¹⁸⁷ *ekā padakoṭis caturaśtīr lakṣaṇaḥ dvātriṃśac ca sahasrāṇi*.

Abhayadeva in the scholia,¹⁸⁸ the number of words in the case of *aṅgas* 1-4, increases continually by half till the eleventh *aṅga* is reached ; and the *Nandī* and an anonymous writer thereupon asserts the same with the modification that, instead of *aṅgas* 1-4, *aṅgas* 1-5 are said to show this increase. This view is however in direct opposition to the actual facts of the case, for *aṅgas* 7-11 are the least of all as regards their extent ; which is so very small that there can be no thought of 100,000¹⁸⁹ countable *padas*,¹⁹⁰ "countable" meaning here probably "those that need a special count", 'numerous' or 'innumerable'. If we reckon on the average for each *padam* three *akṣaras*¹⁹¹ and for each *grantha* (*śloka* i.e. 32 *akṣa.*), twelve *padas*, the following is the result of a comparison of the number of these *granthas*, stated¹⁹² as in the MSS., with the above *pada* numbers [288].

1.	<i>aṅga</i>	2,554	gr.	i.e.	30,648	<i>padas</i>	instead of	18,000	p. ^{193*}
2.	..	2,300	..	..	27,600	..	..	36,000	
3.	..	3,750	..	..	45,000	..	..	72,000	
4.	..	1,607	..	..	19,284	..	..	144,000	
5.	..	15,750	..	..	189,000	..	..	84,000	
							or	2,88,000N	

188 Likewise also Nemicandra in the *Pravaçanasāroddhāra* § 92 v. 726 : *paḍhamam āyāraṃgam aṭṭhārasasahasapayaparimāṇam|evaṃ sesaṃgāṇa vi duguṇā duguṇappamaṇam||*

189 N at least has only "thousands."

190 Accord. to Leumann *samkhejja* signifies merely an indefinite number that is still to be counted, and not always a large number.

191 See *Bhagav.* 1,377. This is true in the case of the prose ; in verse we must reduce the number somewhat. The preliminary question is of course—What does the author understand by *pada* ? (Malayagiri in the *Nandī-ṭīkā* says p. 425 *yatrārtho-palabdhis tat padam.* L.) In this approximation of three *akṣaras* to a *pada* I have reckoned the single members of compounds as a single word, in so far as the compounds can lay claim to be considered as such.

192 See above, p. 250. The *grantha* enumeration is of secondary origin in comparison with the *pada* enumeration.

193* So also in *nīṣṭhabhāṣya pedh.* 1 (taken from the *Ācāra-niry.*). It must, however, be noted that the above number (18,000) is referred to the first *Śrutaskandha* only. Malayagiri says (*Nandī-ṭīkā* p. 425 : *atra para āha yath' Ācāre dvau śrutaskandhau pañcaviṃśatīr adhyayanāni padāgreṇa cāṣṭādaśa pada-sahasrāni tarhi yad bhaṇitām nava bambhaceramāṇo aṭṭhārasa paya-sahasao yeo iti tad virudhyate ; atra hi navabrahmacaryādhyayana-mātra evāṣṭādaśa-padasahasra-promāṇa Ācāra ukto, 'smiṃs tv adhyayane dvau śrutaskandhau pañcaviṃśatīr adhyayanāni etat samagrasya Ācārasya parimāṇam uktam, aṣṭādaśa pada-sahasrāni punaḥ prathama-śrutaskandhasya navabrahmacaryādhyayanasya, vicitrārtho-nibaddhāni hi sūtrāni bhavanī, ata eva caisām samyagarthāvagamo gurūpadeśato bhavati nānyathā, āha ca cūrm-kṛt : do suyakhandhā paṇavisām ajjhayanāni, eyam āyāragāsahiyassa (?) Āyārassa pamāṇam bhaṇiyam ; aṭṭhārasa paya-sahasā puna paḍhama-suyakhandhassa nava-*

6.	<i>aṅga</i> 5,375	gr. ¹⁹⁴	i.e.	64,500	<i>padas</i>	instead of 576,000
7.	„ 812	„ „	„ „	9,744	„ „	[1,152,000]
8.	„ 890	„ „	„ „	10,680	„ „	[2,304,000]
9.	„ 192	„ „	„ „	2,304	„ „	[4,608,000]
10.	„ 1,300	„ „	„ „	15,672	„ „	[9,216,000]
11.	„ 1,316	„ „	„ „	15,792	„ „	[18,432,000]

In the case of *aṅgas* 1 and 5, the numbers above given are less in the case of all the others, greater than the actual state of the case. In a majority of cases the difference is simply ridiculous. The statement in reference to *aṅga* 5 (84,000)¹⁹⁵ is not in harmony with the increase in 1-4 i.e. twice the number of the previous. We should expect that *aṅga* 5 should have preserved the same ratio, as is the case in N. This statement is in direct contradiction to those statements which are found in the MSS. of *aṅga* 5 ; according to which its extent is not 84,000 (and not 288,000 as is stated in N) but 184,000 *padas* (*Bhag.* 1,377), which corresponds well enough to its actual extent : 15,750 gr. = 189,000 *padas*. The peculiar nature of our statement in reference [289] to 84,000 *padas* is, finally, rendered more apparent by the fact that it is found in § 84 of the first part of our *aṅga*, on the strength of which it has again found a place here.¹⁹⁶ In that § it is so free from suspicion that I consider it correct for that period and find in this very circumstance a critical criterion or testimony that, at that time, the fifth *aṅga* had not yet reached its present extent.

As peculiar as the statements in reference to numbers of *padas* are those concerning the “3½ *koṭi*” i.e. 35 millions, in *aṅga* 6. That all this is perfect nonsense, is perfectly apparent. See below. Finally there are several differences of a very surprising nature in the other

bambhaceramayassa pamāṇam; *vicitta-attha-nibaddhānt ya suttāni, gurūvāsao esīm attho jāniyavvo tti*. This view of the *Cūṇikīṭ* (translated by Malayagiri into Sanskrit) seems to be all the more right as the *Digambaras* ascribe also 18,000 *padas* to the *Ācāra* without acknowledging any second *Śrutaskandha*, see Prof. Peterson's Second Report, p. 134.—L.

¹⁹⁴ Another statement 5,500 gr., or 4,155 gr.

¹⁹⁵ Or *sarva-mīlanena* 1841 (v. 1. 1894) *granthas* !

¹⁹⁶ So also Abhayadeva, who shows that he is evidently embarrassed in his statement : *caturaśītipadasahasrāṇi padāgreṇē 'ti samavāyāpekṣayā* (“in reference to § 84”) *dviguṇatayā (tāyā ?) iti (?) nāśrayanāt (?)*, *anyārhā tad dviguṇatve dve taksde 'aṣṭāśītiḥ sahasrāṇi ca bhavaṃtī*. In the following *aṅga* he states the number of *padas* to be 576000 i.e. twice that of those in *aṅga* 5, according to his computation.

statements which are not so readily set aside as incorrect or impossible, differences which exist partly in these statements themselves, partly in their relation to the actual facts. First, the difference to the number of *ajjhayaṇas* in *aṅga* 6, according to A and Abhayad, there are 19 and such is the actual state of the case—but according to BCN^{197*} there are 29. Then as regards *aṅga* 8 the 10 *ajjh.* are wanting in N.¹⁹⁸ The number of the *vaggas* (7), of the *udd.* (10) and of the *samudd.* (10) is in N everywhere 8; likewise as regards *aṅga* 9 N has the number 3 as in the case of the *vaggas*, and in that of the *udd.* and *samudd.*; in the case of *aṅga* 10 N adds 45 *ajjh.* and in that of *aṅga* 11 likewise 2 *suyakh.* In reference then [290] to the actual facts, we must make the preliminary observation that the division into *uddesagas* in the case of *aṅgas* 8-11, and that into *samuddesagas* in general in all the *aṅgas*, is not denoted in the MSS.^{199*} The other differences refer chiefly to the fifth *aṅgaṃ* which has no division into *ajjhayaṇas*; in that *aṅga* they are called *saya* (*śata*), and their number is not 100 but 41 or, including the sub-*sayas*, 138; likewise the existing text has only 1925 (not 10,000) *uddesagas*. A special demarcation of *vāgaraṇa* sections is unknown.²⁰⁰ What can possibly be the meaning of 36,000 *vāgaraṇas* and only 84,000 *padas*! (cf. *Bhag.* 1,376). The differences in reference to *aṅgas* 8-11 are not less remarkable. As regards the *vaggas* (8), *aṅga* 8 agrees with N. but has, not 10 (cf. *aṅga* 3,10), but 93 *ajjh.*;—*aṅga* 9 has likewise not 10 (cf. again *aṅga* 3,10), but 33 *ajjh.*; *aṅga* 10 has ten *dāras* cf. the ten *ajjh.* in *aṅga* 3,10 whereas we have here no information about *dāras* or *ajjh.*, and N, on the other hand, speaks of 45 *ajjh.*—*aṅga* 11 has in agreement with N the 2 *suyakh.*, which are not mentioned in the source of information before us. In the case of *aṅga* 12 there is no possibility of comparing the statements in question with the text, since there is no longer any such extant.—See below.²⁰¹

^{197*} According to Leumann N Ed. has 19 and not 29—Here again, as with *aṅga* 1, only the first *Śrutaskandha* is intended by the assertion of there being 19 *ajjhayaṇas* and not 29. In the same way only Part I. of *aṅga* 11 has been known to the author of *aṅga* 3, 10 as has been shown above on page. 270.—L.

¹⁹⁸ According to Leumann this is not so in N Ed.

^{199*} This statement requires some modification: see the closing words of *aṅgas* 8-10 in Weber's Cat. II., 502 (8). 507(9) 520(10: *dasasu ceva divasesu uddisijjanti.....*); *aṅga* 11 has in the place a reference to *aṅga* 1 (see *ibid.* 534) which, however, has the same bearing.—L.

²⁰⁰ This demarcation, or the number 35,000 representing it, is also found in the table of contents of *aṅga* 5 preceding the statements in reference to the extent.

²⁰¹ I will note here merely the fact that in the section in reference to the twelfth *aṅga*, Bhaddabāhu is mentioned by name, whom tradition proclaims to be the last teacher of this *aṅgaṃ* or of the fourteen *pūrvas*; see above, p. 214. It is furthermore stated that therein was contained a section in reference to Bhaddabāhu and to his history.

The question now arises how are these differences to find a fitting solution ? It is self-evident, that, so far as the extraordinary character [291] both of our information in regard to the number of *padas*, and of the *akkhāias* in *aṅga* 6 is concerned, they are a fabrication of the author ; nor is it improbable that a similar explanation may hold good in the case of the special differences of detail. The carefulness of statement which we notice here, renders it, on the other hand, possible that the author has based his statements on those of his authorities, and that we have to deal with genuine discrepancies between two different texts. Abhayadeva declares here that he is unable to explain the contradiction²⁰² in the case of *aṅgas* 8 and 9 and in the case of *aṅga* 10 all that he does is to admit the existence of the conflict.²⁰³ But in his commentary on *aṅga* 10 he adduces (1) a further case of divergence—an introduction at variance with the general character of the introductions in that it allots to the *aṅga* two *suṣakṣhaṁdhas*, and (2) refers especially to the conflict between the *pūrvācāryāḥ* and the *aidamyugīnāḥ*. See below. Of primal importance for *aṅgas* 8 to 10 (11) is the fact that the statements in *aṅga* 3, 10 too render it [292] probable that these *aṅgas* had then a text different from our own. The irreconcilability of title and contents show that in the case of *aṅga* 10 something must have occurred to cause the present condition of affairs.

As we have seen that there are important differences between the statements made here or in N. and the actual state of things in the eleven *aṅgas*, so far as extent and division are concerned, we now discover that the same holds good as regards the statements now under examination, concerning the contents. These statements, which in N are much more brief than those in *aṅga* 4, are, it must be said, of so general a character and so colourless that their real contents can only be discovered with difficulty. They appear in a form that is purely stereotyped (see the common introduction in *aṅgas* 2-5,²⁰⁴ and in 6-9 and 11,²⁰⁵) whereas there is no such similarity of contents between

202 On 8 : *dasa ajjhayaṇa tti prathamavargāpekṣayai'va ghatate, Nāṁdyā tathai 'va vyākhyātavāi* (see below) ; *yathe (yac ce) 'ha pathyate satta vaggā ti tat prathamavargād anyavargāpekṣayā yato' tra sarve 'pyaṣṭa vargā Nāṁdyām api tathā paṭhitāḥ ; ...sarvāni (adhyayanāni) caikavargagatāni yugapad uddiśyānte, ato ('tra) bhaṇitāḥ ; attha udd'ālā ity ādi, iha ca daṣo 'dḍesanakālā adhiyamta iti nā syā bhiprāyam adhigacchāmaḥ ;—and on 9 : ihā 'dhyayanasaṁmūho vargo daṣa 'dhyayanāni, vargaś ca yugapad evo 'padiśyate, ity atas traya evo 'dḍesanakālā bhavānti evam eva ca Nāṁdāv adhiyate, iha tu dīśyate : daṣe 'ty, atrā 'bhiprāyo na jñāyate.*

203 *Yady api 'ha adhyayanānām daśatvād daśai 'vo 'dḍesanakālā bhavānti, tathāpi vācanāntarāpekṣayā* (cf. N) *pañcacaṭvāriṇśad iti sambhāvyānte iti paṇayāliṣam ity ādi aviruddham (!).*

204 *Samaya, loya, jīva.*

205 *Nayarāim* etc. N limits herein its treatment of the subject entirely to this common introduction and gives nothing else in addition.

each of the single members of these two groups ; and the statements in question are not in exact accordance with the contents of any single one. This latter remark holds good in the case of the special statements in reference to the contents of *aṅga* 10, to which we do not find any such stereotyped introduction. These special statements suit the name of the *aṅga*, but not its present contents. It is of great significance that the statements in *aṅga* 3, 10 (see above, p. 272) are essentially in accordance with these now under discussion. This agreement [293] makes it extremely probable that the contents of the tenth *aṅgam*, as it then existed, was in harmony with these statements.

To the detailed consideration of the 12 *aṅgas* there is appended here, as in the *Nandī*, a passage on the entire *duvālasaṅgaṃ gaṇipīḍagam*. This deals partly with the attacks, which it was subjected to in the past,²⁰⁶ which it now experiences in the present and will experience in the future, partly with the devoted acquiescence which is its lot to meet with in these three periods and concludes with the declaration of its certain existence for ever : *na kayāi na āsi, na kayāi na'tthi, na kayāi na bhavissati*.

The concluding portion of the fourth *aṅga* consists of frequent reference to the legendary hagiology and history of the Jains, genealogical enumerations (and others of different content) of parents, wives, etc. of the Kulakaras, 24 Titthakaras, 12 Cakkavaṭṭis 9 Baladevas, 9 Dasāras, 9 Vāsudevas, partly in metrical form (*śloka* and *āryā*). Towards the end there is a transition to prophecy (construction in the future). Our information here varies in part very materially from that contained in Hem. 26 fg. 691 fg. and is not preserved in the MSS. with any great consistency. Hence it appears that our knowledge is not complete, but is derived from accounts of a partial nature which is in need of additional supplementary testimony. Some of the MSS. afford at one time generous information and at another limited data.

The survey of contents of *aṅga* 4, contained in the detailed account of the *aṅgas*, runs as follows : *se kiṃ taṃ samavāe ? samavāe naṃ sasamayā sūijjantī* [294] *parasamayā s. jāva logāloge sūijjantī*²⁰⁷ ; *samavāeṇaṃ egādiyaṇaṃ egatthāṇaṃ eguttariyaparivaḍḍhiya*²⁰⁸ (*duvālasaṃ*

206 According to Abh., attacks at the hands of Jamāli, Goṣṭhāmāhila, etc., i.e. the representatives of the seven schisms.

207 N. has instead of *sūijjantī* everywhere *samāsijjantī* and, as in the case of 3, the order *jīvā*, *loe*..., *sasamae*.

208 *parivuḍḍhiya* A.

gassa ya gaṇipīḍagassa pallavagge samanugāijjai)²⁰⁹ *ṭhānagasayassa*²¹⁰ *barasavihavitttharassa*²¹¹ *suyanāṇassa jagajivahiya*²¹² *bhagavato samāseṇaṁ samāyāre*²¹³ *āhijjai* ; *tattha ya nāṇāvihappagārā jivājivā ya vanniya*²¹⁴ *vitthareṇaṁ, avare vi ya bahuvihā vivesā naraya-tiriya*²¹⁵ *maṇuyasuragaṇā-ṇaṁ āhār'-ussāśa-lesa-āvāsa-saṁkhā-āyaya-ppamāṇa-uvavāya-cayaṇa-ogā-hān'-ohi*²¹⁶ *veyaṇāvihāṇa-uvaoga*²¹⁷ *joga-imdiya-kasāya*^{218*} *vivihā ya jīvajonī vikkhaṁbh'-ussehapari-rayappamāṇaṁ vidhivivesā*²¹⁹ *ya, Maṁdarādīṇaṁ mahidharāṇaṁ, kulagara-titthagara-gaṇaharāṇaṁ samatta Bharahāhivāṇaṁ*²²⁰ *cakkiṇa ceva cakkahara-halaharāṇa ya, vāsūṇa*²²¹ *ya niggamā*²²² *saṁṭe, ete anne ya evam-āi ettha*²²³ *vitthareṇaṁ atthā samāsejjaṁti*.²²⁴

The commentary is by Abhayadevā.

V. The fifth *āṅga*, *viyāha* or *vivāha* (or °*pannatti*²²⁵) with the epithet *bhagavatī*, and lastly also [295] merely *bhagavatī* (Hem v. 243) ; in 41 *sayas*, *śata*²²⁶, of which some are divided into sub-divisions of the same name²²⁷, and both into *uddesagas*. The number of the latter cannot be discovered from the MSS. themselves, because the latter books (33-41) contain for the most part nothing but stereotyped descriptions, in reproducing which the greatest freedom has been taken.

209 *pallavā avayavās, tatparimāṇaṁ samanugīyate pratipādyate.*

210 N is much better : *samavāe ṇaṁ egāi-egūttariya thānāsaya-vivaḍḍhiyāṇaṁ bhāvāṇaṁ purūvaṇā, āghavijjati : duvālasaṁgassa ga° gassa pallavagge samāsijjai*, N omits all the following. As the words *duvā° gāijjai* interrupt in *āṅga* 4 the connection, I have enclosed them in brackets.

211 *bārassa A.*

212 *jiviyassa hi A.*

213 °*yārī A.*

214 *vinīyā A ; varṇitāh.*

215 *naragatariya A.*

216 *uggāhinoyahi A ; avagāhanā, avadhi.*

217 *uvauga A. B. C.*

218**kasāyā A. B. C. ; prathamā...lopaḥ.*—So *upāṅga* 1, 163 presents *Āraṇa—Accūyā-tiṇī ya* (see p. 88, note 6 of my ed. of the text).—L.

219 *viddhasesa A.*

220 *samasta Bharatādhipāṇaṁ.*

221 *varṣāṇaṁ Bharatādikṣetrāṇaṁ.*

222 °*gamā ya BC.*

223 *ādī 'ttha A.*

224 So *A, samāhijjaṁti BC samāsriyante athavā, samāsyāṁte.*

225 Accord. to Abhayadeva and Malayagiri (Schol. on *up.* 4) *vyākhyāprajñapti* (cf. Hem. Schol. p. 319) : or *vivāha°* or *vivādha°* (cf. Wilson Sel. W. 1, 281), s, *Bhagav.* 1, 371-72 See *ibid.* p. 368n. and below on *upāṅgas* 5 foll., in reference to the name *prajñapti* and the conclusions to be derived therefrom.

226 The reason for the name is as yet involved in obscurity.

227 *avāntarasaya* in *Vidhiprapā.*

Some *uddesagas* are indicated merely by catch-words. According to the usual general survey of extent and division of the work at the end of the MSS. there are in all 138 *sayas*, including all the sub-*sayas*, 1925 *uddesagas*, 184,000 *padas*; and these statements, especially those in reference to the number of words, are in exact agreement with the actual state of affairs, (see *Bhag.* 1,376), and agree so far as the number of the *uddesagas* is concerned, with the specific statements on this head in the *Vidhiprapā* (V), excepting in the case of an insignificant variation (there are only 1,923 *udd.* see p. 296n). In reference to the great difference especially as regards the extent 184,000 *padas* as opposed to the statements of *āṅga* 4 and of the *Nandī* the reader is referred to p. 288. Besides, in its general survey of the extent of the *āṅgas*, the fourth *āṅga* has in § 84, where there is no occasion for suspecting its truth, the same statement that the *vivāhapannattī bhagavatī* had 84,000 *padas*. This statement was transferred from there to the later general survey (see page 289), although it does not belong there. I do not scruple, therefore, for this very reason to regard it as [296] correct. It would then have to be relegated to a period in which the fifth *āṅgam* had not yet attained the half of its present extent. Cf. on this point the statements in *āṅga* 3,10 in reference to the *vivāhacūliyā* as *ajjh.* 5 of the last of the ten *dasā* texts there cited. See above, p. 274. The *vivāhacū.* is also mentioned in a previous passage in the *Nandī* among the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts (*bhagavatīcūlikā*, Schol.). On the other hand, it is noteworthy that *āṅga* 4 in § 81, that is to say just before the mention of the 84,000 *padas* of the *bhagavatī*, refers expressly to its 81 *mahājummas* (see above page 283); and consequently there is herein a direct reference to its latter books. But these very latter books give one at first glance the impression of containing secondary additions.

That *āṅga* 5 grew only gradually to its present extent of 15,750 *grāṁhāgra* or 184,000 *padas*, is proved by a glance at the different proportions of the single books—[1-8, 12-14, 18-20 with 10 *udd.* each, 9,10 with 34 *udd.* each, 11 with 12 *udd.*; 15 without *udd.*; ²²⁸ 16 with 14, 17 with 17 *udd.*, but 21 with 80, ²²⁹ 22 with 60, ²³⁰ 23 with 50, ²³¹ 24 with 24, 26-30 with only 11 each, 25 with 12, but 31, 32 with 28 each, 33, 34 ²³² with 124 each, 35-39 with [297] 132, 40 with 231, 41 with 196 *udd.*] Their contents too prove the gradual extension of *āṅga* 5.

228 *Gosālasayam egasaram* V.

229 With 8 *vagga* each with 10 *udd.* V.

230 With 6 *vagga* each with 10 *udd.*

231 With 5 *vagga* each with 10 *udd.* V.

232 33 and 39 with 12 *avāntarasayas* (of which 8 with 11 each, 4 with 9 *udd.* each);

The first 20 books, which are the substructure of all, are clothed in a legendary form, and contain in irregular order, and without any recognizable connecting thread, the most varied legends in reference to the activity and teachings of Mahāvīra; his conversations²³³ with his first scholar Īmdabhūti (Goyama) at the time of king Seṇia of Rājagṛha being made of special importance. In *sayas* 21 ff. there are no such legends, and each *sayam* has not only a harmonious contents, but many of the *sayas* are connected together as groups, 21-23 treat of plants, 24-30 of the different conditions of living creatures (*jīva*), 24 of their origin, 25 of their *leśyādayo bhāvāḥ*, 26²³⁴ of their *karmabandha*, 27 of their *karmakarāṇa* [298] *kriyā*, 28 of their *pāpakarmādidanḍakanavaka*, 29 of their *karmaprasthāpanādi*, 30 of the 4 *samavasaraṇa* (see above, p. 264); 31-41, finally, in a most peculiar fashion of their state during the four *jummas* (*yugma-yuga*): *kaḍa*, *teoga*, *dāvāra*, *kāliyoga*. The make-up of these latter books, is, as I have already said, purely formal, and is almost similar to a mere table of statistics.

Since this is the case it appears to me a matter of tolerable certainty that *sayas* 21 ff. were added at a later period to *sayas* 1-20. It is perfectly clear that we have here to deal with a chance co-ordination of elements. On the other hand, this fact serves to lend a kind of authenticity to the single constituent parts and especially to those of a legendary colouring. After the most naïve fashion the discordant parts have been brought into conjunction without any attempt at change. That there was, however, a guiding hand in this conjunction is evident from two reasons: (1) Since an introductory verse in *āryā* precedes each *saya* (only up to No. 26 is this true); which verse briefly

35-39 with 12 *avāntaras*, with 11 *udd.* each, 40 with 21 *av.* with 11 *u.* each; *evaṃ mahājummasayāni* (i. e. 35-40) 81, *evaṃ savvaggenāṃ sayā* 138, *savvaggenāṃ uddesā* 1923, V., to which a *yantrakam* i. e. a tabular enumeration of the *uddesas* and days belonging to each *sayas*, is appended.

233 The question 9,34, *purise naṃ bhānte purisaṃ haṇamāne kiṃ purisaṃ haṇati*? — is an interesting parallel to *Bhagavadg.* 2,19; *Kaṭh. Up.* 1, 2 18, 19.

234 In V. and even in the MSS. of the *Bhag.* the foll. names are found for books 26-41: 26 *bandhisae*, 27 *karīsuga* (or *karisuga*) *sae*, 28 *kamma-samajjīṇaṇasae*, 29 *kammapaṭṭhavaṇasae*, 30 *samoṣaraṇasae*, 31 *uvavāyāsae*, 32 *uvvaṭṭanāsae*, 33 *egimḍiyajummasayāni*, 34 *sedhīsayāni*, 35 *egimḍiyamahājummasayāni*, 36 *beimḍiyamahāj*, 37 *teimḍ*, 38 *caūriṃd*, 39 *asannipamciṃd*, 40 *sannipamciṃd*, 41 *rāsijummasae*. The fact that “*abhihāṇāni*” are expressly mentioned for these 16 *sayas* alone (*Jogavih* v. 37), gives them at the very start a separate place. See the remarks on book 15. Note also that, from book 26 on, the introductory *kārikās* no longer appear (book 26 has, it is true, one such) and that one of the MSS. of the text which I have before me, has before book 26 (but also before book 17) a special greeting, *namo suvadevayāe bhagavatīe*. This refers to a new section. If Leumann is correct we are to attribute no importance to the absence of the *kārikā* in the case of books 27 and foll., since the *kārikā* that precedes book 26 holds good in the case of the following books, which have the same arrangement as book 26.

marks the contents of each of the *udd.* of the *saya* by means of catch-words (titles). This occurs here for the first time, since it is found in no former *aṅga*; but from this time on recurs with considerable frequency. The (2) second indication occurs for the first time especially in this *aṅga*, and remains henceforth regularly. It consists in the frequent reference to other texts as parts of the *Siddhānta*, which often completely interrupts and destroys the context. There are also frequent references to those texts, which belong to the *upāṅga* group, e.g. *Rāyapaseṇaijjaṃ* [299] *Pannavanā*, *Jambuddhivapannatti*, see *Bhag.* 1, 382ⁿ. It must however remain an open question whether in each single instance we have to deal with the work of a redactor or with the convenience of the scribe see *supra*, pp. 228-232. We must leave in doubt whether some of these citations are really to be found in the work from which it quotes, at least in its extant form. The passage cited from the *Rājaprasāṇiyam* by Jacobi, *Kalpasūtra*, p. 107 is found, according to Leumann, in the Edit. p. 185 fg.

The introduction consists of three parts. The actual beginning consists in the so-called *paṃcanamaskāra*, a benediction which from this point on recurs frequently; ²³⁵ *namo arihaṃtāṇaṃ, namo siddhāṇaṃ, namo āyariyāṇaṃ, namo uvajjhāyāṇaṃ, namo loe savvasāhūṇaṃ* or here with the addition *namo bambhīe livīe* (see *supra*, p. 220). Next follows the introductory *kārikā* of the first *saya* and then, after the insertion of *namo sayassa*, the customary beginning of legends: *teṇaṃ kāleṇaṃ teṇaṃ samaeṇaṃ Rāyagihe nāmaṃ nayare hotthā, Seṇie, rāyā, Cillaṇā devī, samaṇe bhagavaṃ Mahāvīre* ..

Of the legends which are adduced here, those claim a special interest which deal with predecessors or contemporaries of Mahāvīra, with the opinions of his heterodox opponents, *annaūtthiya*²³⁶ or *ājiviyas*, and with their conversion. Apart from these are named the men, who have patronymic epithet [300] *Pāsāvacchijja* (*Pārśvāpatyīya*) attached to their names.²³⁷ Herein the name of Pārśva, the immediate predecessor of Mahāvīra can be recognised; so, for example, in 1, 9 *Kālāsa-Vesiyaputte* (cf. *Bhagav.* 2,183 fg. Jacobi, *ante*, Vol. IX. p. 160), is styled a *Pāsāvacchijja*, and in 2, 5 there are four of this name: *Kāliya-putta*, *Mehila*, *Ānaṃdarakkhiya* and *Kāsava*, in 5,9 *Paṇḍita therā*

²³⁵ See *up.* 4, *Kalpasūtra*, p. 83.

²³⁶ Abh. explains this by *anyayūthika*; Haribhadra gives, however, the preferable explanation *anyatīrthika*, cf. *prākṛ. tūha-tīrtha*, *Ind. Stud.* xvi. p. 46. See Leumann's glossary to *Aupapāt.* s. v. *annaūtthiya*.

²³⁷ See above, p. 266, from *aṅga* 2,2,7.

bhagavanto, in 9, 32 *Pañje Gaṃḡee*. *Pāsa* himself never appears here²³⁸ though the conversion of his adherents to the doctrines of Mahāvīra is often alluded to.²³⁹ The *Vesālī-sāvayas* too and their adherents appear as his older contemporaries ; this is the case in 2,1 *Piṃḡalae Vesālī-sāvae* (s. *Bhagav.* 1, 440. 2, 184, 197, 249). 12, 2. See above, p. 262, 263 in reference to *Vesālīa* as a designation of Mahāvīra himself. The following are additional names : *Niyamñhīputta* 5, 8, *Samkha-ppā-mokkhā samaṇovāsagā* 12, 1, *Pokkhalī*, *ibid.*, *Gaddabhālī* 2, 1, *Dhammaghosa* 11, 11, *Sumaṃgala* 15, 5, etc.

Imḡabhūti appears as the "oldest" scholar of Mahāvīra, *Aggibhūti* as the "second", *Vāyubhūti*²⁴⁰ as the "third". Some of the usual names of the scholars of Mahāvīra are not mentioned at all—especially that of *Sudharman* ; and of those that are referred to *Moriyaputta* appears in an unusual connexion, viz as a predecessor [301] of Mahāvīra (3, 1),²⁴¹ while *Maṇḍiyaputta* is here too designated as his scholar (3,3.) Besides him there are other scholars whose names are not found in the later usual list of Vīra's scholars ; e. g. *Roha* 1, 6, *Khaṃḡaya*, *Kac-cāyaṇa*, 2, 1, *Kurudattaputta* and *Tīsaya* 3, 1, *Nārayaputta* 5, 8, *Sāmahatthi* 10, 4, *Ānaṃḡa* and *Sunakkhatta* 15, *Māḡamḡiyaputta* 18, 3 ; see *Bhagav.* 2, 195. We find in 9, 33 the history of his opponet *Jamālī* and in book 15²⁴² that of his 'shade of a scholar' (*śiṣyābhāṣa*) *Gosāla Maṃkhaliputta* related in great detail. There are here and there a few statements of an historical colouring so e.g. the incidental mention (7, 9) of a victory of *Vajji Videhaputta* (cf. *up.* 8) over nine *Malālī-Mallaī* (*Mallaki*) and nine *Lecchai* (*Lecchaki* = *Licchavi*) kings of *Kāśī-Kosala* at the time of king *Koṇia*, *Kūṇia* of *Cāṃpā*, or of Mahāvīra

238 In *up.* 10,11 he appears in person as a teacher ; and even till the present day he has received honours as such. The *uvasaggaharastotram*, assigned to *Bhadrabāhu*, is dedicated to him, see *Jacobi*, l. c. p. 12,13, and my remarks on *upāṅg.* 2 below.

239 Conversion from the *cāujjāma dhamma* to the *pañca mahavvayāim* see *Bhagav.* 2, 185 ; *Jacobi*, *ante*, Vol. IX. p. 160.

240 These three names in *bhūti* are probably *nakṣatra* names ; see *Ind. Stud.* 4, 380, 81,3,130 : *Nakṣa.* 2,320.

241 See *Bhag.* 1,440 in reference to chronological conclusions to be drawn from this name.

242 *Gosāla's anekadhā janma maraṇaṃ ca* ; according to the *Vidhiprapā* this book had another title *Gosālayasaye teyanisaggāvaranāmāye anunnāe*. This name, which appears in the MSS. of *Bhag.* at the very close of the book, occurs (see page 224) as that of a text designed for the eighteenth year of study whereas *aṅga* 5 is designed for the tenth year. Since this book, not like the others, is *egasara*, i. e. not divided into *uddesagās*, it may be assumed that it is an independent text, which at a later period found a resting place here. *Leumann* thinks that he can discover in the *Bhag.* several other of the texts mentioned, p. 224 ; e. g. the *āsivisabhāvaṇā* in 8,2,1 (cf. *aṅga* 3,4,4), the *cāraṇabhāvaṇā* in 20,9, the *maḡasum-ṇabhāvaṇā* in 16,6.

himself; the history (12, 2) of Jayantī (aunt of the Kośāmbī king Udayaṇa, son of Sayāṇiya (Śatāṇika) grandson of Sahassāṇiya) who was the patron of the Vesālisāvayas, and who, after hearing the sermon of Mahāvīra, became a bhikkhuṇī.

All these legends, [302] the number of which will be materially increased by a special investigation of the contents give us the impression of containing traditions which have been handed down in good faith. They offer, therefore, in all probability (especially as they frequently agree with the Buddhistic legends) most important evidence for the period of the life of Mahāvīra himself.

Among those statements which may be adduced as witnesses for the first composition of the existing form of the text, an enumeration of foreign peoples asserts the chief place. The names of these peoples recur frequently in some customary form in the remaining texts of the *Siddhānta*, though accompanied by numerous variations of detail.²⁴³ In 9, 33, 12, 2 there are enumerated the foreign female slaves and waiting maids in the house of a rich *māhaṇa* (*brāhmaṇa*); consequently the names are all feminine: *bahūhiṃ khujjāhiṃ Cilātiyāhiṃ*²⁴⁴ *vāmaṇiyāhiṃ*²⁴⁵ *vaḍahiyāhiṃ*²⁴⁶ *Babbariyāhiṃ*²⁴⁷ *Isigaṇiyāhiṃ Vāsagaṇiyāhiṃ*²⁴⁸ *Palhaviyāhiṃ Hlāsiyāhiṃ Lāsiyāhiṃ Ārabhiṃ Damilāhiṃ Simhalihiṃ Pulimdihiṃ Pukkalīhiṃ*²⁴⁹ *Bahalihiṃ Muramḍihiṃ* (*Marumḍ°* Abh.) *Samvarihim* (*Sav°* Abh.) *Pārasihim nānādesivīdesa paripimḍiyāhiṃ*. Of these names *Palhaviyā*, [303] *Ārabī*, *Bahali*, *Muramḍī*, and *Pārasī* are of special interest, since they deal with a period from the second till the fourth century A. D., the age of the Parthian Arsacids and the Persian Sassanids; cf. on Pahlavas (Parthians), Noldeke's remarks in my *History of Sanskrit Literature*, p. 338; on *Muramḍa*, *Ind. Stud.* XV. 280, on *Bāhlī*, Bactria, *Monatsberichte der Konial. Akad. der Wiss.* 1879, p. 462. The *Maruṇḍas* especially appear together with the Śakas

²⁴³ I do not propose here to enter into a detailed discussion of these variations; see *aṅga* 6.1, 117 (Steinthal, p. 28) *up.* 1, 55 (Leumann, p. 60) etc. Besides this enumeration, there is another which occurs only in those texts which are characterized as younger from the fact that they contain this second enumeration. I refer to that of the *Mlecchas*, in which some fifty (not sixteen) names are quoted; see *aṅga* 10, *up.* 4.

²⁴⁴ *Cilātadesotpanna* Abh. cf. *Kirāta*.

²⁴⁵ *Hrasvaśarābhī* Abh.

²⁴⁶ *Vaḍabhiyāhiṃ maḍahakoṣṭhābhī* Abh. (*vakrādhakkoṣṭhābhī* Schol. on *up.* 1).

²⁴⁷ Abh. adds *Vaūsiyāhiṃ*.

²⁴⁸ *Vāruganiyāhiṃ* Abh. who adds *Jonīyāhiṃ* after this name.

²⁴⁹ *Pakka°* Abh.

and the Sahan Shahi on the inscriptions of Samudragupta as tributary to him, the tribute consisting, among other things, of girls (Lassen, 2, 952). The mention of the Ārabas²⁵⁰ can be explained by reference (cf. p. 237) to the flourishing state of trade with Arabia at this period. The name of a grain ālisamḍaga, in 21, 21, points to commercial intercourse at this date, since it may be explained, as I think, as signifying "coming from Alexandria" or "proceeding from A."²⁵¹ It is not explained by the commentary. Alexandria, or the Persian ports Apologos and Omana, carried on a brisk trade with India in *παρθεναὶ εὐελδεῖς* as we learn from the *Periplus* (cf. Lassen, 2, 557, 957, 1159). Another point confirmative of this fact (see introduction to my translation of the *Mālav.* p. 47) is that *Yavanī* girls appear in Kālidāsa in the immediate surrounding of the king. Here then we have direct evidence on the part of the Indian tradition. The great frequency of the appearance of foreign female slaves as waiting-maids and as nurses, which is regarded as customary [304] in the Jain texts, is very surprising, and may be regarded as a proof of national pride, called into existence by a few victories over some foreign people, which can be ascertained only with difficulty. This national pride permitted these foreigners to appear in these menial capacities alone. In the inscriptions of Samudragupta we find immediate confirmation of this conjecture, as has been remarked above. The origin of these customary lists takes us as back to the period of the Guptas.

Besides the above-mentioned list of foreign peoples there is in 15, 17 an enumeration of native races. It contains 16 names :—Aṅga, Vaṅga, Magaha, Malaya, Mālavaya, Accha, Vaccha, Koccha (ttha ?), Paḍha, Laḍha, Vajjī, Mālī, Kosī, Kosala, Avāha, Subhattara. This list has the stamp of considerable antiquity, especially if we compare it with the similar one, *up.* 4.

The mention of the planets, the absence of any allusion to the zodiac. (*Bhag.* 1, 44 ; 2, 228) and the statements in reference to the Brahmanical literature existing at the period²⁵² (*ibid.* 2, 246, 7) are in harmony with the date which we have assumed above. See above pages 236, 238.

²⁵⁰ In *Brāhman* texts they occur only in the list of peoples in Varāhamihira 14,17.

²⁵¹ I would mention incidentally that in 22. 11 *pīlu* is mentioned among the names of trees and in 23, 1 *śiṃgavera* cinnamon among the spices.

²⁵² *riurveda-jajurveda-sāmaveda-athavvāaveda-itihāsa pañcamānam nighamūcchatthānam cañham vedānam saṃgovamgānam sarahassānam sārāe vārāe dhārāe pārāe, saḍamgavi, saṭṭhitamavisārāe, samkḥāne, sikkhā-kappe vāyarāne chaṃde nirutte jotisān-ayāne, annesu ya vahūsu vambhannaesu parivvāyesu nāyesu supari-niṭṭhie.*

In *aṅga* 4 (or *Nandī*, N) there are contained the statements of contents : *se kiṃ taṃ viyāhe* ?²⁵³ *viyāhe naṃ* [305] *sasamayā viāhijjānti parasamayā sasamayaparasamayā, jīvā viā°* 3, *loge* 3 *viāhijjai* ;²⁵⁴ *viyāhe naṃ*²⁵⁵ *nānāvīha-sura-narinda-rāya-risi-vivihasaṃsaiya-pucchiyānaṃ, jineṇa vittharenaṃ*²⁵⁶ *bhāsiyānaṃ, davva-guṇa-khetta-kāla-pajjava-paesa-pariṇāma-jahatthiyabhāva-aṇugamaṇikkheva-naya-ppamāṇasuniṇo-* 'vakkama-vivihapagārapāgaḍapayaṃsiyānaṃ'²⁵⁷ *logālogapāsiyānaṃ*,²⁵⁸ *saṃsāra-sam-uddaruṇḍa-uttaraṇasamatthānaṃ*²⁵⁹ *suravaisaṃpūiyānaṃ, bhaviyajaṇayapaahiyayābhinaṃdiyānaṃ tamaraya vidhaṃsaṇānaṃ, sudittḥadivabhūya-ihāmai-buddhivaddhaṇānaṃ, cattisahasassa-m-aṇūṇayānaṃ*²⁶⁰ *vāgarāṇānaṃ daṃsaṇāu*²⁶¹ *suvaṭṭhabahuviḥappagārā*²⁶² *sisahiyatthāya*²⁶³ *guṇahatthā*.²⁶⁴

We have for this *aṅga* the commentary of Abhayadeva. For a special table of contents for the first two books, two-thirds of the third book, for books 34-41, cf. my treatise, of which mention has often been made here and which created a new course for Jaina investigations : "On a fragment of the *Bhagavati*" part first 1866 part second 1867.²⁶⁵

253 *vyākhyāyānte...yasyāṃ sā vyākhyā* ; *viyāhe iti pulliṃganirdeśaḥ prākṛtatvāt* ; *ṣaṭtriṅśatsahasrāṇāṃ* (*vyākaraṇāṇāṃ*) *darsanāt śrutartho vyākhyāyate iti. vākyasaṃbāṃdhaḥ*.

254 N has here the order *loe ... jīvā...*, *sasamae ...*; the verb is here correct, *viyāhijjai* with *loe* ; *samae*, 'jjaṃti with *jivā*.

255 *viyāhe naṃ* C ; the following is omitted in N.

256 *vitthara* A ; *nānāvidhaiḥ surair vividhasaṃsaya-vadbhiḥ priṣṭānaṃ* ; *Mahāvīreṇa*.

257 *dravya...pariṇāmanāṃ yathāsthitabhāvanugama-nikṣepanayapramāṇasuniṇopapakramo vividhaprakāraiḥ prakṛtaṃ pradarsīto yair vyākaraṇaiḥ tāni teṣāṃ...nayaḥ naigamādayaḥ*.

258 *lokālokau prakāśitau yeṣu*.

259 *saṃsārasamudrasya vistīrṇasya uttarāṇe samarthānaṃ*.

260 *suṣṭhu dīṣṭāni, dīpabhūṭāni* ; *anyūnakāni ṣaṭtriṅśatsahasrāṇi yeṣāṃ tāni, iha makāro* 'nyathāpadanipātaḥ ca prākṛtatvāt anavadyaṃ

261 *teṣāṃ darsanāt prakāśanād uparibāṃdhād ity a., athavā teṣāṃ darśnā upadarśakā ity a.*

262 *śrutarthāḥ, te ca bahuvidhaprakārāḥ ce 'ti vigrahāḥ, śrutarthāṇāṃ vā bahuvidhāḥ prakārāḥ iti vigrahāḥ*.

263 *śiṣyahitārthāya*.

264 *guṇamahatthā (!)* B. C. ; *guṇahastā guṇaparyāptyādilaṅgaṇo hasta iva hastaḥ pradhānavayava(h) yeṣāṃ te* (cf. Pet. Dict. s. v. *hasta* 1 i).

265 In the enumeration of daily labours, 1, 378, the statement in lines 9 and foll. is to be explained thus : "at most a whole *sayam* on one day, a moderate measure in two days, at least a *sayam* in three days"—see above p. 250. *āyamāvila* in 14 stands for *āyamāvila ācāmāra* and signifies a meal taken during a fast consisting of a "sour swallow", a portion of sour pap cf. Leumann *Aupap.* p. 101, and in a derived sense a division of time necessary for this meal—1, 18 read : "need a day each ;" 1.19 read "*sedḥhisayāṃ* (book 34)." Much must be now changed in the middle portion of the treatise.

VI. The sixth *aṅgam*, *Nāyādhammakahāu*, [306] *Jñātā*^{266*} *dharmakathās*, in two *suyakhaṁdhas* (*śrutaskandha*), which are very different in extent. The first in 19 *ajjhayaṇas* contains the *nāyāṇi*, which word is explained by *udāharāṇa*, *dr̥ṣṭāṁta*, i.e. edifying tales or parables, designed to serve as moral examples ; the second which is much smaller, contains in 10 *vaggas* the *dhammakahāu*, i.e. edifying legends. The specific difference in the contents of both parts is not rendered clear by this method of division,²⁶⁷ which itself is characterized in the legendary introduction to the text as a constituent part of the same.

In this introduction, which begins with the formula usually found in legends—*teṇaṁ kāleṇaṁ teṇaṁ samaeṇaṁ*—the work is referred to a dialogue between Mahāvīra's scholar Suhamma and the latter's scholar Jambū,²⁶⁸ which took place at the period of king Koṇia of Campā. Suhamma represents the transmission of the [307] sacred texts as proceeding directly from Mahāvīra. He prefaces "the fifth *aṅgam* is now ended (*pañcamassa aṅgassa ayam aṭṭhe pannaṭte*), what is the contents of the sixth *aṅgam*?" and then continues with a detailed presentation of its division as given above, citing the titles of each of the 10 *ajjhayaṇas* of the first *suakkhaṁdha*. Hereupon follows one of the usual *ajjhayaṇa* introductions which from this point on is found at the beginning of each of the following *ajjh.*

This style of introduction and of tabulation of the contents recurs²⁶⁹ in exactly the same form in the case of *aṅgas* 7-11, and proves that these six *aṅgas* especially are bound together and have perhaps been the subject of treatment at the hands of the same redactor. They are connected like links in a chain, inasmuch as in the beginning of each *aṅga* reference is made to, the *aṅgas* preceding it. The first four *aṅgas* have a mark of unity in their introductory formula *suyam me* and in their close *ti bemi*. The fifth *aṅga* occupies an isolated position.

^{266*} See Schol. Hem. 243 p. 319 (Bgk.-Rieu) for the length of the *ā* in *Jñātā*.—The same length is observed in the Vedic compound *idhmā-barhis* ; see also the *Vienna Oriental Journal*, Vol. III, p. 331, note 2—L.

²⁶⁷ Accord. to the Comm. this difference consists herein, that in the first part *āptop-ālambhādijñātair dharmārtha upanītaḥ*, in the second part *sāksāt kathābhir abhi-dhīyate*. The second part contains, it is true, no parables and similitudes, but the first, as well as the second contains *kathās*. As Leumann informs me the term *nāya* is treated in great detail in *aṅga* 3, 4, 3.

²⁶⁸ The Prakrit text *Jambūdiṭṭhāṁta*, or *Jambūsvāmīkathānakam*, in 21 *uddeśas*, deals with him ; the Prakrit in it is very like the *apabhraṁśa*.

²⁶⁹ The tenth has now, it is true, another introductory formula. Abhayadeva however cites a different one which is exactly the same as that found before *aṅgas* 7, 8, 9, and 11.

The fact that this *introductio solennis* is found in all six *aṅgas*, alike, is proof enough of its late origin and of its being the work of a hand which brought all six into close conjunction. If this be so, it is possible to conceive that the explanation of the name *nāyā-dhammakahāu* which occurs in *aṅga* 6 (*nāyāni ya* [308] *dhammakahāo ya*) is not in harmony with its original signification. I prefer the foll. explanation : first separate the word into *nāyādhamma* and *kahāu* and understand by *nāyādhamma* the “*dharma* of the Jñāta” i.e. of Mahāvira^{270*} (see above, p. 261, on *aṅga* 2, 1, 1, 6), and understand the meaning to be “Recitals for the *dharma* of the Jñāta.”

But we must not suppress an objection. In the *aṅga* section in *aṅga* 4 and *Nandī*, both parts of *aṅga* 6 are especially recognized, and in fact by the same titles : *nāyāi*, and *dhammakahāu*. This misunderstanding, if such here exist, must have been anterior to the date of *aṅga* 4 and N. I cannot however regard this as a cogent objection, since the *Nandī* is the work, according to all probability, of Devarddhi-gaṇi himself (980 Vīra), and the section of *aṅga* 4 is perhaps, in the last instance, the production of a still later period (cf. above, p. 284.)²⁷¹

The statements in reference to the extent of the second part of *aṅga* 6 contained in *aṅga* 4 and identical with those of the *Nandī*, are full of the most fabulous exaggerations, cf. p. 286, 289. Each of the *dhammakahās* is said to contain 500 *akkhāiyās*, each of these 500 *uvakkhāiyās* ; each *uv.* 500 *akkhāiya-uvakkhāiyās* with a total of “3½ *koṭi*”, i.e. 35 millions of *akkhāiās*. This latter sum excites the hostility of surprise since, if we reckon each [309] of the ten *vaggas* of the second part as a *dhammakahā*, the result for all 10 is if we trust the above quoted statements, 125 *koṭis*, namely 10×500^3 , i.e. 1250 millions ! According to the Schol. on the *Nandī* this riddle is solved by the assumption that of the 125 *koṭis*, only 3½ *koṭi* are “*apunarukta*”, and the remaining 121½ *koṭis* have occurred in the nine *ajjh.* 11-19 of part 1, each of which in turn contains 540 *akkh.* having each 500 *uvakkh.* and these 500 *akkh.* *uvakkh* each.

270* The length of the *ā* of *nāyā* (cf. Pāṇ. 6, 3, 129, 130) is irregular according to both explanations.—See however the first note on this *aṅga*. It certainly militates against the plausibility of the above conjecture, that the recitals of the first part are cited in the references of the redactor under the designation of *nāyā* (*jahā aṁḍanāe, jahā Mallināe*)—L.

271 There is no reason whatever to suppose a misunderstanding in the above passages only to please an etymology of the 19th century ; even in this very *aṅga* 6 the term *nāyā* is applied to the first and twelfth *ajjh.* as will be seen from their titles given later on. Remember also the term *nāyajjhayaṇāim* spoken of above on *aṅga* 419.

Dismissing such calculations as mere child's play, let us examine the actual state of things. In the first place the titles of the 19 *ajjhayaṇas* of part 1 are enumerated at the outset (see page 307), and are found singly in *Āvaśy*, 16,82.83 (*Āv.*) and in the *Vidhiprapā* (*V.*)²⁷² They are as follows :—

1. *Ukkhittaṇḍe, Utkṣiptam* : the "raised" but not replaced foot of an elephant, the first birth of prince Megha, whose history is here related *ab ovo* (pregnancy of his mother, birth of the child, education, marriage, instruction at the hands of Mahāvīra). See Paul Steinthal : "*Specimen der Nāyādhammakahā*," Leipzig, 1881.²⁷³ The contents are said by Abh. to be *anucitaprayrttikasya śiṣyasyo-pālabhah*.

2. *Samkhāḍa* (*Av. saṃghāḍa V*), *saṃghāṭakah* ; *śreṣṭhicaṇḍarayaṇa ekabāṇḍhanabaddhatvam* ; or *anucitaprayrttikocitaprayrttikayor anarthārthaprapṛttiparamparā*.

3. *Aṇḍa, mayūrāṇḍam* (cf. p. 270 note 4) ; *pravacanārtheṣu śamkitā-śamkitayoh prāṇinor doṣagaṇau* [310].

4. *Kumma, kūrma* ; *asaṃlīnēndriyetaṇḍarayaṇa* (i.e. *asaṃlīnēndriya-saṃlīnēndriyayor*) *anarthārthau*.

5. *Selaa, Śailako rājarṣiḥ* ; *pramāḍavato' pramāḍavataś cā 'narthetarau* (i.e. *anarthārthau*, evil and weal.)

6. *Tumba (tumbaya V)*, *alābū* ; *prāṇātipātādīmatām karmagurutābhāvene' taresām*²⁷⁴ *ca laghutābhāvena anarthaprapṛtittare*.²⁷⁵

7. *Rohiṇī śreṣṭhivadhūḥ* ; *mahāvratānām virāḍhanāvīrāḍhanayor anarthārthau*.

8. *Mallī, ekonaviṃsatitamajinasṭhīnotpannā tīrṭhakari* ;²⁷⁶ *mahāvratānām evā 'lpenā' 'pi māyāsalyena dūṣitānām ayathāvatsvaphalasādhakatvaṃ*, or *māyāvato 'narthah*.

9. *Maimdi (Māyāṇḍi V)* ; *Mākaṇḍi nāma vaṇik, tatputro Mākaṇḍi-śābdene 'ha grhītaḥ* ; *bhogeṣu aviratimato 'nartho, viratimataś cārthaḥ*.

²⁷² I extract these explanations or, as the case may be, statements of contents, from the introductions to each of the *ajjh.* in Abhayadeva's Comm.¹

²⁷³ On page 4 twenty-one *ajjh.* of part 1 are erroneously spoken of ; there are but nineteen.

²⁷⁴ viz. *apṛāṇāti*°.

²⁷⁵ i. e. *anarthaprapṛtyarthaprapṛti*.

²⁷⁶ See Kup. 10 (800).

10. *Caṁdamā* (*camdimā V*) *candramāḥ*; *guṇavṛddhīhānilakṣaṇāv-anarthārthau pramādy-apramādinoh.*

11. *Dāvaddave* (*°ge Āv.*), *samudrataṭe vṛkṣaviśeṣāḥ*; *mārgārādhana-virāadhanābhyām anarthārthau*, or *cāritradharmasya virādhakatvam ārādhakatvam ca.*

12. *Udāga nāe*, *udakaṁ nagaraparikhājalam*; *cāritrārādhakatvam prakṛtimālīmasānām api bhavyānām sadguruparikarmā bhavati*; or *saṁsargaviśeṣād guṇotkarṣaḥ.*

13. *Maṁḍukke*, *Maṁḍukaḥ naṁdimanīkāra-śreṣṭhijīvaḥ*; *saṁsarga-viśeṣābhāvād guṇāpakarṣaḥ*; or *satām guṇānām sāmagry-abhāve hānir.*

14. *Tevalī 'i ya* (*Teuli Āv.*), *Tetalisutā*²⁷⁷ *bhidhāno'mātyaḥ*; *tathāvi-dhasāmagrīśadbhāve guṇasampad upajāyate*; or *apamānād viśayatyāgaḥ*. See pp. 271 note 2. 317.

15. *Naṁdiphala* : [311] *naṁdivṛkṣābhidhānataruphalāni*; *Jinopadeśāt (viśayatyāgaḥ)*, *tatra ca saty arthaprāptis*, *tadabhāve tv anarthaprāptiḥ*; or *viśayābhiṣvaṁgasyā 'narthaphalatā.*

16.²⁷⁸ *Avarakamkā*, *Dhātakīṣaṁḍa Bharataḥsetrarājadhāni*; *tad-viśayanidānasya sā (anarthaphalatā)*; or *nidānā (t) kutsitadānād vā anarthāḥ.*

17. *Āinne*, *ākīrṇā jātyāḥ samudramadhyavartino' śvāḥ*; *īndriyebho niyantritebhyāḥ sa (anarthāḥ) ucyate*; or *īndriyavaśavartinām itareṣāṁ ca 'narthetarau.*²⁷⁹

18. *Sumsumā* (*Sumṣa Āv.*), *Sumsumābhidhānā śreṣṭhiduhitā*; *lobha-vaśavartinām itareṣāṁ ca tāv eva (anarthārthau)*; or *asamvṛtāśravasye' tarasya cā 'narthetarau.*

19. *Pumḍarīe*, *pumḍarikaṁ*; ²⁸⁰ *ciraṁ samvṛtā'sravo bhūtvā'pi yaḥ paścād anyathā syāt tasya alpakālam samvṛtāśravasya ca tāv (anarthetarāḥ) ucyete.*

After the conclusion of *ajjh.* 19 there follows a special conclusion for the first *suyakhaṁdhe*,²⁸¹ then the usual beginning for the second *suyakhaṁdhe* held in the same strain as the introduction to the *aṅga* itself, and giving in detail the contents of each of the ten *vargas*.

²⁷⁷ *Teyaliputte* in the text.

²⁷⁸ Here there is a detailed account of the *Dovai* (*Draupadi*).

²⁷⁹ i. e., *anarthārthau*.

²⁸⁰ See *aṅga* 2, 2, 1.

²⁸¹ The statement that 19 days are necessary to finish the 19 *ajjh.* is found here.

These treat of the *aggamahisto*, 1, *Camārassa*, 2, *Baliṣṣa Vairoyaṇaraṇṇo*, 3, *asurimḍavajjiyāṇaṃ dāhiṇillāṇaṃ imḍāṇaṃ*, 4, *uttarillāṇaṃ asurimḍavajjiyāṇaṃ bhavaṇavāsi-imḍāṇaṃ* 5, *dāhiṇillāṇaṃ vāṇamaṃtarāṇaṃ*, 6, *uttarillāṇaṃ vāṇaṃ*, 7, *chamḍassa*, 8, *sūrassa*, 9, *Sakkassa*, 10, *Isāṇassa* [312].

The actual composition of the text of the second part is quite summary. To the first *vagga* five *ajjhayaṇas* are ascribed,²⁸² their names being *Kālī*, *Rātī*, *Rayanī*, *Vijju*, *Mehā*, names of the five wives of Camara. The history of the first alone is really related, and that in quite brief fashion; that of the second is very much abbreviated and is identified with the first by the use of the customary marks of abbreviation (*evaṃ jahā Kālī, taṃ ceva savvaṃ jāva*); that of the third is still shorter, and the fourth and fifth are settled with a word or two.

The text of the remaining *vargas* is despatched in a like-summary fashion with but few words, although quite a number of *ajjh*, are allotted to several of them. Their contents is as follows: *varga* 2 five *ajjh*., *vargas* 3 and 4, 54 each, *vargas* 5 and 6 each 32, *vargas* 7 and 8 each 4, *vargas* 9 and 10 each 8.—In the *Vidhiprapā* however 10 *ajjhayaṇas* each are allotted to *varga* 1 and 10 to *varga* 2.²⁸³

The extent of the second part in the MSS. is one-twenty-first of the first part. In one MS. the commentary on part 2 is despatched in four lines. Even if all due regard is paid to the second note on *aṅga* 7 given below on p. 315, how curious are the statements, p. 286, 289, 308, from *aṅga* 4 and *Nandī*.

The events take place in *Rāyagiha*, *Campā*, *Vārāṇasī*, *Bāravati*, *Vīyasogā*, *Teyalipura*, *Ahicchattā*, *Haṭṭhisīsā*, *Puṇḍaragīṇī*. In the first account we find an [313] enumeration of non-Aryan peoples; some are not found among those quoted, p. 302, from *aṅga* 5, others are found here which are wanting there. We read (see Steinthal, p. 28): *bahūhiṃ Cīlāiyāhiṃ khujjāhiṃ vāvaṇi(!)-vaḍabhi(!)-Babbari Vaūsi-Joniya - Palhavi - Isiṇi - Thārugiṇi - Lāsiya - Laūsiya - Damili - Siṇhali-Āravi-Pulimḍi-Pakkani, Bahali-Murumḍi-Sabari-Pārasṭhiṃ*. There is, further-more, mention made here of 72 *kalās* (cf. p. 282 and Steinthal,

²⁸² *paḍhamassa vaggassa paṃca ajjhayaṇā paṃ taṃ : Kālī...Mehā.*

²⁸³ ...*paḍhamavaggo, tammi dasa ajjhayaṇā...vīe dasa ajjhayaṇā*, (see above, p. 231).

p. 29). The word *javanīyā* (St. p. 14), *yavanikā*, "curtain", refers to a stage-curtain or to the theatrical plays of the Greeks. We must not fail to notice the mention of 18 *desibhāsāo* (St. p. 29) in a list which does not go into detail (see below, p. 336 and on up. 1 Cf. *Ind. Stud.* XVI. 38 on the word *talavara* (St. p. 14).

There is a commentary by Abhayadeva.

The table of contents in *aṅga* 4 or *Nandī* (N) is :—*se kim taṁ nāyādhammakahāu*²⁸⁴ ? *nā° hāsu naṁ nāyāṇam*²⁸⁵ *nagarāim ujjanāim ceiyāim vanasamāda* (dāim N) *rāyāno*²⁸⁶ *ammāpiyaro samosaraṇāim dhammāyariyā dhammakahāu ihaloīyā paraloīyā iḍḍhivisesā bhogapariccāyā pavajjau suyapariggahā tavo°-vahāṇāim pariyāgā samlehaṇāu bhattapaccakkhāṇāim pāvogamaṇāim*²⁸⁷ *devalogagamaṇāim*²⁸⁸ *sukulapaccāyāto*²⁸⁹ *puṇa-bohilāo*²⁹⁰ *aṁtakiriyāo* [314] *ya*²⁹¹ *aghaviijaṁti jāva*,²⁹² *nāyā° hāsu*²⁹³ *naṁ pavvaiyāṇam viṇayakaraṇajinasāmisāsanaṇavare*²⁹⁴ *saṁjamapainnāpālaṇadhiimaivavasāya-dulla-bhāṇam*,²⁹⁵ *tavaniyama-tavo° vahāṇa-ṇaduddhārabharabhaggāṇisaḥāṇi-satthāṇam*,²⁹⁶ *ghorapārisahaparājiyāṇam*, *sahapāraddharuddha-siddhālaya-*

284 *jñātāny udāharaṇāni tatpradhānā dharmakathā jñā° °thā, dīrghatvaṁ saṁjñātvāt ; nāyādā is° taken here as karmadh...not as a dvandva.*

285 *nāyāim BC, jñātānām udāharaṇabhūtānām Meghakumārādīnām nagarādīny ākhyāyante, nagarādīni dvāi viṁsatīḥ padāni kaṇṭhyāni.*

286 The foll. is inverted in N *samo° rā° am° dh hāo dh°riyā ihalogaparalogiā riddhivisesā bhogapariccāgā pavajjā pariāgā suapa° tavova° samle° bhattapaccakkhāṇā ; in aṅgas 7 fg. the case is similar.*

287 *pāuga° A, pāvoga° N,*

288 N ed. has according to Leumann the following just as in *aṅga* 7 (p. 307),

289 ? *pavvaya BC, pāvayai A, paccāto N.*

290 *°lābhā N.*

291 *°yāu A, °yāo N. °yāto ya BC.*

292 *jāva* signifies that here *anyāni pañca padāni da(r) syāni, i.e.,* after *āgh.*, the usual five words *pannavijjanti paruvī° dāmsi° nidaṁsi° uvadāmsi°.*

293 *jāva nāyā°* to the end is omitted in N ; in which there follows *dasa dhammakahāṇam vaggā* and the remarks in reference to the number of the *akkhāias.*

294 *sāmi* omitted in BC. *°śāsana-vare śeṣappravacanāpekṣayā pradhānapravacane ity a., pāṭhāntareṇa ; samāṇāṇam viṇayakaraṇajinasāsanaṇammi* (perhaps an older reading) *pāvare.*

295 *paṇṇa, thiti, duvvalāṇam A : saṁyamapratijñā samyamābhuyupagamaḥ ; sai° va dur-adhigamyatvāt kātaranara-kṣobhakatvāc ca pātālam iḥa pātālam* (other reading), *tatra dhṛtmativyavasāyā durlabhā yeṣāṁ te tathā ; pāṭhāntareṇa samyamapratijñāpālānāya dhṛtmativyavasāyās teṣu dūrbalā ye, teṣāṁ.*

296 *dudhara bharabhaggā A ; taponiyama-tapaūpadhāne, te eva rānās ca kātaranara-kṣobhakatvāt saṁgrāmo.....śramakaraṇatvāt durbharabharaś ca, tābhyāṁ bhagnāḥ. parāṇmukhibhūṛāḥ, tathā niḥsahā nitarāṁ asaktā eva. niḥsahakā, nistṣṭās ca nistṣṭāṁgā muktāṁgā ye te ; prākṛtatveṇa, kakāralopa-saṁdhikaraṇābhyāṁ bhagnā ity ādau dīrghatvam avaseyam.*

magganiggayāṇaṃ,²⁹⁷ *visayasuhatucaāsīvasadosamuchiyāṇaṃ*, *virāhiyacari-ttāṇāṇadamsaṇa-jaiguṇavivihappagāranissārasunnayāṇaṃ*,²⁹⁸ *saṃsāra-apāradukkhaduggaibhavavivihaparamparāpavaṃca*²⁹⁹ *dhīrāṇa ya, jiyapa-rīśahakasāyasennadhiidhaṇiya-saṃjamāucchāha nicchiyāṇaṃ*³⁰⁰ *ārāhiyanā-nadamsaṇacarittajoganissalla*³⁰¹ *suddhasiddhālayamagga-m-abhimuhāṇaṃ*, *surabhavaṇavimāṇasokkhāṃ aṇovamāṃ bhottūṇa*³⁰² *ciraṃ ca bhogabhogāṇi* [315] *tāṇi divvāṇi maharihāṇi tato ya kālakkamacuyāṇaṃ, jaha ya puṇo-laddhasiddhi*³⁰³ *maggāṇaṃ, aṃtakiriyācaliyāṇa ya, sadevamāṇusadhīrakara-ṇakāraṇāṇi, bohaṇa*³⁰⁴ *aṇusāsaṇāṇi guṇadosadarisaṇāṇi diṭṭhaṃte paccae*³⁰⁵ *ya soūṇa, logamuṇiṇo jaha ya tṭhiyā*³⁰⁶ *sāsanammi jaramaraṇaṇasaṇakare, ārāhiyasamjamā ya suralogapaḍiṇiyattā uveṃti*³⁰⁷ *jaha sāsayaṃ sivaṃ savva-dukkhāmokkhaṃ*³⁰⁸ *ee anne ya evamāi 'ttha vitthareṇa ya*.³⁰⁹

VII. The seventh *āṅgaṃ uvāsagadasāu*, *upāsakadaśās*, in ten *ajjhayaṇas*; legends about ten *upāsakas* or pious fathers of families (*gāhāvai*), who, by means of asceticism, &c., attained the divine condition and thereby releasement.

Āṅgas 7-9 belong to the second group of *āṅgas* (see above p. 249, 307), from the general connection of the contents of each, from their common designation in *āṅga* 3,10 as *dasāu*,³¹⁰ "decads," from the special common denomination of their introduction (*ukkeha*, *upakṣepa*) or conclusion (*nikheva*), and from their very limited extent,³¹¹ [316]

297 *sahaprārabdhāraddhāḥ, ata eva siddh°rgaj jñāṇāder. nirgataḥ.*

298 *tair eva yatiguṇaiḥ śūṇyakāḥ; padatrayasya ca karmadhārayaḥ: virādhītacari-trajñānadarśana-yatiguṇa-vividhaprakāraṇiḥsāra-śūṇyakāṇaṃ.*

299 *pavaṃcā BC.*

300 *jīya...seṇiddhittidhāṇaya A; jitaṃ pariśahakaśāyasainyaṃ yaiḥ, dhyter dhanikaḥ svāminaḥ (cf. Aupapāt. § 32 p. 126), saṃyame utsāho...avaśyambhāvi yeśam.*

301 *ṇisalla A; niḥsālyo mithyādarśanādirahitaḥ.*

302 *bhuttūṇa B.C.*

303 *siddha B. C.*

304 *bodhaṇa B. C.*

305 *pavatte BC. pratyayāṇs ca, bodhakāraṇabhūtāni vākyaṇi.*

306 *jahaṭṭhiyā B. C.; lokamunayaḥ...parivrājakādayo yathā ca yena prakāreṇa sthitā(h) sāsane.*

307 *uveli C, uveli A.*

308 *°kkhā A.*

309 *evam āhi 'ttha vichāreṇa ya A.*

310 *daśādhyayanarūpāḥ* see Hem. *abhidh.* v. 244. We saw it is true, above (p. 270 seqq.) on *āṅga* 3, 10 that the designation *dasās* suits only the texts cited there, but not our texts of *āṅgas* 7-9 with the exception of *āṅga* 7; these must consequently be regarded as secondary in comparison to the former.

311 The smallness of these *āṅgas* is however to some extent only one of appearance, in so far as each of the numerous tales, which, from being identical with previous

aṅgas 7-9 thus stand in immediate connection with each other and bear the stamp of an undeniable unity.

This conclusion is drawn from the method of treatment which prevails in them, and which explains their inconsiderable extent. The first account contains (as is the case in part 2 of *aṅga* 6) the pattern on which all the others are modelled. We need therefore refer merely to the points of contact, and make mention of what is new in the presentation of the subject. An especial characteristic of *aṅga* 7 is this : Though different localities are adduced for the single stories, which all belong to the period of Mahāvīra, the king is in every case (the name Senia in the eighth story is the solitary exception) called³¹² Jiyasattu, the origin of which name must be sought in the Ajātaśatru of the Buddhistic legends. The titles of the ten stories are found in *aṅga* 3,10 (S), and are in general the same as those given here ; see above, p. 271 :—

1. Āṇanda in Vāṇiyagāma.
2. Kāmadeva in Cāmpā.
3. Culaṇi (nī SV) piyā (°pitar) in Bāṇārasī.
4. Surādeva, in Bāṇārasī.
5. Cullasaiga (sae S, sayaga V) in Ālabhiyā.
6. [317] Kumḍakoḍila (kolia S V) in Kāṃpillapura ; opposition between Mahāvīra and Gosāla Maṃkhaliputta.
7. Saddālaputta in Polāsapura ; he was a potter and adherent of the Ājīvias (ājīvikāḥ Gośalaśiṣyāḥ, Schol.).
8. Mahāsayaa (sayaga V) in Rāyagiha.
9. Nāṃdiṇīpiyā (°pitar), in Sāvattī.
10. Letiāpiā (°pitar), in Sāvattī.

Vardhamānadeśanā is the title of a metrical treatment in Prakrit *gāthās* of the contents of this *aṅga*, to which I have had access. The MS is cut short at v. 865 in the history of Ānanda. An interlineal version in Sanskrit accompanies the Prakrit ; its first verse cites the

ones, are reduced to some phrases only, must be counted in full. At the end especial mention is made of the number of days necessary for the *uddeśanam* i.e. recital or recitation of each of the *ajjhayanās* or *vargas*. The *Vidhiprapa* characterizes the 10 *ajjh.* as *egasara* because they are not divided into *uddesagas*.

³¹² In each account there is a name beginning with Aruṇa ; in the first the name Aruṇa itself, in the others it forms the first member of a compound e. g. Aruṇābhe, Aruṇappahe, Aruṇakānte, Aruṇasitthe, &c.

title *Vardh°*. The sixth name is the same (v. 8) as in S V ; koliae (kolika), the eighth (v. 9) Mahāsayaṇa (but śataka in the *chāyā*), the tenth Tealipio (Tetalipriya, see p. 310).

There is an anonymous commentary, which refers to a *vyākhyā* on *aṅga* 6. by the same author. The word *kaṁṭhya* (often erroneously *kaṁvya*), which is frequently used in the scholia when the meaning of a passage is plain and needs no further comment, implies that these passages are "in everybody's throat, intelligible by themselves". This I owe to the courtesy of a communication from Bühler.

The table of contents in *aṅga* 4 and *Nandī* is as follows :—*se kim tarṁ uvāsagadasāu ? uvā°sāsu naṁ uvāsagāṇaṁ (samovā° N) nagarāim ujā cei vaṇa (N omits) rāy. 313 amṁa samo dhammāyariyā dhammakahā ihaloga-paraloga-iddhi 314 vīsēṣā, uvāsagāṇaṁ ca 315 silavvaya-veramaṇa-guṇa 316 pacca [318] kkhāṇa-posahovavāsa-paḍivajjanayāu 317 suyapariggahā tavo' vahāṇāim paḍimāu 318 uvasaggā samlehaṇāu bhattachaccakkhāṇāu (°ṇāim N) pāuvagama (pāvagamaṇāim N) deva° sukula° puṇabohi 319 amtakiriyāu ya (N omits) āghavijjanti ; uvāsagadasāsu 320 naṁ uvāsagāṇaṁ riddhivīsēṣā parisā 321 vittharadhammasavaṇāṇi 322 bohilābha-abhigama-sammattavisuddhatā-thirattarṁ 323 mūlaguṇottaraguṇā aticārā tthitivīsēṣā 324 ya bahuvīsēṣā paḍimā 325 bhiggahāṇa 326 pālāṇā uvasaggāhiyāsāṇā 327 niruvāsaggayā ya 328 tava 329 ya carittā silavvayaguṇaveramaṇapaccakkhāṇaposahovavāsa apacchim-*

313 N has again an inverted order (and the complete words). *sa, rā. am, dh° hāo dh°riyā.*

314 *riddhi* N.

315 *uv, ca* N omits.

316 Inverted in N : *bhogapariiccāyā pariyāgā suyapariggahā tavo' vahāṇāim sila° paḍivajjanayā paḍimāo.*

317 *guṇaveramaṇa* N (inverted).

318 *silavratāṇy aṇuvratāṇi, viramaṇāṇi rāgādī(vi)ra(ta)yaḥ (!), guṇā guṇavartāṇi, pratyākhyānāṇi namaskārasahitāṇi ; posadho 'ṣṭamyādīparvādīni, tatro' pavasanam āhāsaṇīrasatkārādītyāgaḥ ; pratipādinato...*

319 *devalogagamaṇāim sukulapacchāo puṇabohilābhā* N.

320 What follows, omitted by N

321 *mātāpūṭṭputrādīkābhyāntara (!) pariṣat, dāsīdāsamitrādīkā vā.*

322 *vistaradharmaśravaṇāni mahāvīrādīnām saṁnidhau.*

323 *samyaktva viśuddhata sthīratva.*

324 *ddhiti A ; guṇataraguṇātiyarā tthitāvīsēṣā B. tthiti C.*

325 *samyagdarśanādīpratimāḥ.*

326 *bhiggahagahaṇapa° C.*

327 *hitāsaṇā B C, upasargādhisahanāni, see Leumann, Aupap. p. 100.*

328 *°sagga ya B C.*

329 *tava ya to °namtiya ya* omitted in A.

*amāraṇāmtīya*³³⁰ ya *saṁlehaṇā* ya,³³¹ *appāṇam* jaha ya *bhāvaittā*, *bahūṇi* *bhattāṇi* *aṇasaṇḍe* ya *cheittā*,³³² *uvavannā* *kappavaravimāṇuttamesu*³³³ jaha *aṇubhavaṁti* *suravaravimāṇavarapomḍariesu*³³⁴ *sokkhāim* *aṇovamāim*, *ka-* *mena-bhottūṇa* *uttamāim*³³⁵ *tao* *āukkhaeṇam* *cuyā* *saṁānā* jaha *jiṇamay-* *aṁmi* *bohiṁ* *laddhūṇa*³³⁶ ya *saṁjamuttamam* *tamarayaoghavippa* [319] *mukkā*³³⁷ *uveṁti*³³⁸ jaha *akkhayam*³³⁹ *savvadukkhavimokkham* *ete*. *anne* ya *evam-āim*.

VIII. The eighth *aṅga*, *aṁtagaḍadasāu*, *aṁtakṛtadaśās*, or *amta-* *kṛddaśās*, see Hem. *abh.* v. 244 ; in eight *vaggas*, embraces in all 93 *ajjhayaṇas*, viz. (10, 8, 13, 10, 10, 16, 13, 10) :³⁴⁰ it deals with legends concerning the pious, who have "put an end" to their worldly life.³⁴¹

The number of the *vaggas*, eight, is very remarkable, as it is not in harmony with the concluding part of the title.³⁴² Our surprise is however increased when we reflect that in *aṅga* 3 and *aṅga* 4 (see above 271, 286) ten *ajjhayaṇas* were allotted to our text ; in *aṅga* 4, besides, seven *vaggas* and ten *ūddesaṇakālas*. The *Nandī* agrees with our text in apportioning to it eight *vaggas* (and eight *udd.*), but makes no mention of *ajjhayaṇas* whatever. Furthermore the titles of the ten *ajjhayaṇas* cited in *aṅga* 3, 10, have scarcely anything in common with those of our text (see p. 271, 322) ; some appear in *aṅga* 9. There is therefore here a violent opposition between [320] the tradition and the actual constitution of the text. We have seen above, p.

³³⁰ *paścātkaḷabhāvinyah*, *akāraś ca maṁgalaparihārārthaḥ* (!) *maraṇarūpe aṁte* *bhavā mārāṇāmtikyaḥ*.

³³¹ Thus A, *saṁlehaṇājjhosāhiṁ* B. C. ; *ātmanah sarīrasya jivasya ca saṁlekhanā* *tapasā rāgādījayavasīkaraṇāni tāsām jjhosāna tti joṣaṇa sevānā*.

³³² *cheiyattā* A ; *chedayityā*.

³³³ *kalpavareṣu yāni vimānāny uttamāni teṣu*.

³³⁴ *varattapumḍariesu* A.

³³⁵ *k. bh. utt.* omitted in A.

³³⁶ *bohi* B, *laddheṇa* A.

³³⁷ *raja* A. *rayogha* BC ; *tamo-raja-oghavipramuktāḥ ajnānakarmapravāha-vipra*°.

³³⁸ *uveṁti* omitted in A ; *upayanti*.

³³⁹ *āksayam apunarāvṛttikam*.

³⁴⁰ Likewise in the *Vidhiprapā*.

³⁴¹ *aṁto vināśaḥ, sa ca karmaṇas tatphalasya ca saṁsārasya kṛto yais te'ntakṛtās* *te ca trthakarādayaḥ*.

³⁴² The scholiast seeks to reconcile the contradiction as follows :—*prathamavarge daśā* *'dhyayanāni* *'ti tatsaṁkhyayā aṁtakṛtadaśā*. This is of course a mere make-shift. If Abh. appeals to the *Nandī* on this point (see p. 291n), he can mean nothing else (since the *Nandī* contains nothing of the kind) than that the *Nandī* cites for our *aṅga* eight "vaggas" instead of ten "ajjh." This so-called "explanation" substitutes, without a word of warning "ajjh. for vagga".

272, 291, that even Abhayadeva on *aṅgas* 3 and 4 confessed that he was unable to explain the differences between the statements made there and the text constituting the *aṅga*.

In harmony with this is the fact that the existing text is in an exceedingly fragmentary condition, and is filled with references to sections in *aṅgas* 5 and 6, *upāṅga* 2 and according to the scholia, to the *Daśāśrutaskandha*, the fourth *chedasūtram*. In many instances, the later *ajjhayaṇas* of a *vagga*, just as was the case in part 2 of the sixth *aṅga* and in *aṅga* 7, present us with nothing more than a mere title. Each *vagga* is preceded by a statement in *kārikā*-form of the contents of the *ajjhayaṇas*, which are therein contained. The scholiast on the *Nandī* thinks that by the *vaggacūliya*³⁴³ (mentioned among the *aṇḍapaviṭṭha* texts) the 8 *vaggas* of the *Antakṛddasās* are intended. The same statement is found in the scholium on *aṅga* 3, 10 ; though there appears to be no proper place for any *cūliya* whatever.

The scene of the first story is in *Bārāvati* at the court of king *Amḍhayavaṇḍhi* (*Amḍhakavṛṣṇi*), or of *Kaṇhe nāmaṃ Vāsudeve rāyā* ; the names *Vasudeva*, *Baladeva*, *Ariṭṭhanemi*, *Pajjunna*, *Samba*, *Aṇiruddha*, *Jāmbavatī*, *Saccabhāmā*, *Ruppiṇī* &c., which belong to this story, and also that of *Bārāvati* itself, are met with frequently as the recital proceeds. The ninth story of the first *vagga* treats of *Paseṇai*, [321] *Prasenajit*. The third *vagga* begins with the history of *Aṇiyasa*, son of *Nāge nāma gāhāvati*, *Sulasā nāma bhāriyā*,³⁴⁴ under king *Jiyasattu* of *Bhaddilapura*. The sixth *vagga* begins with the history of *Makayī* under king *Seṇia* of *Rāyagiha*. The other localities are essentially the same as those in *aṅga* 7, viz.-*Vaṇiyagāme*, *Savatthī*, *Polāsapura*, *Vaṇārasī*, *Cāmpā*, and also *Sāee* (*Sāketa*). The last *vagga* treats especially of the ten wives of king *Seṇia*, step-mothers (*cullamāyā*) of king *Koṇiya* : *Kālī*, *Sukālī*, &c., who one and all zealously studied the *sāmāya-m-āiyāim ekkārasa aṇḍāiṃ* and are instructed therein by the *Ajja Cāmdaṇā* (about whom no further notice is given). This piety is probably connected with the death of the sons of each, cf. *upāṅga* 8 (*Nirayāvalisutta*) ; and their grandsons—sons of these sons—become ascetics if we may ascribe any probability to the legend, Cf. *upāṅga* 9.

343 The text has *vaṇḍga*,° but *Pākṣikasūtra* and *Vidhiprapā* and also *aṅga* 3, 10 (above p. 274) have likewise *vagga*°.

344 Cf. *Jacobi*, ante Vol. IX. p. 28 (1880) and *Abhay* on *aṅga* 3, 8 and 9. *Leumann*, *Wiener Zeitschrift f. d. Kunde des Morgenl.* Vol. III. p. 333.

The *kārikās* with the titles of the *ajjhayaṇas* for the single *vargas* are :—

1. *Gotama*³⁴⁵ *Samudda Sāgara Gambhīre ceva hoī Thimete ya| Ayale Kampille khalu Akkhobhe Paseṇai Viṇhu||*.

2. *Akkhobhe Sāgare khalu Samudde Himavaranta Acala nāme ya| Dharane ya Pūraṇe ya Ajjhicaṇḍe (Abhiṇaṇḍe) ceva aṭṭhamae||*.

3. *Aṇiyase Aṇamtasene Ajjiyaseṇe Aṇihayariū Devasene Sattuseṇe| Sāraṇe Gae Sumuhe Dumuhe Kūvae Dāsae Aṇāhiṭṭhi||*.

[322]4. *Jāli Mayāli Uvayāli Purisaseṇi ya Vāriseṇe ya| Pajjuṇṭa Saṁba Auiruddha Saccaṇemi ya Daḍhaṇemi||* For the first 5 names see *aṅga* 9, 1.

5. *Paūmāvati Gorī Gaṇdhārī Lakkhāṇā Susimā ya Jāmbavati| Sacca- bhāmā Ruppini Mūlasiri Mūladattā vi ||*.

6. *Makāyī Kimkam(m)e*³⁴⁶ *ceva Moggarapāṇi ya Kāsava| Khemate Dhitidhare ceva Kelāse Haricaṇḍane|| Vāratte Sudamṣaṇe Punnabhadde taha Sumaṇabhadde Supaiṭṭhe| Mehātimutte Alakkhe ajjhayaṇāṇaṁ tu solasayaṁ||*

7. *Naṇḍā Naṇḍavati cevā Naṇḍuttarā Naṇḍiseṇiyā ceva| Marutā Sumarutā Mahāmarutā Marudevā ya aṭṭhamā|| Bhaddā Subbaddā ya Sujayā Sumaṇāi ya| Bhūyadinṇā ya bodhavvā Sehiyabhajjāṇa nāmāti||*

8. *Kālī Sukālī Mahākālī Kaṇhā Sukaṇhā Mahākaṇhā| Virakaṇhāya bodhavvā Rāmaṇhā taheva| Piuseṇakaṇhā navamī dasamī Mahāseṇakaṇhā ya||*

It is impossible to reconstruct any correct metre in these *kārikās*, since the lines are a confused mass of *śloka* and *āyā* homistiches.

The table of contents in *aṅga* 4 or *Nandī* (N) is as follows :— *se kim taṁ aṇṭagaḍaḍasaū ? aṇṭa° sīsu ṇaṁ aṇṭagaḍāṇaṁ nagarāiṁ ujjaṇāiṁ ceiyaṁ vaṇa° rāyā° ammaṇṇapiyaro samosaraṇaṁ dhammāyariyā dhamma- kahāu*³⁴⁷ *ihalogaparaloga*³⁴⁸ *bhogapariccāga pavajjāu suya*³⁴⁹ *tavo*

³⁴⁵ Also in the *Vidhiprapā* : *ittha ajjhayaṇāṇi Goyama m-āṇi*.

³⁴⁶ *Kimkamme* is found in *aṅga* 3, 10, for *aṅga* 8 ; this should have been stated on page 271. In reference to the question where *Mayāli* is identical with *Bhagāli*, see the same page. Is *Jāli* equal to *Jamāli* ? The account here entitled *Gae* treats of *Somila*, as *Leumann* informs me. See *ibidem*.

³⁴⁷ In N we find the same transposition as in the case of 6, 7, *sa° rā° a° dha° hāo° dh°- riyā*.

³⁴⁸ *°paralogiyā riddhiviṣeṣā* N.

³⁴⁹ N inserts *pariyāgā* before *sua°*.

*paḍimāu*³⁵⁰ [323] *bahuvihā tavo*³⁵¹ *khamā ajjavam maddavam ca soyaṃ ca saccasahiyam*³⁵² *sattarasaviho ya* (B. C., °hā yā ya A) *saṃjamo* (me A, °mo ya B. C.) *uttamam ca baṃbham akimcaṇayā tavokiriyāu samiti guttiū cevā, taha*³⁵³ *appamāyajogo* (°ge A) *sajjhāyajjhāṇa*³⁵⁴ *ya uttamāṇam doṇham pi lakkaṇāim, pattāṇa ya saṃjamuttamam jiya* (jiya A) *parisa-hāṇam ya caūvihakammakkhayanmi jaha kevalassa*³⁵⁵ *laṃbho, pariyāu* (°yāto B. C.)³⁵⁶ *jattio* (°ito B. C., jatiyāu A) *ya jaha pālito* (pālayato A) *munihī, pāuvagāi ya*³⁵⁷ *jo jahim*³⁵⁸ *jattiyāṇi bhattāṇi cheyattā* (cheittā A, che-dattā B. C.) *amtakaro* (°gaḍo B. C.) *muṇivaro*³⁵⁹ *tama-rao'-gha*³⁶⁰ *mukko mokkhasuham anuttaram ca patto* (A, pattā B. C.) *ete anne ya evam-āi-tthā parūviyā* (parūve, B. C.) *jāva*.

IX. The ninth *aṅgam*, *anuttarovavāiyadasāu*, *anuttaraupātikadaśās* ;³⁶¹ in 3 *vāggas* with 33 *ajjhayaṇas* (10, 13, 10) ; contains legends of saints each one of whom attained the highest (*anuttara*) heavenly world (*vimāna*)³⁶².

The name (°*dasāu*) is here too at variance with the constitution of our text, but is in agreement with the statements of *aṅgas* 3 and 4, where only 10 *ajjhayaṇas* are mentioned ; while *aṅga* 4 recognizes but ten (the *Nandī* but three) *uddeśanakālas*, see above p. 286,—[324]. We have already seen that, of all the names given in *aṅga* 3, 10 as those of the 10 *ajjh.*, but three recur in *aṅga* 9. This proves that we have here to do with a text that has suffered a transformation. Our text has been handed down to us in an exceedingly fragmentary state, consisting chiefly of references to Meha (6, 1, 1) and Khaṇḍava (5, 2, 1) ; the

350 14 *paḍimāto* BC ; N has instead of *paḍimāu* merely *saṃlehayāo bhattapaccakkhānam pāvagamaṇā sukulapaccāio punavohilābhā amtakiriyāo a āghavijjānti :—dvādaśa bhikṣupratimā māsiyādayaḥ* (cf. Leumann on *Aup.*, § 24).

351 sic. A, *bahuvihāto* BC.

352 *saucam ca satyasahitaṃ*.

353 *yāto samii guttiū ceva* BC, *samitayo guptayaś ca*.

354 *svādhyāyadhyānayoḥ*.

355 *jñānāder lābhaḥ*.

356 *paryāyaḥ pravrajyālakṣaṇaḥ, yāvāms ca yāvadvārṣādīpramāṇo yathā yena tapo-viśeṣāśrayaṇādinaḥ prakāreṇa pālito munibhiḥ*.

357 *muṇihim ppātovagato ya* BC.

358 *prāyopagamābhidhānam anaśanam pratipanno yo munir yatra*.

359 *amtakṛto munivaro. jāta iti śeṣaḥ*.

360 *raūgha A, ratogha* BC.

361 This should strictly be °*pādika* ; cf. my remarks on *upāṅga* 1.

362 *nā śmād uttaro vidyate ity anuttaraḥ, upapāto* (°*pādo* (!) *janmārthaḥ, anuttaraḥ pradhānaḥ anyasya tathā-vidhayaḥ bhāvād upapāto* (°*pādo*) *yeṣāṃ te, tadvaktavyātāpratibaddhā daśā daśādhyayanopalakṣitā*.

first story alone of each *varga* is passably complete, the others are cited merely by their catch words.

The events of these recitals transpire in Rāyagiha, Sāgeta Vāṇiyagāma, Hatthiṇapura. The names of the personages involved are to be extracted from the *kārikās*, which cite the titles of the 33 *ajjhayaṇas* ; viz :—

1. Jālī³⁶³ Mayāli Uvajāli Purisasene ya Vārisene ya/Dihadaṁte ya Laddhadaṁte Vehallo Vehāyase Abhaye ti kumāre||See page 521 for the first five names.

2. Dihasene Mahāsene Laddhadaṁte (again (!) ya Gūḍhadaṁte ya Suddhadaṁte ya|Halle Dumme Dumasene Mahādumasene ya āhite|| 1|| Sihe ya Sihasene ya Mahāsihasene ya āhite|Pumasene ya bodhavve terasame hoi ajjhayaṇe || 2 ||

3. ³⁶⁴Dhanne ya Sunakkhatte Isidāse ya āhite|Pellae Rāmaputte Pacaṁdimā Puṭṭimāi-ya||1|| Peḍhālaputte (cf. *aṅga* 2, 2, 7) aṇagāre Poṭṭileiya Vehalle|dasame vutte ime.ye dasa āhiyā||2||.

Our information in reference to these persons is limited almost entirely to their names [325] alone. In the first history (of Jālī), which is a prototype of the rest, it is at least related that he *ekkārasa aṇgāim ahijjati*.

It is surprising that the table of contents in *aṅga* 4, or *Nandī* (N), is particularly explicit. This is probably to be explained by the fact that it had as its subject an entirely different text from that which we possess. It is as follows :—*se kiṁ taṁ aṇuttarovavāiyadasāo ? aṇu°sāsu ṇaṁ aṇuttarovavāiyāṇaṁ ṇagarāi ujjā° cei° vaṇa°³⁶⁵ rāyā° amma° samo° dhammāya° dhammakahā°³⁶⁶ ihaloga°³⁶⁷ pavvajjā suya°³⁶⁸ tavo° paḍimāo°³⁶⁹ saṁlehaṇā bhatta° pāu° aṇuttarovavatti* (A, vāto BC. °rovavāyatti N) *sukulapaccāyāi* (yāti BC, ccāto N) *puṇabohi° aṇtakiriyā āghavijjanti ;*

³⁶³ *ittha ajjhayaṇāṇi Jālī-m-āṇi, Vidhiprapā.*

³⁶⁴ Five of these names recur in *aṅga* 3, 10 for *aṅgas* 8 and 9, cf. p. 271.

³⁶⁵ N omits (an error of the scribe).

³⁶⁶ N inverts *sa° ra° am° dh° hāo dh° riyā.*

³⁶⁷ *ihalogapari° A, ihalogapārāloga BC, ihaloipārāloia riddhiviśeṣā bhogapariccāga pavajjāo N.*

³⁶⁸ *pariyāgā°* before *sua* in N.

³⁶⁹ *paḍimātave, A, merely paḍi° BC, paḍimāo uvasaggā N.*

anu° sāsū³⁷⁰ nam titthagarasamosarañāim paramamaṅgalajagahiyāni (hittā-
nam A) jīñātisesā ya bahuvisesā³⁷¹ jīñasīsānam ceva samaṇagaṇa, (gaṇa-
gaṇa A) payaragamdhahatthīnam³⁷², thirajasānam, parisahasenna (seṇa A)
rivu (ripu A) balapamaddaṇṇīam (balāpa° C) tavaditto³⁷³ carittaṇāṇasamma-
ttasāra-vivihappagāra vittharapasattha guṇasamjuyānam³⁷⁴ aṇagāramaharist-
nam aṇagāraguṇānam vanna³⁷⁵ uttamavaratava viṣiṭṭhanāṇajogajuttānam,
jaha ya jagahiyam bhagavaū,³⁷⁶ jārisā ya (omitted in BC) riddhi [326]
visesā devāsuraṇānusānam, parisānam pāubbhāvā ya, jīñsamīvam jaha
ya uvāsanti jīñavaram,³⁷⁷ jaha ya parikahemti (hamti A)³⁷⁸ dhammam loga
(loka A) guru³⁷⁹ amara-narasuragaṇānam, soṇa ya tassa bhaṇiyam
(bhāsiyam A) avasesakammavisayavirattā narā jahā (jadhā BC) abbhuvemti
(abbhāvamti A) dhammam urālam samjamatavam cā 'vi bahuvihappagāram,
jaha bahūni vāsāni aṇucarittā ārāhiyanāṇadamsaṇacarittajogā jīñavayana-
m-aṇugayamahiyabhāsiyā,³⁸⁰ jīñavarāṇa (jaṇa A) hiyaṇa-m-aṇunettā,³⁸¹
je ya jahim jattiyāni bhattāni cheyattā (°tittā BC, cheiyattā A), jadd-
hūṇa ya samāhim uttamam, jīhāṇajogajuttā uvavannā (°vattā B) muṇivarutt-
amā, jaha aṇuttareṣu pāvamti (pāveti A) jaha aṇuttaram tattha visayasokk-
ham, tato³⁸² ya cuyā kameṇa kāhimti samjayā, jaha ya aṇtakiriyam, ce
(ete. BC) anne ya evamādi 'ttha jāva.

X. The tenth aṅgam, paṇhāvāgarañāim, praśnavyākaraṇāni, in ten
dāras, treats in a dogmatic and not in a legendary form, of the ten
ethical duties, viz. ; first of the 5 *adhammas* or *aṇhayas*, *āśrava*,³⁸³ which

370 N omits the foll., *titthakara* BC.

371 *jagaddhiñāni...*; *bahuvisesā* 'dahaṁ vimalasūyamdham' ity-ādyaś' *catustriṅśad*
adhikatarāḥ.

372 *gaṇadharādīnām śramaṇottamāṇām*.

373 *davavad davāgnir iva* (v. e.) *diptāny ujjalāni*; *pāthāmtareṇa* (the foll. is the reading
of the text, *tapodipāni yāni caritrajāṇasamyaktvāni*).

374 *praśastaś ca kṣamādayo guṇāś*; *tañ samyutānam*; *kva cid*; *ruciragaṇa dhuajānam*
iti pāṭhaḥ.

375 *vaṇaū A*, *vattato B*, *vannato C*, *vaṇakaḥ ślāghā, ākhyāyata iti yogaḥ*.

376 *bhagavato jinahitam* (v. e.), *bhagavata iti jinaśāsanam iti gamyate*.

377 *jinasamīpe yena prākāreṇa pañcavidhābhigamādinā sevante rājadayo jinavaram*.

378 *parikathayati* : i. e. plur. majest.

379 *Iokagurur iti jinavaro*; perhaps *gurū°* plural.

380 *jinavacanam ārāvi* (?) *anugataṁ sambaddham, mahitam pūjitam, bhāṣitam yair*
adhyāpanādīnā; *pāthāmtare jinavacanam anugatyā* nuku'yena suṣṭhu bhāṣitam
yais te jinavacanānugatīsubhāṣitāḥ.

381 *hiyātana B*, *hiyateṇa C*; *aṇunittā A*; *iha saṣṭhi dvitīyārthe, tena jinavarān h-*
dayena tamasā (tapasā ?) anuniya prapya dhyatvā.

382 *anuttaravimānebhyaḥ*,

383 i. e. *āśrava*, for which we should expect *āśnava*. In the explanation "ā abhivīdhinā
śrauti śravati karma yebhyas te āśravāḥ", *śnauti śravati* should probably be read
for *śrauti śravati*. In up 1, *aṇhāti* is actually explained by *āśnauti* but also by
āśravati badhnāti (it corresponds in fact to Sanskrit *āśnāti*, L.).

muṣṭ be avoided. These are,—injury to life, [327] lying, robbery, unchastity, (love of) possession, and then of the 5 *dhammas*, or *saṁvaras* (*i.e.* the opposites of each of the above sins).³⁸⁴

The difference between the title and the actual text or contents, between the actual text and the statements of tradition on this point, is especially great. There is nothing said in reference to questions (*praśna*) which find their solution (*vyākaraṇam*). The whole *aṅga* appears to be a didactic dogmatic explanation addressed to Jambū, but not asked for by particular questions. The *Nandī* and *aṅga* 4 state that it contains 45 *ajjhayaṇas*, 45 *uddesaṇas*, etc. ; but no such conclusion is warranted from the facts of the case, cf. p. 286. One *suyakkhaṁdha*, which these authorities and the existing constituent parts ascribe to the text, is branded by the scholiast Abhayadeva. He asserts that the text "*pustakāmtare*"³⁸⁵ consisted³⁸⁶ rather of two *suyakkhaṁdhas* (each containing 5 *ajjhayaṇas*). To prove this the scholiast adduces *verbatim et litteratim* a special introduction confirmatory of his assertion³⁸⁷ ; but this cannot be found in the MSS of our text. This introduction has the same usual form as the introductions to *aṅgas* 6-9 and 11 ; and Abh. refers directly to *aṅga* 6 for the correctness of his explanation, whereupon he adds : *yā ce ha dvi* [328] *śrutaskāṁdhatō 'ktā 'sya sā na rūḍhā, ekaśrutaskāṁdhatāyā eva rūḍhatvāt*. In all probability the enumeration of this text in *aṅga* 3, 10, in the sixth place among the ten *dasāu*, shows that it stands in close connection with the present text or its 10 *dāras*. But we have seen, p. 272, that the names of the ten *ajjhayaṇas* there have no connection whatever with our text, and that the author had before him quite a different text under this name. It is an important feature, that, as stated above, his statements or names are in essential harmony with those statements of contents in reference to our *aṅga*, which occur in *aṅga* 4, or in the *Nandī* ; see page 334. It is of interest in this connection to notice the character of the remarks of the commentator at the beginning of the passage, in reference to the name *praśnavyākaraṇadaśās*. This name, he states, is found, *kvacit*—

³⁸⁴ *tesim nāmāni, jahā : hiṁsādāraṁ 1, musāvāyad. 2, teṇiyad. 3, mehuṇad 4, pariggahad. 5, ahimsād. 6, saccad. 7, atēniyad. 8, baṁbhacerad. 9, apari-ggahādāraṁ 10. (Vidhiprapā).*

³⁸⁵ Likewise in the *Vidhiprapā* : *ittha kei paṁcahiṁ ajjhayaṇehiṁ do suyakkhaṁdhe icchaṁti.*

³⁸⁶ This is self-evident, since the contents are actually divided into two parts.

³⁸⁷ *pustakāmtare punar evaṁ upodghātagraṁtha upalabhyate.*

it is found in *aṅga* 3, 10 and in *aṅga* 4, (see p. 334)—and consequently points to 10 *adhyāyana*s of *praśnānām vyākaraṇāni*. His words are :—*ayaṃ ca vyutpattiyartho 'sya pūrvakāle 'bhūḍ, idānīm tu āśravapaṇcaka-saṃvarāpaṇcakavyākṛtir eve' ho 'palabhyate, atīśayānām* (cf. p. 334) *pūrvā-cāryair aidāmyugīnāpuṣṭā (°napr°?) laṃbanapratiṣevipuruṣāpekṣayo 'ttāritatvād iti*. However, the corrupt conclusion is to be understood—cf. Ed. p. 499—one fact at least is patent ; that we have here traces of the manifest consciousness that the *pūrvācāryas* were acquainted with a different text of this *aṅga* than the *aidāmyugīna*. Everything shows that we are completely justified in asserting that we no longer possess *aṅga* 10 in its original, [329] or in its ancient form. The introductory words in the commentary of Abh. are a proof of this :—*śrī Vardhamānam ānamya vyākhyā kācid vidhīyate|praśnavyākaraṇāṅgasya vṛddhanyāyānusārataḥ|| ajñā vayan, śāstraṃ idaṃ gabhīraṃ, prāyo 'sya kūṭāni ca pustakāni|sūtraṃ vyavasthāpya tato vimṛśya vyākhyānakālpād ita eva nai 'va||2||*.

It is perfectly plain from this that there is here a violent polemic against other text-forms.

That *aṅga* 10 originally, like *aṅgas* 7—9 and 11, was of a legendary character (cf. *aṅga* 3, 10), is rendered probable by a comparison with *upāṅgas* 8—12, which are of the same character. Their position at the end of the *upāṅga* series allows us to draw conclusions in reference to the *aṅga* corresponding to them. If this be so, the transformation of our *aṅga* must be placed at a still later period than that to which we have to refer the harmonizing of the 12 *aṅgas* and the 12 *upāṅgas*.

There are various criteria contained in the *aṅga* itself which determine the late date of its composition. I premise that the introduction which we possess, consists, if the vocative *Jambū* be omitted, of three *gāthās*, which state in brief the contents of the work :—

*iṇam o aṇhayāsaṃvara-viṇicchayaṃ pavayaṇassa nīsaṃdam|vocchāmi
niṇchayatthaṃ subhāsitatthaṃ mahesīhiṃ||1||*

[330] *paṇcavidho pannatto Jīṇehiṃ iha aṇhaye aṇātīye (aṇādiu B)|
hiṇsā mosam³⁸⁸ adattam abaribha (is wanting ; perhaps ya) pariggahaṃ
ceva||2||*

*jārisao jaṁ nāmā jaha ya kato jārisaphalaṁ deriṁti| je vi ya kareṁti
pāvā pāṇavahaṁ taṁ ṇisāmeha||3||*

Then follows in prose, first an explanation of the *pāṇivaha*; then 30 of its synonyms (*nāmāṇi imāṇi gonnāṇi*); then the subject itself is treated of, at the conclusion of which the entire doctrine is referred immediately to *Nāyakulanārṇdana* (*Jñātā*)³⁸⁹; *evam āhaṁsu Nāyakulanārṇdano mahappā Jiṇo u Viravaranāmadhejjo, kaheṣi ya pāṇivahassa phalavivāgaṁ; eso so pāṇivadho caṁḍo* (as in the introduction) *vemaṇaso*.

The next four sections are similarly arranged, except that after the vocative Jambū the treatment of the *aliyavayaṇaṁ*, *adinnādāṇaṁ*, *abambhaṇaṁ*, *pariggaha*, begins without the interposition of *gāthā* strophies. The synonyms are invariably 30 in number and the conclusion is the same.

In the case of the five *saṁvaradārāṁ*, two *gāthās* are found in the introduction of the first (*ahiṁsā*) after Jambū 1.³⁹⁰

*itto saṁvaradārā-i paṁca vucchāmi āṇupuvvīe | jaha bhaṇiyāṇi
Bhagavayā savvadukkhavimukkhaṇaṭṭhāe||1||*

*paḍhamam hoi ahiṁsā, biiyaṁ saccavayaṇaṁ ti pannattam/dattam
aṇuṇṇāya saṁvaro ya bambhaceraṁ pariggahattam||2||*

[331] The further details in *dāras* 6-10 are similar to those in *dāras* 1-5. The enumeration of the synonyms, which are here called *pajjavanāmāṇi*,—60 in the case of *ahiṁsā*—is carried on in a style somewhat different, and the concluding formula is not the same :—*evam Nāyamuṇiṇā bhagavayā pannaviyaṁ parūviyaṁ pasiddham siddham siddhavarasāsaṇam iṇam āghaviyaṁ suvesiyaṁ pasaṭṭham (paḍhamam) saṁvaradārāṁ samattam ti bemi*. The last two concluding words form a bond of connection between the existing redaction of *aṅga* 10 and *aṅgas* 1-4, to which these words belong. Furthermore, the appeal to the *Nāya* recalls *aṅga* 2. Perhaps we have to deal here with traces of ancient date; but, on the other hand, if we consider how many considerations make for the opposite conclusion a conservative point

389. See above, p. 261, on *aṅga* 2, 1, 27.

390. There are five *gāthās* more inserted between *dāras* 5 and 6.

of view will not permit too great weight to be laid upon these particulars, which are rather the result of an effort to impart an ancient flavour to the *aṅga*.

The following arguments, drawn from *aṅga* 10 itself, reinforce our conclusion that this *aṅga* is of late origin. The character of the language is late. The nominative in *o* has assumed in almost every instance the place of the nomin. in *e*, except in quoted passages in the frequent compounds there is no deference paid to the laws of *saṁdhi* between the members of the compounds; also these are often not inflected at the end, (*etāni prāyo luptaprathamābahuvacanāni padāni*, are the words of the scholiast), but retain their pure thematic form. [332] In the other *aṅgas* (e.g. in the tables of contents in *aṅga* 4) and especially inserted in them, we find phenomena not dissimilar in character, but not in such numbers. Their presence however invariably characterizes the passages in which they occur as being of secondary origin. Furthermore—and this is conclusive evidence—the enumeration of the names of the non-Aryan peoples is three times as great as that in *aṅgas* 5, 6, (p. 302, 313). Here there are 53, there but 18 names. The list is as follows³⁹¹ :—*ime ye bahave Milukkha* (mile° BC) *jātī*, *kiṁ te*, *Saga* - *Javaṇa* - *Sabara* *Vavvara* - *Kāya* - *Murumdo* - *dda* - *Bhaḍaga* - *Tiṇṇiya* (*Bhittiya*) - *Pakkaniya* - *Kulakkha* - *Goḍa* (*Goṁḍa*) - *Sihala* - *Pārāsa* - *Komcā* - *Amḍha* - *Daḍḍa* - *Villala* (*Chill*°) - *Pulimda* - *Ārosa*³⁹² - *Domva* - (*Dova*) - *Pokkāṇa* - *Garṁ* - *dhahāraga* (!) - *Vahallā* - *Jallāra* - *Mamāsa* - *Vāusa*³⁹³ - *Malīyā* - *ya* - *Cumcūā* - *ya* - *Cūliyā* *Kāṁkaṇiga* (*Komkaṇagā* B) - *Meyā*³⁹⁴ - *Palhava* - *Mālava* - *Maggara* - *Ābhāsiyā* - *Anakkha*. *Cīṇa* - *Nhāsiya* (*Lāsiya* BC) - *Khasa* - *Khāsiya* - *Nidura* (*Neṭṭara*) - *Marahattṭha*³⁹⁵ - *Muṭṭhiya* (*Mauṣṭikāḥ*) - *Ārava* - *Domvilaga* - *Kuhūṇa* - *Kekaya* - *Hūṇa* - *Romaga* - *Bharu* - *Maruga* - *Cilātavisayavāsī* - *ya*. Some of these names are of evidently late occurrence. The peoples are all characterized as *pāvamatiṇo* and *kūrakammā*.

[333] Especially interesting is the bitter polemic against erroneous

³⁹¹ Of the very frequent variants in the MSS., I have chosen those which appear to have the best authority; cf. the similar enumeration in *upāṅga* 4.

³⁹² *Āroṣāḥ*, *Āroṣāḥ*.

³⁹³ *Jallārāḥ* *Māmāsāḥ* *Bakuṣāḥ* Schol.

³⁹⁴ *Meta* BC, *Medāḥ*; see Elliot, *Hist. of India*, 1, 519 fg. *Indische Streifen*, Vol. II, p. 403.

³⁹⁵ *pāṭhāntare* *Madhāḥ* (*Mudhāḥ* E) Schol. The *Marahattahas* have nothing to do with the *Mlecchas*. *Ramahattā* in *upāṅga* 4.

teachers (*natthikavāṇo vāmalogavārī*)³⁹⁶ in *dāra* 2; under these are comprised the “*Bauddhāḥ*” (Schol.), and the adherents of Issara (Śiva) and Viṇhu. *Ciṇapaṭṭa* appears in *dāra* 4, in the signification of “silk dress”.³⁹⁷ In *dāra* 5 are found the names of the planets; but not in the Greek order; thus Jupiter, Moon, Sun, Venus, Saturn, Rāhu, Dhūmaketu, Mercury, Mars. The first of the series of the 28 *nakkhattas* is unfortunately not stated; only the first and the last of the 72 *kalās* are given; *lehāiyāu saūnaruyāvasāṇāu*; — in the same passage and in the ninth *dāra*, 64 *mahlāguṇas* are likewise mentioned: — *raijaṇaṇe sippasevam* etc.—The *ahimsā* is characterized in *dāra* 6 as *bhagavaṇī*, truth *saccam*, in *dāra* 7, as *bhagavaritāṃ titthagarasubhāsiyaṃ dasaviham*³⁹⁸ *caūddasapuvvīhiṃ pāhuḍatthavidiyam*,³⁹⁹ which is a reference to the *prābhṛta* division in the 14 *pūrvas*. Abhayadeva comments on this *aṅga*.

The table of contents in *aṅga* 4, or *Nandī* (N), is ;— *se kiṃ taṃ pañhāvāgarāṇāni ? pañesu aṭṭhuttaram paṇṇasayam, a. apasīṇasayam, a. paṇṇāpasīṇasayam*,⁴⁰⁰ *vijjāti* [334] *sayā*⁴⁰¹ *nāgasuvanṇehiṃ saddhiṃ*⁴⁰² *divvā sarivāyā*⁴⁰³ *āghaviṃjānti ; pañhāvāgarāṇadasāsu naṃ sasamayaparasa-*
mayapannavaya (paṇavayā A) patteyyabuddhāvivihaṭṭhabhāsā (bh. omitted
in A) bhāsīyānaṃ,⁴⁰⁴ *atīsayagūṇa-uvasama-nāṇappagāra (rā A) āyariya-*
*bhāsīyānaṃ vitthareṇaṃ thira (vira A) mahesṭhiṃ*⁴⁰⁵ *vivihavittṭhārabhāsi*

396 *lokāyatikāḥ, vāmam pratīpam lokam vadanti ye.*

397 cf. *ciṇapiṭṭharāsi* in *up.* 2 and 3.

398 *janapadasammatasatyādibhedena daśavaikālikādi prasiddham.*

399 *caturdaśapūrvibhiḥ prābhṛtārthaviditāṃ pūrvagatāṃsaviseṣābhi-dheyatayā jñātām.*

400 *tatrā 'ṅgulabāhuprasnādikā mantravidyāḥ prasnāḥ* : yāḥ, vidyāḥ or prasnavidyāḥ ;
later on *prasnā* is treated outright as a fem. *punar vidhinā japyamānā aprstā eva*
(*śubhā*) *śubham kathayānti tā aprasnāḥ* ; *tathā āṅguṣṭhādiprasnābhāvāṃ pratitya*
yā vidyāḥ śubhāśubham kathayānti tāḥ prasnāprasnāḥ ;—Schol. in N ye *pṛstā*
apṛstāś ca kathayānti te prasnāprasnāḥ.

401 Instead of *viññā* N has merely *aṃguṭṭhapaṇiṇāṃ vāhupaṇiṇāṃ addāgapapaṇiṇāṃ aṇṇe vi vicittā divvā vijjāṭṭisayā nāgasavaṇṇehiṃ siddhiṃ divvā samvayā āghaviññāṃti*. Compare the names of the *pañhā° dasū* found in *aṅga* 3, 10. This title we find above in the text. The old text appears therefore to have dealt with chiromantic and other prophetic arts. The explanation in the commentary : *anye vidyāṭṭisayā stambhāstambhavaṣikarāṇavidyēṣikarāṇaccāṇadayoh* refers to magic in general, which was cultivated by the Jains especially ; cf. the statements in reference to the contents of the *mahāparinnā*, p. 251 the books of magic of Nāgārjuna, &c. The orthodox belief could take umbrage at this part of the contents of *aṅga* 10.

402 *savvīm A ; upalakṣaṇatvād yakṣādibhiś ca saha.*

403 *saṁvādāḥ śubhāśubhagatāḥ saṁlāpāḥ.*

404 *prajñāpakā ye pratyekabuddhās te (taiḥ !)* *karakāḍy-ādisaḍṣair vividhārthabhāṣā-*
bhāṣitās tāsām ādarśam guṣṭhādisambandhinīṇām praśnānām vividhaguṇamahār-
thāḥ praśna° daśāv akhyāyanta iti yogaḥ. The expression *pratyekabuddha*, which
recurs in the *Nandī*, is of interest ; cf. p. 265 and *Bhag.* 25. 6, 8, according to
Leumann.

405 *stkiramaharsibhih; pāṭhāntarena virama°.*

yāṇam ca, jagahiyāṇam,⁴⁰⁶ addāga⁴⁰⁷-mguṭṭha-bāhu-asi-maṇi-khomā-ticca-m-āiyāṇam vivihamaḥāpasinavijjā-maṇapasinavijjā (omitted in A) daivayapaṇḍagappahāṇagunāpagāsiyāṇam,⁴⁰⁸ saṁbhūyavigunappabhāva (ppa om. A) ṇaragaṇa-m-ativimhayakarīṇam,⁴⁰⁹ [335] atisayam-aṭyakālasamae⁴¹⁰ damasama (sama is omitted in A) tittthakaruttamassa⁴¹¹ tṭhii (tṭhita A) karaṇa-kāraṇāṇam,⁴¹² durabhigama duravagāhassa savvasavvannūsamma-yassa⁴¹³ buddha (abuha A) jaṇavi-bohakarassa paccakkhayapaccaya-karīṇam⁴¹⁴ paṇhāṇam vivihaguṇamahatthā jīṇavarappaṇiyā āghavijjāṁti (aṭṭhāvijj° A).

XI. The eleventh āṅgam, vivāgasuyam, vipākaśrutam : in two śrutaskandhas, of 10 ajjhayaṇas each, contains legends on the reward of good and evil deeds.

Its division is in harmony with our information on this point in āṅga 4 and Nandī, with this exception, that in āṅga 4 nothing is said of the two śrutaskandhas. See above p. 270, 280 in reference to the kammavivāga texts, which are connected in name and contents, and which have 10, 43 and 55 ajjh., and are mentioned in āṅgas 3, 10, 4, 43 and in the Kalpasūtra.

Imḍabhūti beholds some horrible deed, and is told by Mahāvīra, whom he questions concerning it, the previous history, e.g. previous births of the individuals in question. The event itself is then explained⁴¹⁵ and the fate of the persons in future births is made known

⁴⁰⁶ jagaddhitāṇam.

⁴⁰⁷ adāgaṁduṭṭha bāhu asa maṇi revāma āticca māyāṇam A ; on addāga, ādarśa (magician's mirror) cf. Hāla v. 204 (p. 75).

⁴⁰⁸ vividhapaśna (°śnān pra) ty uttaradāyinyah, manahpramitārthottaradāyinya (ś ca), tāsām devatāni tadadhiṣṭhātdevatās, teṣām prayogaprādhānyena pradhānatayā guṇam vividhārtha-samvādakalakṣaṇam prakāśayānti loke vyamjayānti yais te vividha° prakāśikās tāsām (the masc. and fem. of praśna together !).

⁴⁰⁹ dviguṇena upalakṣaṇatvāt laukikapraśnavidyāprabhāvāpekṣayā bahuguṇena pāthāntare : vividhaguṇena. prabhāvena mātmyena manujasamudayabuddher vismayakāryaś camatkārahetavo yāḥ praśnāḥ.

⁴¹⁰ aṭṭa A ; atisayam aṭṭa°.

⁴¹¹ dama(h) śamas tatpradhānatirthaṁkarāṇām darśanāntara śāstīṇām uttamo bhagavān jīnas tasya.

⁴¹² sthītikāṇām sthāpanām, tasya kāraṇāni hetavo yās tāḥ.

⁴¹³ sarveṣām sarvajñānām sammatam iṣṭam.

⁴¹⁴ pratyakṣakeṇa jñānena pratyayaḥ "sarvātiśayanidhānam...jinavacanam" ity evamrūpā pratipattiḥ, atkaraṇaśīlānām.

⁴¹⁵ This recalls the legend of the Śatap. Br. about Bhṛgu Vāruṇi (Ind. Streifen -1, 24), with the exception that there is no reference here to the tortures of hell, but merely to a retribution on earth.

to the inquirer. Mahāvīra's answer thus treats the question in a three-fold manner. There is here no mention of a *cele caitya*, as is the case in other legends; [336] but a *jakkhāyatana* of this and that *jakkha* is continually referred to. The part played by the *yakṣa* here is at least as important as that in the Pālisutta of the Buddhists, if not more so;—see *Ind. Streifen*, 3, 507a,—they being in fact exact representatives of the *devas*⁴¹⁶ of the *Brāhmaṇs*.

Here, as in *aṅgas* 7, &c., the first history only is related in detail, all the others being briefly told. The titles of the tales in the first *suyakkhamdha* are :—

1. Miyāputta in Miyagāma, son of king Vijaya and Miyā, born blind and deaf and dumb, lame, and a cripple, without hands, feet, ears, eyes, nose, and with mere indications (*āgii, ākṛti*) of the existence of these parts of the body. The account is similar in *aṅga* 3, 10.

2. Ujjhiya (°yae V), son of the merchant Vijayamitta and of Subhaddā in Vāṇiyagāma. A prostitute is here referred to, who was *bāvattarikalāpamḍitā caūsattḥiggaṇḍā-guṇovavetā. aṭṭhārasadesibhāsāvisārada*. The latter are unfortunately not enumerated. (In *aṅga* 3, 10 *Guttāsa*, instead of *Ujjhitaka*).

3. Abhagga (°ggaseṇe V), son of a robber⁴¹⁷ Vijaya and of Khamdasirī in the robber-village (*corapalli*) Sālāḍavī. (In *aṅga* 3, 10 *aṇḍe* instead of *Abhaggaseṇe*.)

4. Sagaḍa, son of the merchant Subhadda and of Bhaddā in Sahaṃjaṇi (Also in *aṅga* 3, 10).

5. Vahasatidatta, son of the *purohita* Somadatta and of Vasudatta in Kosambī. (In *aṅga* 3.10 *māhaṇa*).

6. [337] Naṃdivaddhaṇa, son of king Siridāma and of Bandhusirī in Mahurā. (In *aṅga* 3.10 *Naṃdisena*).

7. Uṃbaradatta, son of the merchant Sāgaradatta and of Gaṃgadatta in Pāḍaliputta. (In *aṅga* 3, 10 *Uḍumbara*.)

8. Soriyadatta, daughter of the *macchamḍha* (*matsyabandha* Abh., fisherman) Samuddadatta and of Samuddadatta in Soriyapura. (In *aṅga* 3, 10 *Soria*.)

⁴¹⁶ A trace of this in the *Sinhāsanadv. Ind. Stud.* 15, 357, in Hāla, v, 372 Bh. (*Ind. Stud.* 16, p. 115). In the commentary on the *Sūryaprajñ.* and elsewhere, *serie* is explained by *vyāntarāyatanam*.

⁴¹⁷ *aṣṭaṭṭhipathamamadle...baṃdiggaḥaḥeḥim ya*; cf. Hāla, preface, p. XVII.

9. Devadattā, daughter of the house-owner Datta and of Kaṇhasiri in Rohiṇāa (or Rohiḍāa). (A different name in *aṅga* 3, 10).

10. Amṛjū, daughter of the merchant Dhanadeva and of Piamṅu in Vaddhamāṇapura. (A different name in *aṅga* 3, 10).

The ten *ajjhayaṇas* of the second *suyakkhamdha* are :

1. Subāhu, son of king Addiṇasatta and of Dhāriṇī in Hatthisīsa.
2. Bhaddanaṃdi, son of king Dhaṇāvaha and of Sarassatī in Usabhapura.
3. Sujāta, son of king Mitta and of Sirī in Vīrapura.
4. Suvāsava, son of king Vāsavadatta and of Kaṇhā in Vijayapura.
5. Jīṇadāsa, son of prince (*kumāra*) Mahācamḍa and of Araha-dattā in Sogaṃdhitā.
- 6.⁴¹⁸ Dhaṇapati, son of the yuvarāja Vesamaṇa and of Sirī in Kaṇakapura.
7. Bhaddanaṃdi, son of the prince Mahabbala and of Rattavatī in Mahāpura.
8. [338] Mahāmbala, son of the prince Bhaddanaṃdi, and of Sughosa.
9. Camḍa, son of the prince Mahācamḍa and of Juvasirīkamṭa in Camḍā.
10. Varadatta, son of king Mittanaṃdi and of Sirīkamṭa in Sāgeya.

All these fine-sounding names, and those brought into connection with them, are in all probability pure fabrications; the names of the localities alone, e.g. Pāḍaliputta, have some chronological value.

The table of contents in *aṅga* 4, or *Nandī* (N), is as follows :—
*se kiṃ taṃ vivāgasue o vivāgasue naṃ sukaḍadukkaḍāṇaṃ kammāṇaṃ phalavivāge*⁴¹⁹ *āghavijjanti, se*⁴²⁰ *saṃsāu duvihe, paṃ, taṃ : duhavivāge ceva suhavivāge ceva, tattha naṃ dasa duhavivāgāṇi dasa suhavivāgāṇi; —se kiṃ taṃ duhavivāge (°gāṇi B C) ? duhavivāgesu naṃ duhavivāgāṇaṃ (N-omitted in ABC) nagarāi cei ujjā vaṇa rāyā ammāpiyaro samosaraṇa*

⁴¹⁸ In *Vidhiprapā* are the following inversions :—Dhaṇavai 6, Mahavvala 7, Bhaddanaṃdi 8, Mahācamḍa 9.

⁴¹⁹ °ga N.

⁴²⁰ *se* up to *suhavivāge ceva* omitted in N; *saṃsuto* BC.

*dhammāyariyā dhammakahā*⁴²¹ *nagaragamaññāim*⁴²² *samsārapavamañcaduha-*
paramparāu ya āghavijjanti, se taṃ duhavivāgāṇi;— se kiṃ taṃ suhavivāgāṇi ?
*suhavivāgesu ṇaṃ suhavivāgāṇaṃ nagarāim*⁴²¹ *jāva dhammakahā ihaloga-*
*paraloga*⁴²³ *bhogapari° pavva*⁴²⁴ *suyapariggahā tavo pariyā*⁴²⁵ *saṃlehaṇa*
*bhattapacca pāva*⁴²⁶ [339] *devaloga sukula° puṇabohi° amtakiriyāu ya*
*āghavijjanti;— duhavivāgesu*⁴²⁷ *ṇaṃ pāṇātivāya aliyavayaṇa (°yayāṇaya A)*
corikka (°rakka A) karaṇa paradāramehuṇa sasaṃgatāe maha (°hā A)
*tivvakasāya imdiyappamāda pāvappaoga-asubhajjhasāṇa-saṃciyāṇaṃ*⁴²⁸
kame māṇaṃ pāvagāṇaṃ pāva-aṇubhāgaphalavivāgā ṇiraya (°gāṇi naraga
A) gati tirikkhajaṇi bahuviha (°hā A) vasaṇasaya-paramparābaddhāṇaṃ
*(°rāpava° A) maṇuyatte (°tatte A) vi āgayāṇaṃ jahā*⁴²⁹ *pāvakammaseseṇa*
*pāvagā hoṃti phalavivāgā bahuvasaṇaviṇāsa*⁴³⁰ *nāsakannoṭṭhaṃguṭṭhakara-*
*caraṇaṇahacheyāṇa jibbhachheyāṇa (jibbhache° A) amjaṇa*⁴³¹ *kaḍag-*
*gidahaṇa*⁴³² *(dāh° B C, dahāṇa A) gayacalaṇa malaṇa phālaṇa*⁴³³
*ullambāṇa*⁴³⁴ *sūla-layā (sūlatā A)—lauḍa-laṭṭhibhaṇjaṇa*⁴³⁵ *taṭṭh-sisaga*
*tattatella kalakala-abhisimcaṇa kumbhipāga*⁴³⁶ *kampaṇa*⁴³⁷ *thirabam-*
*dhaṇa*⁴³⁸ *(baridha A) vaha (vehava A) vajjha (vabbha A) kattana*⁴³⁹
*paṭibhayakara*⁴⁴⁰ *karapaliṇaṇāim*⁴⁴¹ *dāruṇāṇi dukkhāṇi aṇovamāṇi*

421 In N again transposed *na. u. va. cē. sa. rā. am. dh° hāo dh° riyā.*

422 *nagara°* to *jāva dhammakahā* omitted in N; *nagaragamaññāim ti, bhagavato Gauta-*
masya bhikṣādyarthaṃ.

423 *ihaloīyāpārāloiyā riddhiviśeṣā N.*

424 *pavvaṇi A.*

425 *tavo paḍi BC.*

426 *bhogaparicāgā pavvajjāo pariyāgā° suapariggahā tavo°-vahāñāim saṃlehaṇo*
bhattapaccakkhāñāim pāvagamaññāim suhaparamparāo sukulapaccāo puṇavo-
hilābhā amtakiriyāo a āgh° N.

427 N omits all the following.

428 *pāpapravogāsubhādyavasānasamcitāṇaṃ.*

429 *jāhā to nahaceyaṇa* omitted in A.

430 *vināsaṇe (!) ādi yavat pratibhayakara karapradipanaṃ ce 'ti dvamdvaṃ.*

431 *mraṇṣaṇaṃ vā dehasya kṣārataḍḍhinā.*

432 *kaṭāṇaṃ vidalavañśādimayāṇaṃ agniḥ kaṭāgnis tena dahanam.*

433 *vidāraṇaṃ.*

434 *vṛkṣaśākhādāv udbandhanam, cf. lambiyaga Aup. § 70.*

435 *lauṭṭha B; sūlena latayā lakuṭṭhena yaṣṭiyā bhāṇjanaṃ gātrāṇaṃ.*

436 *°ṇaṃ kumbhipāga A, °pāgaṃ BC; kuṃ (bhyāṃ) bhājanaviśeṣe pākāḥ.*

437 *kampaṇaṃ śitalajalachoṭanādinā śitakālena gātrotkampaṇaṃ.*

438 *nivāḍaṇiṃtraṇābaddhaḥ.*

439 *kuṃtādinā śastreṇa bhedanam varddha (naṃ) kartanam.*

440 *patibhayakaraṃ A, patibhayaṃ karaṃ BC, patibhayakaraṃ C; bhayajananaṃ.*

441 *palī° BC (without kara), karapallī° A; karapradipanaṃ vasaṇaveśṭitasya tailā-*
bhiṣasya (?) kavayor ami (agni?) prāvādhanaṃ (?); tāni ādir yeṣāṃ duḥkhāṇāṃ
tāni, tāni tathā ca dāruṇāni ce 'ti karmadhārayaḥ. This appears to me quite un-
necessary; there is no ādi in palivaṇāi, which is merely a neutr. pl.

*bahuvihaparamparāṇubaddhā*⁴⁴² *na muccaṃti, pāvakammavallie (velīe A)* [340] *aveyāittā*⁴⁴³ *hu*⁴⁴⁴ *na tthi mokkho*⁴⁴⁵ *taveṇa*⁴⁴⁶ *dhittidhaṇiyabaddha-kacheṇa*⁴⁴⁷ *sohaṇaṃ*⁴⁴⁸ *tassa vā 'vi hotthā*⁴⁴⁹ — *etto ya*⁴⁵⁰ *suhavivāgesu ṇaṃ* (omitted in A) *silasaṃjama niyama guṇatavo-vahāṇesu sāḥusu suvihiesu*⁴⁵¹ *aṇukampāsaya payoga (paūga A)*⁴⁵² — *tikālamati*⁴⁵³ — *visuddha-bhattapāṇāi payayamaṇasā*⁴⁵⁴ *hiyasuhanīsesatīvrapariṇāmanicchiyaṃti*⁴⁵⁵ *payachiūṇa*⁴⁵⁶ *payogasuddhāim*⁴⁵⁷ *jahā (jahi A) ya nivvatte(ṃ)ti*⁴⁵⁸ *u*⁴⁵⁹ *bohilābhāṃ, jaha ya (jahā A) parittikare(ṃ)ti (karoti A)*⁴⁶⁰ *narani-rayatiriya suragatigamaṇavipula*⁴⁶¹ *pariyatṭa*⁴⁶² *aratibhayavisāyasokamichattaselasamaṇkaḍaṃ*⁴⁶³ *annāṇa (aṇāna A) tamaṃdhakāraccikkhallasu-duttāraṃ jaramaraṇa* [341] *joṇi-saṃ-kkhubhiyacakkavālaṃ*⁴⁶⁴ (vala A) *solasakasāyasāvayapayaṃḍaṃ* (C, *payamḍacaḍaṃ A*)⁴⁶⁵ (aṇātiyaṃ aṇavaya-

442 *badhā A*; *jīvā itī gamyate*.

443 *pāpakarmavallyā phalaśaṃpādikayā...yato'vedayitvā (an)anubhūya karmaphalam itī gamyate*.

444 *hur yasmād-arthe*.

445 *viyogaḥ karmaṇaḥ sakāśāt, jivāṇaṃ itī gamyate*; *av, hu na 'tthi m. is a species of formula solemn*.

446 *kiṃ sarvathā ? ne'ty āha : tapasā anaśanādikavratena*.

447 *dhitti A*; *dhittis cottasamādhānaṃ. dhaniyaṃ atyarīhaṃ, baddhā nipīḍitā, kach-aṃ bamdhaviśeṣo yatra tat tathā tena, dhittiyuktene 'ty a*.

448 *śodhanam apanayanam*.

449 *hoyyā BC*; *tasya karmaviśeṣasya vā 'vi 'tī saṃbhāvanāyāṃ, hotthā saṃpadyate ; nā 'nyamokṣo'yo' sti ti bhāvīḥ*.

450 *itaś cā 'nāmtaraṃ*.

451 *suṣṭhu vihitam anuṣṭhitam yeṣāṃ te suvihitās, teṣu bhaktādi dattvā yathā boḍhilābhādi ni(r)varitayānti tathe 'hā 'khyāyata itī sambamḍhaḥ, iha ca saṃ-pradāne' pī saptamī*.

452 *aṇukampāsaya prayogas tena*.

453 *triṣu kāleṣu yā matir buddhiḥ yad uta dāsyāṃ 'ti paritoṣo, diyamāne p'ṣo, datte ca p'ṣa itī sā trikālamatis, taya*.

454 *pattaya A*; *prayatamanasā ādarapūtacetasā*.

455 *hiyaṃ l suhanisesaṃ A*; *..tīvrah prakīṣṭaḥ, parinamo 'dhyavasānaṃ, niścita' saṃ-sāyā matir buddhir yeṣāṃ te hitasukhaniḥśreyasatīvrapariṇāmaniścitamatayaḥ*.

456 *pradāya*.

457 *paūga A*; *saṃsārādidoṣarahitāni*.

458 *jīvā itī gamyate*.

459 *tūśabdo hhāsa (?) mātrārthaḥ*.

460 *parittī kurvaṃti, hrasvatām nayaṃti, saṃsārasāgaram itī yogaḥ*; on the foll. see *Aupapāt. § 32* (Leumann, p. 44).

461 *gamaṇa BC, gaṭigamaṇa A*; *°gaṭiṣu vipulo vistīrṇaḥ*.

462 *parivarto (vṛtto ?)*.

463 *visākha, sila, B*; *°mithyātvaṇi eva śailāḥ parvatāḥ taiḥ saṃkaṭaḥ saṃkīrṇo yah*.

464 *mahāmatsyamaṇakāradyanekajalajalāntujātisammādena praviloḍitaṃ cakravālāṃ jala-pārtimāḍalyam yatra*.

465 *payamḍacaḍaṃ B*; *śoḍaśa kasāya eva śvāpadāni makarādini prakāṇḍāni atyar-tharaudrāṇi yatra*.

ggam)⁴⁶⁶ *saṃsārasāgaram iṇaṃ, jaha ya nibaṃdharṇti āgamaṃsuragaṇesu, jaha ya anubhavarṇti suragaṇavimāṇasokkhāṇi āṇovamāṇi* (omitted in A) *tāu ya kālaṃtaracuyāṇaṃ ihe 'va naralogam āgayāṇaṃ, dū-vāu (vapu BC)-vanna-rūva-jāti-kula-jamma-āroga-buddhi-mehā* (omitted in A) – *visesā*⁴⁶⁷ *mittajāṇa* (jīṇa A) *sayāṇa*⁴⁶⁸ *dhanna (dhamma A)-dhaṇa* (omitted in A) *vibhava*⁴⁶⁹ *saṃiddh (°ddha A) sārasamudayaविशेषā bahuvihakāmabhogu-bbhavāṇa (°gabbhavā BC) sokkhāṇa, suhavivāguttamesu*⁴⁷⁰ *añuvaraya (ana° A) paramparāṇubaddhā asubhāṇaṃ subhāṇu (BC, A omits) ceva kammāṇa bhāsiyā bahuvihā* (v. omitted in A) *vivāgā vivāgasuyammi bhagavayā jīṇavareṇa saṃvegakāraṇatthā*,⁴⁷¹ *anne (annā A) vi ya evamañiyā (°ādiyā BC) bahuvihā vitthareṇaṃ atthā (attha A) parūvaṇaya āghavijjanti* (°jjai BC).

XII. The twelfth *aṅga*, *diṭṭhivā*, *dr̥ṣṭivāda*, presentation of the (different) views.⁴⁷² This title [342] corresponds to our information in reference to the contents of this text now no longer extant; and we conjectured on page 248 that the character of its contents was the *causa movens* of its loss. On page 242 we saw that in all probability the *diṭṭhivā* is not further mentioned even in the *aṅgas* with the exception of *aṅga* 4.⁴⁷³ This remark holds good merely of the name *diṭṭhivā* and not of the so-called 14 *puvvas*, which, according to the presentation of the subject in *aṅga* 4, form a principal part of the *diṭṭh*. Tradition indeed appears to regard the *puvvas* as identical with the *diṭṭh*. The 14 *puvvas* are mentioned both in *aṅga* 10 (the redaction of which, as we have seen, p. 327 foll., is of secondary origin), where their division into *pāhuḍas* is alluded to (see p. 333), and frequently in *aṅgas* 6 and 8; and in fact in a very peculiar way. The detailed discussion, according to name and contents, of the 14 *puvvas* in *aṅga* 4 and *Nandī* and in the later tradition, cites the

466 BC, *aṇaiyaṃ aṇavadayaṃ A*; *anādikam, anavavargam anantam*.

467 *medhāviśeṣā ākhyāyaṃta iti yogāḥ*.

468 *svajanaḥ pītṭipittivyādih*.

469 *dhannadhāṇa C*; *°vibhavaṃ B*; *dhanadhānyarūpo yo vibhavaḥ lakṣmāḥ*.

470. °go u° BC; *subhaviṇṇa uttamo yeṣāṃ te subhaviṇṇakottamāṃ teṣu, jiveṣu iti gamyate, iha ce 'yaṃ saṣṭhyarthe saptamī; te subhaviṇṇakādhyaṇavācyāṇāṃ sādhuṇāṃ āyuskādiviśeṣāṃ subhaviṇṇakādhyaṇeṣu ākhyāyaṃta iti prakṛtāṃ, atha pratyeḥ śrutaskāṃdhayor abhidheye puṇo (guṇa?) pāpaviṇṇakarupe pratipādyā tayoṃ eva yaugapadyena te āha : anuparatā acinnā ye paramparāṇu (m) dhāḥ, ke? viṇṇaḥ iti yogāḥ*.

471 *saṃvegahetavo bhāvāḥ*, cf. Leumann, *Aup*. Glossary under *saṃvāyaṇa*.

472 *dr̥ṣṭayo darśanāni, vadanāṃ vādaḥ, dr̥ṣṭināṃ vādo dr̥ṣṭināṃ vā pāto yatra*.

473 Leumann cites *aṅga* 5, 20, 8 for the *duvālasāṃga gaṇipīḍaga*, or *āyāro jāva diṭṭhivā*, likewise *bārasamig* in *aṅga* 8, 4, 1. The first passage is based in the last instance on *aṅga* 4.

uppāyapuvva at their head. Twice in *aṅga* 6 and once in *aṅga* 8 (3, 1) are they characterized, just as are the eleven *aṅgas*, or together with them, as *sāmāiyā-m-āiyāim*. Leumann says : "Of special interest are three of the many instances in *aṅga* 6, where it is related that a man who has just become a member of the order studied the 14 *puvvas* or 11 *aṅgas*." These three instances are found in p. 591 of the Calcutta edition, compared with p. 597, p. 1354, compared [343] with p. 1355 and p. 1454, compared with p. 1455. The second passages quoted, in which the 11 *aṅgas* are mentioned, have reference to a period later by five to twenty years than the first, in which the 14 *puvvas* are treated of."

How can this use of the attribute *sāmāiya-m-āiyāim* of the 14 *puvvas* be explained ? This use is found in no other place⁴⁷⁴ with the exception of *aṅgas* 6 and 8, and here only in the parallel use of the epithet in reference to the 11 *aṅgas*, and in no instance where there is an isolated mention of the 14 *puvvas*. Hence it is too bold an assumption if we assert that a *sāmāiya-puvvam*, instead of the *uppāya-puvvam*, once actually stood at the head of the 14 *puvvas*. On the other hand, it is probable that in *aṅga* 6 this epithet has been transferred from the *aṅgas* to the *puvvas*, and that the generic signification of the word *sāmāia*, and the greater antiquity which the statements in *aṅga* 6 probably possess in contrast to those in *aṅgas* 4, formed the means of transition. This assumption is however a mere make-shift, since there is no further criterion for such a special inter- relation of both groups of texts.

The *upāṅgas*, too, attest in several particulars the existence of *aṅga* 12. In *up.* 8-12, probably the oldest of the *upāṅga* texts, it is true, only 11 *aṅgas* are mentioned. But in *up.* 1, 26 (Leumann, p. 36) we discover a reference to the *coddasapuvvi* together with the *duvālasaṅgiṇo* ; and in the introduction to *up.* 4, [344] in v. 5, the *diṭṭhivā*, and in v. 3, the *puvvasuyam*, are mentioned by name as the source of information of the author. It is furthermore worthy of note that *up.* 5 and 7 agree with the *puvvas* in the division into *pāhuḥas*. According to *up.* 6 they both appear to have been divided into *vatthus* at the time of this *upāṅga*. The tradition is desirous of establishing a close connection between the *upāṅga* and the *aṅga* in the present order of succession of each. Hence we may conclude that,

⁴⁷⁴ The cases cited above p. 244, 245, where was mention made of *sāmāiam-āi jāva bimduśarāo*, do not belong in this connection, since the first *aṅgam* and not the first *pūrvam* was there referred to.

at the period in which the existing corpus of the twelve *upāṅgas* was established,—that is, at the date of the redaction of the present *Siddhānta*,—there were in reality 12 *aṅgas*, and that the *diṭṭhivā* consequently still existed or was considered as extant.

The *diṭṭhivā* or, as the case may be, the *duvālasaṅgaṃ gaṇipīḍagam* is frequently mentioned in the other parts of the *Siddhānta*, which are united to the *upāṅga*. These portions of the *Siddhānta* are in reality the storehouse of information about the *diṭṭhivā* or *duvālasaṅgaṃ gaṇipīḍagam*. See the citations on p. 246 from *Āvasy.* and *Anuyogadv.* With these may be associated the corresponding statements in *chedas*. 2 and *Nandī*, in which we find several direct citations (see below) from the *puvvas*; and in fact the *chedas* 3-5 are repeatedly called as excerpt from *puvva* 9, 3, 20, which is referred back even to Bhadrabāhu !

On p. 223, 224 we have seen from several old *versus memoriales*, the source of which is unfortunately no longer extant, that the *diṭṭhivā* at the period of the existence of these verses was highly esteemed, inasmuch as it was designed for the highest gradation of intelligence, and was held to be the object of the study of the nineteenth year. Here we must not suppress the thought that the reason for this relegation of the *diṭṭh.* to a late period of study, was because it may have been considered [345] dangerous for an earlier and less mature stage of advancement. Finally, appearing as too dangerous,⁴⁷⁵ it may have been dropped altogether.

It is exceedingly peculiar that the *puvvas*, which are a principal part of the *diṭṭhivā* and represent a preliminary stage of the *aṅga* both according to tradition and, in all probability, to their name itself, are said to have proceeded from the mouth of the Tīrthakara and to have been collected by his *gaṇadhara*s before the *aṅgas*. The *puvvas* are mentioned in *aṅgas* 6 and 8 as texts independent of, or even previous to, the 11 *aṅgas*, but in *aṅgas* 4, &c., are represented as forming but one of the five sections of the last *aṅga*. It was to be expected that they should be partly independent texts, and partly should stand at the beginning of the entire *Siddhānta*.

The key furnished by tradition points to the fact (cf. p. 214) that the knowledge of the *diṭṭhivā* (or of that of the *puvva* here

⁴⁷⁵ The same probably holds good of the other texts above mentioned, which immediately preceded the *diṭṭhivā*, and which are no longer extant.

identified with the *diṭṭhivāa*) was limited to Bhadrabāhu alone even at the time of the Council of Pāṭaliputra, which instituted the first collection of the *aṅga* texts; and that recourse was had to Bhadrabāhu when the collection of the 11 *aṅgas* was perfected. To this circumstance then we must ascribe the fact that the "*pūrvas*" are placed at the end and not at the beginning of the whole collection. But, [346] according to this very tradition, at that time, on the one hand, there were no longer 14 but 10 *pūrvas*, the knowledge of which was further disseminated, and, on the other, the *pūrvas* do not appear as a part of the *diṭṭhivāa* but as the *diṭṭhivāa* itself. Both of these statements of tradition are contradicted by a *locus classicus* which, in default of the text itself, affords, together with the detailed table of contents in *aṅga* 4 and *Nandī*, information concerning the *diṭṭhivāa*. *Aṅga* 6 and the *Nandī*, our sources of information, are here in complete agreement, but in the table of contents of the other *aṅgas* the *Nandī* is much briefer than *aṅga* 4. The contradiction is this: (1) there is not even the slightest difference made between *pūrvas* 1-10 and 11-14; and (2) all the 14 *pūrvas* are cited as a mere section—the third part—of the *diṭṭhivāa*.

As regards the latter circumstance, it may be stated that in the *Siddhānta* itself, though in late texts, we find several times the peculiar fact, that, in case a collective enumeration of the *aṅgas* is attempted, and the first member, whether it be *sāmāia* or *āyāra*, and the last, are mentioned, this last member does not appear as *diṭṭhivāa* but as *vimḍusāra*. See above, p. 244, 245. *Vimḍusāra* is the title of the last of the fourteen *pūrvas*. It is certainly very remarkable that the title of a section (and *vimḍusāra* must be considered to be such in this connection as in others) is coördinated with that of an independent text. As regards these passages it is impossible to assume [347] that the *diṭṭhivāa* at that time exceeded this section in extent. This constitutes an important divergence from the presentation of the subject in *aṅga* 4, or N., in which latter the *Vimḍusāra*, as the last section of the third part, is followed by two additional parts. Hemacandra, who in his treatment of the *dr̥ṣṭivāda* (*abhidh.* v. 245, 246), cites the *pūva* (*gata*) as its fourth, and not as its third part, affords us only such assistance as confirms the divergence in question. Since the fifth part of the *dr̥ṣṭivāda* consists of so-called *cūlikās*, which are a secondary addition the *diṭṭhivāa*, according to Hemacandra's treatment⁴⁷⁶ too, actually concludes with the *Vimḍusāra* section.

476 In Hemacandra's treatment of the subject there are other minute divergences from the statements in *aṅga* 4, or *Nandī*; on which see below.

So much is clear :—That that conception which limits the *ditthivā* to the 14 *puvvas* alone is too narrow. We find a recognition of the other constituent parts of the *ditthivā* also in those statements of the scholia, in which (cf. p. 258) “*pūrvāṇi sammaty-ādikāś ca*” (*anuyogaḥ*) are mentioned instead of the *ditthivā* referred to in the text. See *Āv. niji.* 8, 54. By *sammatyādikaḥ* (*anuy*) we are probably to understand the first parts of *aṅga* 12, though the order has been inverted.⁴⁷⁷

[348] To the statements made, p. 212 foll., in reference to the gradual decline of the knowledge of the *puvvas*, I add the following :—In the *Kālasattari* of Dharmaghosa⁴⁷⁸ verse 38 foll., Thulabhadda is referred to the year *Vīra* 215 ; and there still existed in the time of *Vaira* 584 (*Vīra*) 10, in that of *Dubbaliā* 616 (*Vīra*), 9½ *puvvas*. In the scholiast on the passage and in KL 247^b the latter name is cited as *Durbalikā-Puṣpa* (°*śya*)*mitra* ; in the Berlin scholiast on the *Nandī*, introduct. v. 32, as *Durvalikāpuṣpa* (°*śya*), he and his teacher *Āryarakṣita* being called the two *navapūrvīṇau*. In the year 1000 the entire *puvvagayam* was “*gayam*”.

Let us now turn to the *locus classicus* itself. Its statements are unfortunately not clear and in fact were unintelligible to the scholiasts of both texts (Abhayadeva on *aṅga* 4, and Anon. on *Nandī*). They both assert with tolerable unanimity that, inasmuch as the text itself was no longer extant, they merely report the few utterances of tradition. Abhayadeva has the foll. at the beginning of his remarks : *sarvaṃ idaṃ prāyo vyavachinnam tathā' pi yathāpiṣṭam (! dṛṣṭam ?) kimcīt likhyate* ; and the anonymous scholiast on N. has : *s. i. pr. vy. tathā 'pi leśato yathāgatasampradāyam kimcid vyākhyāyate*. In explaining the first part Abhayadeva says : *etac ca sarvaṃ samūlottarabhedam sūtrārthato vyavachinnam* and the anon. schol. :—*tāni ca samūlottarabhedāni sakalāny api sūtrato'rthataś ca* [319] *vyavachinnāni yathāgatasampradāyataś ca darśitāni*. Finally, Abhayadeva expresses himself in a similar manner concerning the second part : *amūny api sūtrārthato vyavachinnāni tathā 'pi dṛṣṭānusārataḥ kimcīt likhyate*, and the anon.

⁴⁷⁷ *Sammati* 1) “opinion”, “view”, in the *St. Petersburg Dict.*, i. e. synonymous with *dṛṣṭi*. Leumann tells me that *Silāṅka*, too, on *aṅga* 1, 1, 8, refers to *sammatyādaṃ* a discussion on the 7 *nayas* (see below p. 352), and was in possession of a text of that name before him ; cf. also the *sammativṛtti*, below p. 371.

⁴⁷⁸ *Dharmaghosa*sūtri, scholar (v. 74) of *Devīmāda*, died accord. to KL. 255a *Samvat* 1357. This does not agree with *Kālas.* v. 41 foll. where in general the same prophetic statements are found as in *Satruṃj. Māh.* 14, 290 foll. (See my *Treatise*, p. 47). These statements contain the dates 1912 and 1850 *Vīra* (i. e. *Samvat* 1442 and 1380).

schol. says *etāny api samprati sūtrato'rthataś ca vyav., yathāgatasampra-dāyato vācyāni.*

The *diṭṭhivā* is stated to have consisted of five parts. The first part is the *parikammam*, by which, the scholiast says, we are to understand those preparations necessary to grasp the meaning of the *sūtras* correctly. These preparations are analogous to the 16 arithmetical operations *parikarmāṇi* which must be understood in order to compute without assistance from others.⁴⁷⁹ They are divided into 7 groups, each one of which is again divided into various subdivisions, the total number of which is 83. The first two groups have each 14, the next five but 11 of these subdivisions, which everywhere bear the same title. They begin,⁴⁸⁰ in the case of groups 1 and 2 with the *māuyāpayāim*, in the case of groups 3-7 with the *pāḍho*. *Pāḍha* doubtless signifies "reading"; and the *māuyāpadāṇi*, numbering 46 according to *aṅga* 4, 46,—see p. 281,—recall the 46 signs of the alphabet, and therefore deal with preliminary instruction in reading and writing. The statement *bambhīe ṇam livīe chāyālisam māuyakkharāṇi*, which follows immediately thereupon, tends however to invalidate [350] this assumption. Since this statement certainly, though strangely enough (see above, p. 281 note), refers to 46 sounds or signs of the alphabet, the 46 *māuyāpadāṇi* which are mentioned immediately before must refer to something else.⁴⁸¹ Furthermore since both scholia upon this occasion offer the second of the above-cited explanations of their ignorance, and consequently make no attempt to clear up the names of the 7 groups or of their 84 sub-divisions, it cannot be demanded of us that we do more than follow their example.⁴⁸²

479 Schol. on N : *parikarma yogyatāpādanam, taddhetuḥ śāstram api parikarma ; śūtra-pūrvagatā-'nuyoga-śūtrārthagrahaṇayogyatāśampādanasamarthāṇi parikarmāṇi, yathā gaṇitaśāstre samkalitādiny ādyāni soḍaśa parikarmāṇi, śeṣagaṇitaśūtrārthagrahaṇe samarthāṇipādana* (doubtless 'rthatā-sampā' ?) *samarthāṇi.*

480 The interesting fact becomes here apparent that the text of N is unconditionally older. See below.

481 It is greatly to be lamented that the MS of Abhayadeva to which I have had access, is here so corrupt, that nothing definite can be gained from it. The passage reads :—(*diṭṭhivāyassa ṇam chāyālisam māuyāpayā paṃ, bambhīe ṇam livīe chāyālisam māuyakkharā paṃ*) : *diṭṭhivāyassa iti dvāśāśāṅgasya, māuyāpaya tti sakalatvā-hmayasya(?) akvāśadi (akārādi ?) māṭṭkāpadāṇi' va dṣṣivādarthaprasartha(?) n'igamaḥ/dhovya(?) lakṣaṇāṇi tāni va (tāni ca) siddhaśreṇi-manuṣyaśreṇy-ādinā* (i e. names of the first two groups of the *parikamma*) *viṣayabhedeḥ (dena) katham api bhidyamānāni śatohat vāriśhād gavati (bhavam'i ti ?) sambhādhyate ('vyate) : tathā bambhīe ṇam livīe tti lekhyavidhau 46 māṭṭkākṣarāṇi, tāni ca.* (see p. 281).

482 Some of these names are not certain since the MSS. vary. *Āgāsapayāim, keubhūyam rāsibaddham, keubhūyapaḍiggaho* refer probably to the domain of astronomy.

Following upon the enumeration of the seven groups in the significant statement⁴⁸³ that six of this number (according to the schol. the first six) belong to the system *κατ' ε'ξοχης* (*sasamaiyāṇi*) and that the number seven belongs to the *ājīviyas*. The six are then characterized as *caūkkanaīyāni* (*caturṇayikāni*); the seven as *terāsiyāni* (*yāim nayāim* N, *trairāśikāni*). The scholia explain one of these two names of schools by [351] *Gośālapravartitājīvika* (*°tā ājivikāḥ* N) = *pāṣaṇḍa-siddhānta* (*pāṣaṇḍinaḥ* N), the second by *trairāśikapāṣaṇḍasthās*. The mention of this second name leads us, so to speak, to the domain of history. The *Terāsiyas* represent the six schism,⁴⁸⁴ which *Āvaśy.* 8, 56, 72, refers to the year 544 after *Vīra*,⁴⁸⁵ and this name is perhaps attested by epigraphic testimony of the time of Gotamīputra Sātakarṇi. If we suppose that the reading *Terāsikā*, proposed by Bühler (*Archaeolog, Survey of West India*, 1882, p. 104) for the inscription Nāsik No. 11a, is conclusive, it is not improbable that it refers to the *Terāsiyas* quoted above. Bühler, it must be confessed, has adopted another explanation of the name in his Survey.

The explanations of the scholiasts have as yet not assisted me in the endeavour to discover what is referred to by the four *nayas*,⁴⁸⁶ &c [352]. It is a significant fact that the twelfth *aṅga*, according to the above statements, treated not merely of the proper but also of heterodox doctrines, or, as the case may be, of hermeneutic methods; and the title of this *aṅga* seems to refer to this peculiarity in its contents,

⁴⁸³ In the Berlin MS. of the *Nandī* this passage is omitted in the text, though it is explained by the scholiast

⁴⁸⁴ See above p. 275.; accord to Abhayadeva however:—*ta eva cā* “*jīvikās trairāśikā bhaṇitāḥ*, or, accord. to the schol. on the *Nandī* which is identical:—*ta eva Gośālapravartitā ājivikāḥ pāṣaṇḍinas trairāśikā ucyamte*—the *trairāśikā* are the same as the adherents of *Gośāla*. In § 6 of the *Theravāḍi* of the *Kalpasūtra Chaluq*, the founder of the sixth schism, is stated to have been the scholar of Mahāgiri, who was the successor of Thūlabbadda (*Vīra* 215, cf. p. 348), and is placed about 300 years earlier than *Vīra* 544. These are discrepancies not easily overcome. The further explanation of the name *trairāśika* in the schol. on N. is:—*te sarvaṃ vastu trayātmakam icchamti. tad yathā; jīvo' jīvo jīvājīvas ca. loko'loko lokā-lokāś ca sat asat sad-asat, nayacimtayām dravyāstikam paryāyāstikam ubhayāstikam ca; tatas tribhi(h) rāśibhiś caramti 'ti trairāśikāś. tanmatena saptā'pi parikarmāni ucyamte*. It is worthy of note that the triad form ascribed to the *Trairāśikas* is made use of—cf. p. 266 in *aṅga* 4, where the statement of the contents of *aṅgas* 2-5 is given, and in fact with the citation of two of the examples quoted here. Accord. to the schol. on *Kalpas.*, cf. Jacobi, p. 119, the *Vaiśeṣikadarśanam* took its rise from the *Terāsiyas*.

⁴⁸⁵ Cf. *Āvaśy.* 8, 37: *eehiṃ (ebhir naigamādibhir nayaiḥ) dīṭṭhivāe parūvaṇā suttaatthakahaṇā ya*.

⁴⁸⁶ *nayāḥ sapta naigamādayaḥ, naigamo dvidhā, sāmānyagrāhī viśeṣagrāhī ca, tatrā 'dyaḥ saṃgrāhe dvitīyas tu saṃvyavahāre praviṣṭaḥ, tato dvau saṃgrahavyavahārau, rijusūtras ca' kaḥ śabdādayaś ca trayo 'py eka eva nayāḥ kalpate, tata evam*

which was probably of great moment in determining the fate of the last of the *āṅgas*. See pp. 248, 342.

The *suttāi* are cited as constituting the second part of the *diṭṭhivāa*. In all there are 88 *suttāi*, a number ascribed⁴⁸⁷ to the second part in *aṅga* 4, 88. In reality, however, there are but 22, beginning with *ujjuya* (*ujjusua* N ; *rijuka*), but conceived as divided into four parts. The proper orthodox (*sasamaya*) doctrine and the heterodox views are represented as being equally authoritative. The former are divided into two different forms which are also represented by the *ājīviya* (*Gośālakapravartitapāṣaṇḍa* Abh.), or *terāsiya*. The 22 names are not explained by the scholia. They refer⁴⁸⁸ the name *sūtra* to the explanation of the meaning of the *pūrvas*, and consider this as well as the first part as an introduction to the third part of the *diṭṭhivāa* which follows.

[353] The third part is composed of *puvva gae*, *pūrvagatam*, i. e.⁴⁸⁹ the 14 *pūrvāṇi*, which the Tīrthaṅkara (Mahāvīra) himself is said to have imparted to his scholars, the gaṇadharas—see above p. 216, 217—who then composed the *āṅgas* (*ācārādikam*). Besides this explanation which represents the *pūrvas* as older and earlier doctrines anticipating the *āṅgas*, there is another which is possible. If our second conjecture is correct, we should have to understand by the *pūrvas* that preliminary knowledge necessary to the comprehension of the doctrine. The titles of the 14 *pūrvas*⁴⁹⁰ quoted here in the text and enumerated before in § 14 are explained singly in the scholia, and the number of their *padas*, is stated. The enormous size of these figures greatly exceeds as a rule that which the scholiasts—see above p. 288—state to be the number of the *padas* of the *āṅgas*, each one of which was said to contain twice the number of *padas* of the preceding

*catvāra eva nayāḥ, etaiś caturbhīr, nayair ādyāni ṣaṭ parikarmāṇi svasamayavaktav-
yatayā cīmtyamte*; on this see Śilāṅka on *aṅga* 1; 1, 8, above p. 347n.

⁴⁸⁷ The *ujjusuya* and the *parinayāparinayam* are stated to be the first two in the series. As regards other names reference is made to the *Nandī* and not to the independent treatment of the subject further on in *aṅga* 4. See above p. 284.

⁴⁸⁸ *Sarvasya pūrvagatasūtrārthasya sūcanāt sūtrāṇi, tāni ca sarvadravyāṇām sarvapar-
yāyāṇām sarvanayāṇām sarvabhāṅgavikalpāṇām prakāśakāṇi dvāviṃśatiḥ prajñaptāṇi,
tathā rijusuṣṭrām iti ādi*.

⁴⁸⁹ Cf. Schol. Hem. 245 ; *pūrvāṇam gatam jñānam asmin pūrvagatam*. The anonymous author of the *Vicārāṃgatasamgraha* which contains in 25 *vicāras* a grouping of *siddhānta* passages, *ā'apakas*, states that the *pūrvagataśrutadharas* were called *vācakas*, or, accord, to the *Nandīvṛtti* cited by him, but which I have not seen, three other names *vādiya khamāsamane divāyare vāyaga tti egaṭṭhā* | *pūrvagaya-
mmi tu sutte ee saddā pauṭṭamti*. Can the *Vicārāṃgatasamgraha* be identical with the *Siddhāntalāpakoddhāra* of Kulamaṇḍana, *Sāmv.* 1409-55 cited in Kl. 255b ?

⁴⁹⁰ They agree in general with those in Hem. 247, 248. The explanation is likewise identical ; see the schol. *ibid*. The number of *padas* is the same as that stated in

The names of the *pūrvas* [354] are as follows :—

1. *uppāyapuvva*,⁴⁹¹ *utpādapūrvam* ; 10 *vastu* and 4 *cūliya vastu* ; *ekā padakoṭi*, 10 millions.

2. *aggeniyam* (A B C), *agge-aṇiyam* N (*aggāṇiyam* N ed., according to Leumann) ; *agreniyam* Abh.,⁴⁹² and *agrāyaṇiyam*⁴⁹³ Schol. on N ; 14 *vastu* (so also in § 14) and 12 *cūliya vastu* ; *saṃnavatiḥ padalakṣāḥ* (9,600,000). A direct citation from this is found in *Āvaśy.* 10,42⁴⁹⁴ and in Malayagiri on *upāṅga* 4 (*agrāyaṇīyākhye dvitīyapūrve karmaprakṛti prābhṛte barmdhavidhāne sthītibarmdhādhikāre catvāri anuyoga-dvārāni...*). An anonymous *avacūri* on Candra-mahattara's *Saptatikā* (ms. or. fol. 690) calls this work an excerpt from the *diṭṭhivā*, especially from the fourth *prābhṛtam* (*karmaprakṛtīnāmam* of the fifth *vastu* of the second *pūrva* ("agrāyaṇīya"). In the *Vicārāmṛtasamgraha* we find the following interesting statement taken from the "Nandīvṛtti : —*Siyaśarma-Sūryādibhir agre 'nīyādīpūrvebhyah samuddhṛtāḥ śatakādi karmagramthāḥ*. There actually [355] exists a *siddhapāhuḍam* in 120 *gāthās*, which is characterized as having taken its rise from the *aggeṇiyapuvva* ; see p. 361.

3. *vīriyam*, *vīryapravādam*,⁴⁹⁵ 8 *vastu* and 8 *cūliya vastu* ; *tasyā 'pi(!) saptatiḥ padasahasrāṇi* Abh., but in the schol. on N : 78 *padalakṣāḥ* 7,800,000.—Citation from this in Haribhadra on *Āvaśy.* 10,42 (see p. 354, note 4).

4. *atthinatthippavāyam*, *astināstipravādam*,⁴⁹⁶ 18 *vastu* (also according

the introduction to the *Kalpāntarvācyāni*. In this work the number of *vasti* (? *vastu*) of each *pūrva* is said to increase from 1 on by geometrical progression (8192 in the case of *pūrva* 14). Here however in the text itself—see p. 366—we find entirely different figures which are quite credible. The figures in the case of 1.3.7.10 vary somewhat in the enumeration of the *pūrvas* in Nemicaṇḍra's *pravacanasārodhāra* § 92, v. 719-25.

491 *sarvadravyāṇām paryavāṇām* (! *paryāyāṇām*) *co'tpādabhāvam aṅgikṛtya prajñāpanā* Abh., *sarvadravyāṇām utpādam adhikṛtya prarūpaṇā* N.

492 *tatrā 'pi sarveṣāṃ dravyāṇām paryavāṇām* (!) *jīvaṇīṣeṣāṇām cā 'graṃ parimāṇam varṇate ity agreṇīyam*, Abh. ; *agraṃ parimāṇam tasyā 'yanam paricchedas tasmāi hitam agrāyaṇīyam sarvadravyādi-parimāṇakāri* Schol. on N.

493 The Schol. on Hem. *Kalpāntarvācyāni* has the same.

494 *aggeṇīammi jahā Divāyaṇa jattha ega tattha sayam | jattha sayam tatthe 'go hammai vā bhūmajae vā vi |* Haribhadra says : *jahā agriyaṇīe* (!) *vīrie atthinatthippavāyapuvve ya pāḍho : jatthe 'go Divāyaṇo bhūmajai tattha Divāyaṇasayam bhūmajai, jatthā Divāyaṇasayam bhūmajai tattha ego Divāyaṇo bhūmajai ; evaṃ hammai*. According to this the similar passage should be found also in *puvvas* 3 and 4. See the remarks on Ambaḍa in *Aup.* § 89 ; Ambaḍa is mentioned *ibid* § 76 together with *Divāyaṇa*.

495 *padaikadeṣe padasamudāyopacārāt sakarmetarāṇām jīvāṇām ajīvāṇām ca vīryam pravadaṭi 'ti vīryapravādam* Schol. on N.

496 *yat loke dharmāstikāyādi vastu asti yac ca nā 'sti kharasīṃgādi tat pravadaṭi 'ty astin° dam*, Schol. on N. *yā loke yathā vā nā* (del, ?) *'sti athavā syādvādābhi-*

to § 18) and 10 *cūliya* v. ; 60 *padalakṣāḥ*, 6 millions.—Citation as above.

5. *nāṇappavāyaṃ*,⁴⁹⁷ *jñānapravādam* ; 12 *vastus* ; *ekā padakoṭī eka-padonā* (Abh., *padenai* 'kena nyūnā schol. on N), i. e., 9,999,999(!) Malayagiri on N has, according to Leumann, 10,000,006.

6. *saccappavāyaṃ*, *satyappravādam* ;⁴⁹⁸ 2 *vastus*, *ekā padakoṭī ṣaḍ-bhir adhikā*, 10,000,006(!) 060 Malay., according to Leumann.

7. *āyappavāyaṃ ātmapravādam* ;⁴⁹⁹ 16 *vastus* (also according to § 16) ; 26 *padakoṭayaḥ* 260 millions. Leumann says that a passage, which caused the second schism, is found in the schol. on *aṅga* 3,7 (see above, p. 275). *Uttarajjh.* 3,9, *Āvaśy.* 8,65.

[356] 8. *kammappavāyaṃ*, *karamappravādam*⁵⁰⁰ ; 30 *vastus* ; *ekā pada-koṭī* 80 *padasahasrāṇi*, 10,080,000(!). A passage from this, which caused the *Abaddhiā* or *Goṭṭhāmāhila* to inaugurate the seventh schism is found in the extract just quoted, and in *Haribhadra* on *Āvaśy.*, 8,89, where he remarks : *aṭṭhame kammappavāyapuvve kammaṃ parūvinti* upon the following passage of the text : *Goṭṭhāmāhila navamatṭhamesu puc-chā ya Vimjhassa.*

9. *paccakkhānappavāyaṃ*⁵⁰¹, *pratyākhyānapravādam* ; 20 *vastus* (also in § 20) ; 84 *padalakṣāḥ*, 8,400,000. For this *pūrvam* we have quite a number of references. The above cited passage of *Āvaśy.* 8,89-91 and *Haribhadra's* scholion seem to prove that the *Abaddhiā* stood in some relation to the ninth *pūrvā*.⁵⁰² The statement is frequently made that the *kalpasūtram*, which forms the eighth *adhyayanam* of the *daśā-*

prāyatas tad eva nā 'sti 'ty evaṃ pravadaṭi 'ti, Abh. The *syādvāda*, which the Brāhmins consider to be a distinguishing mark of the Jains, comes here for once into prominence.

⁴⁹⁷ *matijñānādibhedabhinnaṃ saprapaṃcaṃ vadatī 'ti* Schol. on N ; *matijñānādipāṃca-kasya bhedaṣya prarūpaṇā* Abh.

⁴⁹⁸ *satyaṃ saṃyamo vacanaṃ ca, tat prakarseṇa vadati*, Schol. on N ; *tad yatra sabhedam apratipakṣaṃ ca varṇyate* Abh.

⁴⁹⁹ *ātmanāṃ jīvaṃ anekadhā nayamat abhedena yat pravadaṭi*, Schol. on N.

⁵⁰⁰ *karma jñānāvaraṇīyādikam aṣṭaparakāraṃ, tat prakarseṇa prakṛtiṣṭhity-anu-bhāga-pradeśadibhir bhedaḥ saprapaṃcaṃ vadati*, Schol. on N... *bhedaḥ anyaiś co 'ttarottarabhedair yatra varṇyate*, Abh.

⁵⁰¹ *tatra sarvapratyākhyānasavarūpaṃ varṇyate*, Abh, in the Schol. on N merely ; *atrā 'pi padaikadeṣe padasamudāyopacārāt*.

⁵⁰² The text reads *puṭṭho jahā abaddho | kaṃcuṇaṃ kaṃcuo samunnei | 'evaṃ puṭṭhaṃ abaddhaṃ | jīvo kammaṃ samannei* ||90|| *paccakkhānaṃ seṃā aparimāṇeṇa hoi kāy-avvaṃ | jesim tu parimāṇaṃ | taṃ daṭṭhaṃ (duṭṭhaṃ BH) āsā. hoi* ||91|| *Haribh.* has : *pratyākhyānaṃ śreyāḥ aparimāṇeṇa kālāvadhiṃ vihāya kartavyaṃ—jaṃ tassa avasesaṃ navamapuvvassa taṃ saṃmittaṃ ; tato so abhiniveseṇa Pūsamittasayāsaṃ ceva gāmitūna bhāṇai*—Pūsamitta's name is elsewhere brought into connection with the fourth schism. See schol. on *up* 1, below p. 381. This name occurs frequently in the legends of the Brāhmins and Buddhists.

śrutaskandha, and the fourth *chedasūtra*, was “*uddhṛta*” by Śrī Bhadrabāhusvāmin from the ninth *pūrva*. Thus, for example, in the introduction [357] to the *Kalpāntarvācyāni*.⁵⁰³ This appears to me to rest upon a misunderstanding (as will be developed further on) of the statement that is frequently met with elsewhere, e. g. in Dharmaghoṣa in the *Rṣimaṇḍalasūtra* v. 167 (see Jacobi, *Kalpas*. p. 11,12), to the effect that Bhadr. extracted *dasa*⁵⁰⁴ *kappavavahārā* from the 9th *puvva*. By these are meant the *chedasūtras* 3-5, and by *kappa*, not the *kalpasūtram*, but the fifth *chedasūtram* is implied. Haribhadra, too, on *Āvaśy*. 6, 88, characterizes the ninth *pūrvam* in general as *chedasūtra lakṣaṇam* and especially the twentieth *prābhṛtaṁ* (by name *oghapr.*), the third *vastu* (by name *ācāra*) as the source of the *oghaniryukti* treating of the *oghaśamācārī*. He says that the *oghaniryukti* is *nirvyūdhā* therefrom. In an *avacūri* (composed⁵⁰⁵ A. D. 1383) on Droṇācārya's *vṛtti* of the *oghaniryukti*, the *chedasūtras*, especially *kalpa* and *vyavahāra*, are referred to the same source. See also the scholiast on *Uttarajjh*. 26.

10. *vijjāṇupavāyaṁ*, *vidyānupravādam* ;⁵⁰⁶ 15 *vastus* (also in § 15) ; *ekā padakoṭīḥ daśa ca padasahasrāṇi* (*daśa ca* p. omitted in N) 10,010,000. The cause of the formation of the fourth schism is a passage from this *puvva*, cited in the passages quoted on *puvva* 7, or *Āv*. 8,59. [358] *neṇṇiā* 'ṇupavāe, on which Haribhadra says : *anupravādapūrve neṇṇiyaṁ vacham* [vatthu ?] *paḍhati*) Leumann compares the 9 *neṇṇiyaṁ vatthus* in *aṅga* 3,9.

11. *avaṁjham*, *avaṁdhyam* ;⁵⁰⁷ *kalyāṇam* Hem. ; *abandhyam iti vā* Schol. : 12 *vastus* ; 26 *padakoṭayaḥ*, 260 millions.

12. *pāṇāum*, *prāṇāyus* ;⁵⁰⁸ *prāṇāvāyam* (!) Hem. ; 13 *vastus* (cf. § 13) ; 1 *padakoṭī* 56 *padaśatasahasrāṇi*, 15,600,000.

⁵⁰³ This is the chief passage, which contains the statements in reference to the *pūrvas*.

⁵⁰⁴ *Dasa* is not to be connected with *kappa*, as is assumed by Jacobi (The ten *kalpas*), but denotes the *dasāo*, the fourth *chedasūtram* itself, a part of which exists to-day under the title of the *kalpasūtram*.

⁵⁰⁵ *navamapūrvāntarvarti tritīyaṁ sāmācārīvastv asti, tatrā 'pi viṁśatitamāt prābhṛtāt sādhanugrahārtham Bhadrabāhusvāminā nirvyūdhā*. The following fact speaks decisively against Bh. as author of the *oghan*. In v. 1 not only are the *cauddasapuvvins* praised, to which he himself belongs, but also the *dasapuvvins* which reach to Vajra ; consequently the existing text must have been composed at a period considerably posterior to Vajra.

⁵⁰⁶ *tatrā 'nekavidyātiśayā varṇitāḥ Abh., vidyā anekātiśayasampannā ānukūlyena siddhi prakarṣeṇa vadatīti*, Schol. on N. On *sātiśayatva* in connection with *vidyā*, cf. p. 251n.

⁵⁰⁷ *vaṁdhyam nāma niḥphalaṁ, avaṁdhyam sapphalaṁ ity a., tatra hi sarve jñānata-paḥsamayamayogāḥ śubhaphalena sapphalā varṇyamte, apraśastā ca pramāḍādikāḥ sarve aśubhaphalā varṇyamte*, Abh.

⁵⁰⁸ *prāṇā pāṁce 'ndriyāṇi 5, trīṇi mānasādini valāni 3, uchvāsa-ni (h) svāso 1, āyūśca, tāni yatra varṇyamte tad upacārāt prāṇāyuh* schol. on N.

13. *kiriyāvisālam, kriyā (bhiḥ) viśālam* ;⁵⁰⁹ 30 vastus ; 9 *padakoṭayah*, 90 millions.

14. *logaviṃḍusāram* (without *loga* in § 14), *viṃḍur iva sāram*⁵¹⁰ ; 25 vastus (also in § 25) ; *ardhatrayodaśa (sārdha° N) padakoṭayah* 125 (135 N) millions. This *pūrvam* is often mentioned as the conclusion of the *aṅgas* or of the *suṃṇāna*. See above p. 245, 346.

It is now perfectly clear that the number of *padas* which has been handed down to us is purely a matter of fiction. The exact figures in the case of 5 and 6 are simply amusing. It is easy to revel in detail, when the fancy is the only controlling agent.

The enumeration of the names in the text is followed by detailed statements in reference to the number of each of the *vatthus*, [359] vastus and *cūliyas* or *cūla-vatthus*,⁵¹¹ i. e. sections into which each of the 14 *puvvas* are divided. These numbers, in all 225 *vatthus* (*mūlav.*) and 34 *cūlav.*, are also mentioned in three *kārikās*, which have been inserted ; and each of which has been quoted in its proper place.

The fourth part is called *anuyoga* ; Hem. calls it *pūrvānuyoga*⁵¹² and places it (cf. p. 347) in the third position, the *pūrvagatam* occupying, according to him, the fourth place. A contents of historical character is ascribed to this fourth part. The *anuyoga*⁵¹³ is divided into two sections : (1) into the *mūlaprathamānuyoga*, treating of the root (of the tree of the sacred doctrine), or, according to the scholiasts, of the Tīrthaṅkaras,⁵¹⁴ i. e., the history of the beginning, of the preliminary birth, of the existence and of the final completion of the *bhagavaṃtāṇaṃ arahaṃtāṇaṃ* ; and (2) into the *gaṇḍikānuyoga*, i. e., the doctrine of the

509 *kriyābhiḥ saṃyamakriyādibhiḥ viśālam*, schol. on N ; *tatra kāyikyādayaḥ kriyāḥ sabhedāḥ saṃyamakriyā-chedāḥ (chāṃda?) kriyāvidhānāni ca varṇyamāte*, Abh. (Malay. has according to Leumann : *saṃyamakriyāchāṃdakriyādayaḥ ca*).

510 *loke jagati śrutaloke vākṣarasyo 'pari viṃḍur iva sāram, sarvākṣarasamni-pātalabdhīhetutvāt*, schol. on N.

511 N has *cullavatthūṇi*, which is explained by the schol. by *kṣullavastūṇi*, whereas *cūla* is explained by *śikharam* ! Abh. understands here, as in *aṅga* 1, *cūḍā* to be secondary additions. See p. 360n.

512 cf. Wilson Scl. W. 1, 285, *pūrvānuyoga* on the doctrines and practices of the Tīrthaṅkaras before attaining perfection, ... *pūrvagate* on the same after perfection(!)

513 *anuyogaḥ, sūtrasya nijenā 'bhidheyena sārddham anu (rūpaḥ?) sambandhaḥ ity a. Abh.*

514 *iha dharmapraṇaya(na) mūlam tāvat tīrthakārās, teṣāṃ prathamam samtyaktvā-vāptilakṣaṇapūrvā(bha) vādī gocaro 'nuyogo mū° gaḥ*, Abh.

“little knots,” single knotted points, members, sprouts,⁵¹⁵ of the sacred doctrine, *i.e.*, the history of the numerous figures of the Jaina hagiology which are stated to be—[360] *kulakara*, *īrthakara*, *gaṇadhara*, *cakka-dhara*, *Dasāra*,⁵¹⁶ *Baladeva*, *Vāsudeva*. The history of *Harivaṃśa* is added to this group and, strangely enough, that of *Bhadrabāhu* himself, whom tradition represents to be the last teacher of the *diṭṭhivā*. Other “knots” are finally added, *viz.* *tavokammagaṇḍikā cittaṃtara* (*citrāṃtara*) *gaṇḍikā*, *osappiṇi*^o and *ussappiṇi*^o, and also all sorts of stories illustrating the way how beings become gods, men animals or hell-beings.

Abhayadeva is unfortunately very brief here, and to add to our difficulties the MS. is full of corruptions. *Abh.* refers especially to a *Nandīṭikā*⁵¹⁷ composed probably in Prakrit, which is, however, not the same as the commentary on *N*, which I have before me. This too, is very brief and presumably contains a direct citation from one of the sections which belong here. See below p. 368 on *cittaṃtarag*.

The fifth part is composed of the *cūliyās*—additions, which were referred to p. 358 in the discussion on part 3 to which they belong. They belong however to the first four *puvvas* alone. According to the schol. (and also to the schol. on *Hem.* 246) by these *cūliyās* we are to understand *cūlā*-like (*i. e.*, like excrescences) *paddhatis*, which embrace that which was not treated of in all the four preceding⁵¹⁸ parts of the *dṛṣṭivāda*. [361] The text, however, takes pains to limit them to the first four *puvvas*.

In the final remarks in reference to the complete extent of the *diṭṭhivā*, the following parts are ascribed to it,—1 *suyakkhandha*, 14 *puvvas*, *saṃkheyya* “computable” (perhaps “innumerable,” see above p. 281) *vatthu* and *cūla* (*culla* *N*) *vatthu*⁵¹⁹ and *pāhuda* (*prābhṛta*), *pāhuda-pāhuda*, *pāhudiya* and *pāhudiya pāhudiya*, to which the same epithet is attached. The *payasahassa*,⁵²⁰ *akkhara*, &c., are characterized by the same epithet, *i. e.*, *saṃkheyya*.

⁵¹⁵ *ikṣv-ādinām pūrvāparaparvaparicinnō madhyabhāgo gaṇḍikā gaṇḍike 'va gaṇḍikā, ekārthādhikārā, grāṃhapaddhatis tasyā anuyogaḥ*, schol. on *N*; *iha 'kavaktavya-tārthādhikāranugatāvakyā ('tavakyaḥ?) paddhatayo gaṇḍikā ucyante tāsām anuyogo 'rthakathanavidhir gaḥ gaḥ*, *Abh.*

⁵¹⁶ See *Pet. Dict.* s. v. *dasāra*, attribute of every Buddha.

⁵¹⁷ Doubtless that of *Haribhadra* is meant. See schol. on *Gaṇadhara-sārdhaśata* v. 55. This, too, is indicative of the fact (see p. 284, 352) that the *Nandī* is strictly the proper place for that entire treatment of the 12 *aṅgas* which later on found a home within the fourth *aṅga*. See p. 349, 363.

⁵¹⁸ *iha dṛṣṭivāde parikarma-sūtra-pūrvagatā 'nuyogoktānuktārthasaṃgrahapaddhatayaḥ (saṃgrahaparā grāṃhapaddh. N. Schol.) cūlāḥ*.

⁵¹⁹ The number of *vatthu* and *cūlav* for the 14 *puvva* at least, was shortly before (cf. p. 359) stated with exactness in the text itself.

⁵²⁰ See above for the fabulous accounts of the scholia.

Though the scholia fail to explain further the words *pāhuḍa*, &c., they manifestly signify the same as chapter, paragraph, &c., and are actually so used⁵²¹ in *upāṅgas* 5, 7 ; and in *aṅga* 10 (see p. 333), the word *pāhuḍa* is used in connection with the 14 *puvvas*. In the *Amuyogadvārasūtra* (end of the *pamāṇa* section), the *diṭṭhivā* is said to be computed according to *pāhuḍa*, *pāhuḍiā*, *pāhuḍapāhuḍiā*, and according to *vatthu*. This method of counting is said in the *Amuyogadvārasūtra* to be similar to the division of the *kālia sua*, i. e., into *uddesaga*, *ajjhayaṇa*, *suakkamāḍha*, *aṅga*, which is there contrasted with the *diṭṭhivā*. *Vatthu* appears in *up.* 6 as the name of the sections of *up.* 5 and 7 in which it no longer occurs in the signification.

If we now cast a glance at the entire field of information which we possess in regard to [362] the twelfth *aṅga*, it is manifest that, though this *aṅga* had a genuine existence, nevertheless the information at our command produces an impression of less weight than that concerning the previous eleven *aṅgas*. In the case of the latter we possess the texts themselves as a means of verification, but in the case of the twelfth *aṅga* there is no such help upon which we can rely.

These statements, and especially those in reference to the 14 *pūrvas*, are, however, not purely fictitious. This is clear from the citations adduced above in our consideration of each, and especially of 2-4, 7-10, and from traditions in reference either to the extracts from them or to their relations to the origin of some of the seven schisms. Another proof of the validity of these statements lies in the fact that the number of the *vatthus*, *māuyāpadāṇi* and *suttāṇi*, contained in the *diṭṭhiv.*, which is mentioned in *aṅga* 4 §§ 13-16, 18.20.25.26 and 88 is in direct agreement with the later statement of contents. Finally the name *pāhuḍa* in *aṅga* 10 appears in direct connection with the 14 *puvvas*. At the period of the *Āvaśyakasūtra*, especially, and at that of the *Amuyogadvārasūtra* these texts must still have existed, and perhaps even at the time of the older commentaries (cf. e. g., p. 347n.), if the statements of the latter are not mere reproductions of old traditions. See p. 225.

The statement of the contents of *aṅga* 12 is found in *aṅga* 4, or *Nandī* (N), and is as follows :

*Se kiṃ taṃ diṭṭhivāe ? diṭṭhivāe naṃ savvabhāvaaparūvaṇaya*⁵²² *āghavijj-*

⁵²¹ The name *pāhuḍa* is found in the *Siddhapañcālikā* of Devendrasūri in 50 *gāthās*. The author, in v. 1, says that he has taken his material *sirisiddhapāhuḍāo*. See above v. 354.

⁵²² ABC, °vaṇā N.

amti,⁵²³ *se samāsao paṁcavihe paṁ* [363] (*ṇatte*), *taṁ* : *parikammaṁ*⁵²⁴ *suttāim puṇṇavagayam*⁵²⁵ *anuyogo*⁵²⁶ *cūliya* §—*se kiṁ taṁ parikamme* ? 2 *sattavihe paṁ*, *taṁ* : *siddha*⁵²⁷ *seṇiyāparikamme*,⁵²⁸ *maṇussase*°, *buddhase*,⁵²⁹ *uggahaṇāse*°, ⁵³⁰ *uvasaṁpajjaṇāse*°, ⁵³¹ *vippajahaṇāse*°, *cuyācuyase*°;—*se kiṁ taṁ siddhase*°⁵³²

2. *coddasavihe pannatte*, *taṁ jahā* : *māuyāpayāṇi*⁵³³ *egatṭhiyapayāim* *pāḍho aṭṭhapayāṇi*⁵³⁴ *āgāsapayāṇi*⁵³⁵ *keubhūyam* *rāsibaddham* *egaguṇam* *duguṇam* *tiguṇam* *keubhūya*⁵³⁶—*paḍiggaha*⁵³⁷ *saṁthārapaḍiggaha*⁵³⁸ *namdāvattam* *siddhāvattam*, *se* 'taṁ *siddhase*°;—*se kiṁ taṁ maṇussase*? 2 *coddasavihe paṁ*, *taṁ* : *tāim ceva māuyāpayāim*⁵³⁹ *jāva namdāvattam* *maṇussāvattam*,⁵⁴⁰ *se* 'taṁ *maṇussase*°, ⁵⁴¹—*avaśesaṁ parikammāim* *pāḍhāiyāim* *ekkārasavihāni*⁵⁴² *paṁ*;—*icc* [364] *eyāim*⁵⁴³ *satta parikammāim*, *cha*⁵⁴⁴

523 ABC, °jjai N.

524 ABC, °mme N.

525 ABC, *gae* N : when 1 henceforth cite N alone, ABC agree.

526 BC, °ugo A, °oge N.

527 *siddhi* AN.

528 *etāni siddhaśreṇikāparikarmādi (dīni) mūlabhedataḥ saptavidhāni, mātṛkāpadādyuttarabhedapekṣayā tryaśitividhāni*, schol. on N.

529 BC, *putthase*° AN.

530 BC, *ugāḍha* A, *ogāḍha* N.

531 °ṇā BC, °ṇa AN.

532 *siddhi* A.

533 A, °dāni BC, *māugāpayāim* N.

534 BC, *aṭṭhā* AN; in N before *pāḍho*.

535 BC, *aṇāsa* A, *āmāsa* N.

536 N, *bhūye* BC, *bhūyam* A.

537 *ggāho* AN.

538 BC, *samsā*° *ho* AN.

539 *māuyāim pa*° BC, *māuyap*, A, *māugāp* N.

540 AN, *ssabaddham* BC, incorrectly.

541 In N this § is differently understood, since all the 14 names are again enumerated, and, in fact, just as above with the same variations:—*māugā*°, *pāḍho* after *aṭṭhapayāim*, *āmāsa*° (sic !), *keubhūyappaḍiggaho*, *samsārapaḍiggaho*.

542 It follows from this *ekkārasavihāni* that the reading of N. which gives *pāḍho* after *aṭṭhapayāim*, is correct; otherwise there would be twelve species, not eleven. N consequently has preserved the original form of the text. N is also more exact in another point:—From the text we conjecture merely that the last member of each of the seven series (after *namdāvattam*) begins in each case with the first part of the name of the series. In N, however, where as in the case of *maṇussase*° and in all the foll. series, the enumeration of the 14 members is in each case complete, the readings being the same as heretofore, the last member of each always varying, or it is expressly called *putthāvattam*, *ogādhāvattam*, *uvasaṁpajjaṇāvattam*, *vippajahaṇāvattam*, *cūcūāvattam*. Further on N has frequently, sometimes in agreement with A, the better reading. Some omissions are due to the incorrectness of the Berlin MS.

543 *eyāim* BC, *eyāim* AN.

544 *cha* s. s. *āj*. omitted in N, the schol. however says: *eteṣāṁ ca saptānām pari*

sasamaiyāṇi satta ājīviyāṇi, cha caūkkaṇaiyāṇi,⁵⁴⁵ satta terāsiyāṇi,⁵⁴⁶ evāṃ eva⁵⁴⁷ sapuvvāvareṇaṃ satta parikammāṃ tesīm bhavaṃti 'ti-m-akkhāyāṃ ; se 'ttam' parikammāṇi ;—se kiṃ taṃ suttāṃ ? suttāṃ⁵⁴⁸ aṭṭhāsī bhavaṃti 'ti-m-akkhāyāṃ,⁵⁴⁹ taṃ,⁵⁵⁰ ujugāṃ,⁵⁵¹ pariṇayāpariṇayaṃ, bahubhaṃgiyaṃ, vinayapavvatiyaṃ,⁵⁵² aṇaṃtaraṃ,⁵⁵³ paraṃparaṃ, sāmāṇaṃ,⁵⁵⁴ saṃjūhaṃ,⁵⁵⁵ bhinnāṃ, ahavvāyaṃ,⁵⁵⁶ sovatthiyaṃ,⁵⁵⁷ ghaṇṭaṃ, naṃdāvattaṃ, bahulaṃ, puṭṭhāpuṭṭhaṃ⁵⁵⁸ viyāvattaṃ,⁵⁵⁹ evaṃbhūyaṃ, dūyāvattaṃ vattamānuppayaṃ,⁵⁶⁰ samabhirūḍhaṃ,⁵⁶¹ savvatobhaddaṃ,⁵⁶² paṇāsāṃ⁵⁶³ dupaḍiggaḥaṃ, icc-eiyāṃ bāvīsaṃ suttāṃ chinnaceyaṇaiyāṇi⁵⁶⁴ sasam [365] ayasuttaparivāḍḍe ; icc-eiyāṃ⁵⁶⁵ bāvīsaṃ suttāṃ achinnacheyaṇaiyāṇi⁵⁶⁶

(karmanā)m ādyāni (Abh. has : saṭ ādimāni parikarmāni) saṭ svasamayavakta-vyatānugataṇi svasiddhāntaprakāśakāni 'ty a. ye tu Gośālapravartitā ājivikāḥ pāsamāḍīnaḥ tanmatena sapṭa pi (cyutācyutaśreṇikāparikarmasahitāni Abh.) prajñāpyante.

⁵⁴⁵ *nayāṃ* N ; ādyāni saṭ caturṇayopetāni, schol. on N.

⁵⁴⁶ *yāṃ* N ; *trairāsiukāni*, *trairāśikamatam avalāmbya sapṭa parikarmāni trividhana-yacimtayā cīmtayānte*, schol. on N.

⁵⁴⁷ Instead of *evāṃ eva* to *akkhāyāṃ* N has merely *nayāṃ parikamme*.

⁵⁴⁸ Instead of *su°* to *akkhāyāṃ* N has *suttāṃ vāvīsaṃ paṃ*.

⁵⁴⁹ BC *akkhāyāṃ* A.

⁵⁵⁰ A omits.

⁵⁵¹ BC, *ujjāyāṃ* A, *ujjusuaṃ* N.

⁵⁵² C, *pac°* B ; *vijayavirayaṃ* A, *vijayacariyaṃ* N.

⁵⁵³ *ra* BC.

⁵⁵⁴ BCN, *sām°* A.

⁵⁵⁵ °*bū* B, simply *jūhaṇ* A.

⁵⁵⁶ BC, cc A, *āyaccāyaṃ* N.

⁵⁵⁷ *sāva* N.

⁵⁵⁸ merely *puṭṭhaṃ* A.

⁵⁵⁹ °*vaccam* N.

⁵⁶⁰ °*payam* A.

⁵⁶¹ *ruḍḍhaṃ* N.

⁵⁶² BC, *savvāo°* N, *savvāu* A.

⁵⁶³ AC, *paṇāsāṃ* BN.

⁵⁶⁴ °*yāṃ* N ; *iha yo nāma nayāḥ sūtraṃ chedena chinnaṃ evā'bhīpraiti, na dvitīyena sūtreṇa saha sambāṃdhayati ; tathā hi : dhammo maṃgalaṃ ukkiṭṭhaṃ iti ślokaṃ chinnachedanayamatena pūrvasūrayaḥ tathā vyākhyānti sma yathā na dvitīyādislokānāṃ apekṣā syāt, tathā dvitīyādin api tathā vyākhyānti sma yathā na teṣāṃ ādyaślokāpekṣā syāt ; tathā sūtrāṇy api yatrayābhīhīprāyena (yan nayābhi°) para-sparaṃ nirapekṣāni vyākhyānti sma, sa chedachinnanayaḥ tataḥ, svasamaya-vaktavyatāṃ adhikṛtya chinnachedanayatvaṃ, tathā yaḥ sūtraṃ sūtrāntareṇa sahā 'chinnaṃ arthataḥ sambāṃdham abhipraiti, sa achinnachedanayaḥ, yathā : dhammo maṃgalaṃ ukkiṭṭhaṃ ity ayam śloko 'chinnachedanayamatena vyākhyāyāmaṇo dvitīyādin apekṣate, 'py etam ślokaṃ, evam anyonya(m) dvāvīṣati (ḥ) sūtrāni akṣararacanāṃ adhikṛtya parasparaṃ vibhaktāny apy dvitīyādayo arthasambāṃdham apekṣya sāpekṣāni*, schol. on N.

⁵⁶⁵ A. N. *etāṃ* BC.

⁵⁶⁶ °*nayāṃ* BC.

ājivīyaśuttaparivāḍḍie ; *icc-eiyāim*⁵⁶⁷ *bāvisam* *suttāim* *tika*⁵⁶⁸ *nayāni*⁵⁶⁹ *terāsiya*⁵⁷⁰ *suttaparivāḍḍie* ; *icc-eiyāim* *bāvisam* *caṭṭakkanaiyāni*⁵⁷¹ *sasamay-asuttaparivāḍḍie*⁵⁷² *evām* *eva sapuvvāvareṇam*⁵⁷³ *aṭṭhāsī*⁵⁷⁴ *suttāim*⁵⁷⁵ *bhava-mti* 'tī'⁵⁷⁶ *m-akkhāyam* ;⁵⁷⁷ *se* 'tām *suttāim*.

Se kiṃ tam *puvvagae* ⁵⁷⁸ *puvvagae coddasavihe*⁵⁷⁹ *paṃ*, *taṃ* : *uppāya-puvvaṃ*, *aggeṇīyam*⁵⁸⁰ *viriyam* *atthinatthippavāyam*, *nāṇappavāyam*, *sac-cappavāyam*, *āyapp.*, *kammapp.*, *paccak-khāṇapp.*⁵⁸¹ *vijjāṇuppavāyam*, *avaṃjham*, *pāṇāu*,⁵⁸² *kiriyaṇisālam*, *logaḃimḍusāram* ;—*uppāya* [366] *puvvaṃ* *naṃ*⁵⁸³ *dasa* *vatthū cattāri cūliya*⁵⁸⁴ *vatthū paṃ*, *aggeṇiyassa*⁵⁸⁵ *naṃ* *puvvaṃ* *coddasa* *v.* *bārasa*⁵⁸⁶ *cūliya* *v.* *paṃ*, *vīriyapuvvaṃ* *aṭṭha* *v.* *aṭṭha cūliya* *v.* *p.*, *atthinatthippavāyassa*⁵⁸⁷ *aṭṭhārassa* *v.* *dasa cūliya* *v.* *p.*, *nāṇappavāyassa* *naṃ* *puvvaṃ* *bārasa* *v.* *p.*, *saccappavāyassa* *naṃ* *p.* *do*⁵⁸⁸ *v.* *p.*, *āyapp.* *naṃ* *p.* *solasa* *v.* *p.* *kammapp.* *naṃ* *p.* *ṭṭsaṃ* *v.* *p.*, *paccakkhāṇassa* *naṃ* *p.* *ṭṭsaṃ* *v.* *p.*, *vijjāṇupp.* *naṃ* *p.* *pannarasa* *v.* *p.* *avaṃjhassa* *naṃ* *p.* *bārasa* *v.* *p.* *pāṇāussa* *naṃ* *p.* *ṭṭasa* *v.* *p.* *kiriyaṇisālassa* *naṃ* *p.* *ṭṭsaṃ* *v.* *p.*, *logaḃimḍusārassa* *naṃ* *p.* *paṇavisam*

⁵⁶⁷ *eyāim* A; *atha* *nayavibhāgāmtaram* *adhikṛtya* *bhedam āha* : *trairāśikanayamatena sūtraparipātyām* *vivakṣitāyām* *trikanayikāni*, *svasamayavaktavyatām* *adhikṛtya* *su°* *vi°* *saṃgrahavyavahārarijusūtrasābdarūpanayacatuskayo* (! omission) *schol.* on N (Malay. accord. to Leumann, continues *catuṣṭayopetāni* *saṃgrahādinaya-catuṣṭayena* *cintyānta* *ity ā.*)

⁵⁶⁸ *tikka* A, *tiga* N.

⁵⁶⁹ *yāim* N,

⁵⁷⁰ *sīm* A.

⁵⁷¹ °*yāim* N, *ṇayāni* A.

⁵⁷² N adds *suttāim*.

⁵⁷³ *pūrvāparasaṃmudāyarūpeṇa* *sarvasaṃkhyayā*, *schol.* on N.

⁵⁷⁴ °*sūri* B, °*sūta* C, °*sūi* A, °*saī* N.

⁵⁷⁵ °*ṇi* A.

⁵⁷⁶ *titti* A, *tīti* N, *bhavatiti* BC.

⁵⁷⁷ °*iyāim* BC, °*iyāni* A, °*iyam* N.

⁵⁷⁸ See Abhayadeva's scholion. above, p. 216. The anonym. *schol.* on *Nandī* has the foll. *iha* *tīrthakaras* *tīrthapravartanakāle* *gaṇadharāṇ* *adhikṛtya* *pūrvam* *pūrvagatasūtrārtham* *bhāṣate* *tataḥ* *pūrvāṇy* *ucyānte* ; *gaṇadhara* *api* *tataḥ* 'va *racayānti* *pascād ācārādikaṃ*.

⁵⁷⁹ *caṭṭh°* N.

⁵⁸⁰ ABC *aggeṇīyam* N, *aggāni*. Ned. (accord. to Leumann).

⁵⁸¹ BC, °*ṇuppavāyam* A, *kkhāṇam* N.

⁵⁸² BC, *pāṇāu* A, *pāṇāo* N.

⁵⁸³ N adds *puvvaṃ*.

⁵⁸⁴ *culla°* N.

⁵⁸⁵ °*ṇiassa* N.

⁵⁸⁶ *duvālāsa* N.

⁵⁸⁷ °*yapuvvaṃ* N.

⁵⁸⁸ *doṇṇi* N.

v. paṁ ; dasa coddas' aṭṭha aṭṭhāraseva (°sa N) bārasa duve ya vatthūṇi⁵⁸⁹/solasa tīsā vīsā pannarasa aṇupavāyaṁmi||bārasa ekkārasame bārasame terase' va vatthūṇi/tīsā puṇa terasame coddasame⁵⁹⁰ pannaṇvisā u||cattāri duvālasa aṭṭha ceva dasa ceva cūla⁵⁹¹ vatthūṇi|āillāṇa caṇṇhaṁ sesāṇaṁ cūliyā na 'tthi|| ; se 'ttaṁ puvvagaṇaṁ.⁵⁹²

Se kiṁ taṁ aṇuyoge ?⁵⁹³ a° ge duvihe p., taṁ : mūla⁵⁹⁴ paḍhamāṇuyoge ya gaṁḍiyaṇuyoge ya : Se kiṁ taṁ mūlapa° ge ? ettha⁵⁹⁵ ṇaṁ arahantāṇaṁ bhagavatāṇaṁ puvvabhūva⁵⁹⁶ devalogagamaṇāṁ⁵⁹⁷ āṇi⁵⁹⁸ cavaṇāṁ⁵⁹⁹ jamma [367] nāṇi ya abhiseyā rāyavarasirīo⁶⁰⁰ sīyāu⁶⁰¹ pavvajjāo⁶⁰² tava ya bhatta⁶⁰³ kevalanāṇāsuppāyā⁶⁰⁴ titthappavattanāṇi ya, saṁghayaṇaṁ,⁶⁰⁵ saṁthāṇaṁ uccattaṁ āṇi⁶⁰⁶ vanṇavibhāgo,⁶⁰⁷ sīsū gaṇā⁶⁰⁸ gaṇaharā ya, ajjū pavattiṇīo,⁶⁰⁹ saṁghassa cauviḥassa jaṁ cā 'vi⁶¹⁰ parimāṇaṁ, jiṇa⁶¹¹ maṇapajjava⁶¹² ohīṇāṇi⁶¹³ sammatta-suyāṇāṇiṇo ya vādī⁶¹⁴ anuttaragati ya⁶¹⁵

589 mūlavatthūṇaṁ N.

590 AN, caūda° BC.

591 culla° N.

592 gae A ; se 'ttaṁ p. omitted in N.

593 BC, oge N, uge A ; and so throughout.

594 N. omits.

595 ABC, mū° ge N.

596 arhatāṁ bhagavatāṁ samyaktvabhavād ārabhya pūrvabhavāḥ, devalogagamanāni, teṣu pūrvabhavāṣu cā'yuh. devalokebhyas cyavanam, tirthakarabhavatveno 'tpādas, tato janmāni, tataḥ sailarāje surāsurair vidhiyamānā abhiseka ity-ādi pāṭhasiddham yāvan nigamanam ; iha sarvatra 'py apāmtarāle vartibhyo vadvyah (vah° ?) pratiniyataikārthadhikāras, tato vahuvacanam : schol. on N.

597 NA, °ṇāṇi BC.

598 N, āṇi A, āu BC.

599 N, cavaṇāṇi BC, ciyāṇi A.

600 N, rīto BC, rīu A. (Ned. breaks off, Leumann says, at abhiseyā and is merely prāthamabhāga,)

601 N, omits.

602 N, jjāto BC, jjāu A.

603 ABC, uggā N.

604 A, ppāyātā BC, ppāyāo N.

605 saṁgha° to vibhāgo omitted in N.

606 āu A.

607 vaṇavibhāu A.

608 ABN, gaṇi C.

609 N, ṇiū ABC.

610 vāvi ABC, ca N.

611 jiṇa BC.

612 vā N.

613 nāṇi N ; hiṇāṇi to siddhā omitted in A.

614 BC, pavāi N.

615 °gai a N.

uttaraveṇvino⁶¹⁶ ya muṇiṇo jattiyā 2 siddhā, siddhapaho⁶¹⁷ jaha desio jaccirāṇ kālāṇ, pāvagao⁶¹⁸ ya jo jahim jattiyāim⁶¹⁹ bhattāim cheyattā⁶²⁰ amṭagaḍe⁶²¹ muṇivaruttame⁶²² tamaraoghavippamukke⁶²³ siddhipaham⁶²⁴ aṇuttaraṇ ca patte, ⁶²⁵ ee anne ya evam-āṭ⁶²⁶ bhāvā mūla⁶²⁷ paḍhamāṇuoge kahiya āghavijjanti⁶²⁸ pannavi° parūvi° ; se 'ttaṇ mūlapaḍhamāṇuoyoge ;— se kiṇ taṇ gaṇḍiyāṇuoyoge ? 2 aṇegavihe pannatte, taṇ jahā⁶²⁹ kulagarag-amḍiyāo⁶³⁰ titthayarag. gaṇadharag, ⁶³¹ cakkaharag. ⁶³² Dasārag. Baladevag. Vāsudevag. Harivaṃsag, ⁶³³ Bhaddabāhug. [368] tavokammag. cittamitarag. ⁶³⁴ osappiṇṭg. ⁶³⁵ ussappiṇṭg⁶³⁶ amaranaratiriyāniraya⁶³⁷ gati⁶³⁸ gamaṇa viviha pariyattāṇaṇuoyoge, ⁶³⁹ evam-ādīyāo⁶⁴⁰ gatigaṇḍiyāo⁶⁴¹ aghavijjanti panna° ⁶⁴² parū° ; se' ttaṇ gaṇḍiyāṇuoyoge. ⁶⁴³

616 *utt. ya m. in N alone.*

617 *siddhapaho to kālāṇ in N alone.*

618 *N, pāvogato BC, pāvagau A.*

619 *AN, jetti° BC.*

620 *ABC, cheittā N.*

621 *N, °ḍo BC kaḍo A.*

622 *N, °mo ABC.*

623 *N, kkā ABC.*

624 *BC, sidha A, mukkkhasuham N.*

625 *N, pattā ABC.*

626 *āḍi A.*

627 *A omits.*

628 *agh. p. p. omitted in N.*

629 *jahā omitted in A ; instead of 2 aṇe° jahā N has ga°ge ṇam jahā.*

630 *Thus N, °yāto BC, °yāu A ; so also further on ; kulakarāṇāṇ Vimalavāhanādīnāṇ purvabhavaṇmanāṇādīni saprapaṇcam upavarṇyaṇte evam tīrthakaragaṇḍikā-diṣv abhidhāṇavaṣato bhāvaṇyaṇ schol. on N.*

631 *In N after Vāsudevag.*

632 *BC, cakkavatti AN.*

633 *In N after Bhaddā°.*

634 *In N after osapp. ; citrā anekārthā amtare Rṣabhajitatīrthakarapāṇtarāle Rṣabhavaṇśasamudbhūtānāṇ bhūpatināṇ śeṣagativyudāsena śivagatigamanā-nūttaropapāṇapratipādikā gaṇḍikāṣ, tāsāṇ ca prarūpaṇā Subuddhināṇnā Sagara-cakravartino mahāmātyeṇā 'stāpade Sagaracakravartisutebhya Adityayaṣa-ḥprabhṭināṇ Rṣabha, vaṇśarājānāṇ narapatināṇ saṁkhyāpradarāṇena kṛtā sācā' iccāṣaṇnāṇ Usabhasse 'ty-ādīnā 'vaseyā, schol. on N.*

635 *N usa° BC, ussa A ; ṇi BCN, ṇi A.*

636 *BN omit ; usa° A, ṇi C.*

637 *niraya omitted in A ; amare 'ti vividheṣu parivartteṣu bhavabhramāṇeṣu jaṇtū-nāṇ iti gamyate 'maratiriyagnirayagatigamanāṇ, evam ādikā gaṇḍikā vahāva (!) ākhyāyaṇte, schol. on N.*

638 *gaṇ N.*

639 *BC, °uge A ḥḥaṇeṣu N.*

640 *yāu A. ātiyāto BC, merely āi in N*

641 *A omits.*

642 *N omits.*

643 *AN, go BC.*

Se kiṃ taṃ cūliyāo ⁶⁴⁴ *jan nam* ⁶⁴⁵ *āillāṇaṃ cāuṇhaṃ puṇvāṇaṃ*
cūliyāo ⁶⁴⁶ *sesāṃ puṇvāṃ acūliyāṃ* ⁶⁴⁷ *se 'ttaṃ cūliyāo.*

At the conclusion of this review of the 12 *āṅgas*, I present the apostrophe to eternity, which is given in *āṅga* 4 and in *Nandi*, in entire agreement with each other, at the close of their statement of the contents of the *āṅga*. With all the unwavering firmness of this apostrophe it looks like a protest against all who might either doubt or attempt to undermine its validity (see p.293) :—

Icc eiyaṃ duvālasaṃgaṃ gaṇṇipidaṃgaṃ atṭte ⁶⁴⁸ *kāle aṇaṃtā jīvā āṇāe* ⁶⁴⁹
virāhittā cāuraṃtasasāraṃakāṃtāraṃ aṇupariyaṭṭimsu ; ⁶⁵⁰ *icc eiyaṃ du°*
ga° paḍuppanne [369] *kāle (bis) aṇupariyaṭṭimti* ⁶⁵¹ *icc eiyaṃ du° ga° aṇāgae*
kāle (bis) aṇupariyaṭṭissaṃti ;—*icc eiyaṃ du° ga° atṭte kāle a. j. āṇāe ārāhittā*
ca° vṭṭivatimsu , ⁶⁵² *vṭṭivaṃti. vṭṭivaissaṃti* ;—*icc eiyaṃ du° ga° na kayāi*
na āsi , ⁶⁵³ *na kayāi na tthi, na kayāi na bhavissai, bhuvim* ⁶⁵⁴ *ca bhavaṃti*
ya ⁶⁵⁵ *bhavissaṃti ya* ⁶⁵⁶ *dhuve nīae* ⁶⁵⁷ *sasae akkhae* ⁶⁵⁸ *avvae* ⁶⁵⁹ *avaṭṭhie* ⁶⁶⁰
nicce ; ⁶⁶¹ *se jahā nāmae paṃca atthikāyā na kayāi na āsi na kayāi na*
tthi na kayāi na bhavissaṃti , ⁶⁶² *bhuvim ca bhavaṃti ya bhavissaṃti ya*
dhuvaṃ nitiyā ⁶⁶³ *jāva niccā, evāṃ eva du° ga° na kayāi na āsi (bis) nicce* ;
—*ettha* ⁶⁶⁴ *ṇaṃ du° ge ga° ge aṇaṃtā bhāvā a. abhāvā, a. heu a, aheu, a.*

644 N *yāto* BC, *yāu* A.

645 BC, AN omit.

646 BC, °*yāim* N, *yāu* A.

647 N, has *avaśesā puṇvā acūliyā*.

648 *tīe* N.

649 *ājñayā*.

650 *aṇupariyaṭṭavāṃtaḥ Jamālivat*.

651 *bhramaṃti*.

652 *vyativrajjitavantaḥ*

653 *nāsī* N (thus in every case).

654 *bhūim* N. (always)

655 *bhavai* a N (always).

656 *bhavissai* a N (always).

657 *niyatāṃ*.

658 N omits ; *akṣayaṃ*.

659 *avyayam*,

660 *avasthitam*.

661 Instead of *av. nicce* N has here *supariṭṭhie*. In the following repetition, however, it is the same as in the text.

662 *ssai* N.

663 *niyayā* N.

664 The following is omitted in N.

kāraṇā a. akāraṇā, a. jīvā a. ajīvā, a. bhavasiddhiyā a. abhavasiddhiyā, a. siddhā a. asiddhā āghaviḥḥanti parū parina° damsi° nidamsi° uvadamsi°, eyam du° gam ga° gam.

Before I proceed further I should like to state that beside the *Vidhiprapā* of Jinaprabha (A.D. 1307) (see above p.223) in the meantime two other *samācārī* texts, unfortunately anonymous, have come to my knowledge. They are both written in Prakrit with an occasional intermingling of Sanskrit, and are in agreement throughout with the statements in the *Vidhip*, which they antedate. The first of these texts, *āyāravihi*, in 21 *dāra*, contains in its tenth *dāraṃ, jogavihi*, not merely the enumeration of the *aṅgabāhira* texts, as *Nandī* [370], *Pākṣikas*, and *Vidhiprapā*, especially in the form of the two latter, but also the same detailed exposition and examination of the single portions of the *aṅgas, upāṅgas, &c.*, according to the period of time requisite for their study (measured according to *dīṇa* and *āyambīla*). The order of succession is the same as in the section of the *Vidhiprapā* which treats of this point. It is especially interesting that ten, and not five, *ajjh*, are here—see p. 322—ascribed to each of the first two *vargas* of the second part of the *aṅga* 6 : *dusu dusu vaggesu kamā ajjhayaṇā huṃti dasa ya cauppanna/battisā caū aṭṭha ya dhammakahā bīa suakkhamdhe*. The text which we possess does not agree with this allotment of *ajjh*. The same holds good of the second of these two texts, which bears the name *sāmāyārivihi*. We read in it the following concerning the first *vagga* : *tammi dasa ajjhayaṇā* and immediately thereupon *vie dasa ajjhayaṇā*. Since this second text is twice—at the conclusion of the *jogavihi* section and at the conclusion of the whole—expressly ascribed⁶⁶⁵ to Abhayadeva, or to his oral instruction of the author Paramānanda, it is very surprising that we find such differences between it and the present text, Abhayadeva himself in his commentary commenting upon that text which allots to both *vagga* only five *ajjh*, each. If the *sāmāyārivihi* appears to be more than two hundred years older than the *Vidhiprapā* on account of its pretended relation to Abhayadeva (A.D. 1064, above p. 277), [371] the *āyāravihi* must be regarded as of greater antiquity. Its author refers, at the conclusion of *dāra* 21, “*etāni gurukṛtyāni, śrāvakakṛtyaṃ punaḥ śrīmad Umāsvatīvācaka-srī Haribhadrāsūri pratiṣṭhākalpādibhyo, vaseyam*” to two authors considerably before his time. In v. 50, 51 of the *Gaṇadharasārdhāśatakam* composed by Jinadattasūri, the scholar of

⁶⁶⁵ *Siri Abhayadeva sūriguruvayaṇā mayam mae eyam/Paramāṇandēnakayam.....// śrī Abhayadevasūrer āsyasararuhavihārīṇi (?) patre/samācārī rūmārī (?) Paramānandāi padam cakre||.*

Jinavallabha who died A.D. 1112, (see Kl. 248 b), the former of the two authors is called the first teacher after the interval following upon Āryarakṣita and Durbalikāpuṣpa (above p. 348)⁶⁶⁶ In Sarvarājagaṇi's schol, on the *Gaṇadharaśrīrdhaśatakam* a *śrāvaka-prajñāpti* is cited among the 500 (or 105 ?) *payaraṇas* (*prakaraṇa*), composed by him in Sanskrit according to the statement in the text. The title *śrāvaka-prajñāpti* is in entire harmony with the statement of the *āyāravihi* just quoted. According to the *Gurvāvali* of Tapāgaccha Kl. 253a (28) there lived an Umāsvātikara in 1190 Vīra (= Samvat 720), who is, however, distinguished from the author of the *śrāvaka-prajñāpti* (*°ptyādi*) — (*yataḥ sammativṛttau*, of, above p. 347, *Śrī Umāsvātivācaka ity uktam*). The latter is probably, as Klatt kindly informs me, the person of this name who appears in the Bombay MS. of a *paṭṭāvali* of the *Vṛhat-Kharātaragaccha*, in the continuation of the old *Sthavirāvali* immediately after its last member. Duṣagaṇi, the teacher of Devarddhigaṇi, and separated by one gradation alone from Haribhadra who is mentioned together with him in the *āyāravihi*. Since the date of Devarddhigaṇi is 980 Vīra, and the death of Haribhadra is placed in [372] 1055 Vīra, see Kl. 253a (27), tradition seems to place Umāsvātikara, the author of the *śrāvaka-prajñāpti*, about 1000 Vīra (= Samvat 530) ! While it is true that the *āyāravihi* does not claim to stand in direct connection with Umāsv. and Haribh., merely citing them, yet this citation is of such a character that it is calculated to afford ancient testimony concerning a treatise which mentions, not sources of information of later date, but merely these two names which are manifestly of tolerable antiquity. The statements contained in this work gain consequently in authority and the same conclusion holds good of the information of a literary and other nature in harmony therewith, contained in both *sāmācārī* texts (*sa°vihi* and *vihipavā*). In continuing from this point on to adduce the testimony of the *Vidhiprapā* (V) especially, I do so, partly because it has a fixed date, and partly because it contains the most detailed statements. I shall, however, not fail to state where *Āyāravihi* (*Avi*) or *Sāmīyārīvihi* (*Svi*), which takes an intermediate position between *Avi*. and V. as regards fullness, offer anything worthy of particular note.

The second part of the *Siddhānta* is formed by the 12 *uvaṅgas*, *upāṅgas*. This title is applied in the *aṅgas* to the Brāhmanical *upāṅgas* alone. In *aṅga* 3, three of the existing *uvaṅgas* are apparently mentioned, but under the title *aṅgabahira* and not under that of

⁶⁶⁶ The very faulty MS. reproduces the Umāsāyi of the text by Umāsvāmi in the commentary ! This form of the name is found elsewhere, e. g., in the *Vicārāmṛta-saṃgraha* as that of the author of the *śrā°pti*.

uvaṅga. In the *uvaṅgas* themselves this appellation occurs at the beginning of the eighth alone, but there, according to all probability, it is a special designation of *uv.* 8-12 alone, and had consequently [373] not yet acquired its present signification. The *Nandī*, too, does not accept it in its present meaning. It enumerates all the texts in question, which now bear this name, but enumerates them among the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* (for which term the *Pākṣikasūtram* &c. present *aṅgabāhira*) and in an order different from the usual one at present in vogue. The solitary passage, in which I have been able to discover this title used in the *Siddhānta* in its general signification, is in the *Mahānisiha*, Book 3 (*aṅgovaṅga*...).

At the present day there are 12 texts bearing this name, corresponding to the number of the *aṅgas*. This arrangement is probably intentional and dates from a period (see p. 344), in which the twelfth *aṅga* either really existed or at least was counted in with the others. There is an alleged⁶⁶⁷ inter-relation between the 12 *aṅgas* and the 12 *uvaṅgas*, *uvaṅga* 1 being placed in connection with *aṅga* 1, *uvaṅga* 2 with *aṅga* 2, and so on. In the three *sāmāyārī* texts,⁶⁶⁸ *uv.* 8-12 are called *nirayāvaliyāsuaṅghaṇḍho uvaṅgam* (*Āvi.*, *Svi.*), in the *Vidhipr. egamuvaṅgam*; each of the five *vaggas* of which respectively corresponds⁶⁶⁹ to *aṅgas* 8 to 12. It is not improbable that [374] the existing order of the 12 texts may have been the result of such considerations; and the similarity in extent of each of the different members of both series renders this assumption the more worthy of credence.⁶⁷⁰ There are, however, so far as I can see, no instances of real inner connection

⁶⁶⁷ cf. Abhayadeva on *uv.* 1, Malayagiri on *uv.* 2,4, Śānticandra on *uv.* 6.

⁶⁶⁸ The order of succession adopted there, and which I follow from this point on, varies so far as the position of *uv.* 5-7 is concerned from that of Bühler—see above p. 226 where these appear as Nos. 6,7,5.

⁶⁶⁹ In the *Vidhiprapā* we read; Some, however, regard both *uv.* 7 and *uv.* 5 as belonging to *aṅga* 5, and according to their view the *uvaṅgam* belonging to *aṅgas* 7-11 is the *śrutaskandha* formed by *uv.* 8-12: *anne puṇa caṁḍapannattim sūrapannattim ca bhagavāi-uvaṅge bhaṇānti tesim maṇa uvāsagadasāṇa paṁcaṇhaṁ aṅgāṇaṁ uvaṅgam nirayāvaliyāsuyakkhaṇḍho*. This is manifestly an arrangement of those who no longer count the *diṭṭhiyā* as belonging to the *aṅgas* and is in entire harmony with the actual facts of the case. The statement in V. that follows is a riddle: *orāji annavaṇa sūjaṁcamnikakapupphavaṇhidasā āyārāi-uvaṅgā nāyavvā ānupuvvī* (this is the close of the *uvaṅgavihi*). The same remarkable statements are repeated in the *Jogavihāna* in v. 60: *vaccaṁ sattu-dinehiṁ nirayāvaliyāsuyakkhaṇḍho* [59] *orāji paṇṇavaṇa sūjaṁcamnikakapupphavaṇhidasā* | *āyārāi-uvaṅgā neyavvā ānupuvvī* [60]. A solution of this riddle is, however, not far to seek, if we read *o° ra°ji° su° jaṁ° cam° ni° ka° ka°*. By this means we have the beginning syllables of *uvaṅgas* 1-3, 5-10 in their present order; and here again there is reference to 12 *uvaṅgas* and to 12 *aṅgas*.

⁶⁷⁰ The last members in both series have the least, those in the middle the greatest, extent.

between the *aṅgas* and the *uvaṅgas* having the same position in the series. I say this, despite the fact that the scholia are only too zealous in attempting to establish such an inter-relation.

Definite groups are recognizable here as in the case of the *aṅgas*. Though all the *uvaṅgas* with the exception of *uv.* 3 begin with the legendary introductory formula *teṇaṃ-kāleṇaṃ* ... yet in the case of *uv.* 2.4 the *paṃcanamukkāra*, which we have met with already in *aṅga* 5, is placed before this introduction. In *uv.* 4 a verse, designed to glorify this *paṃcanamukkāra*, follows upon it, and then come several other verses of an introductory character. In the case of *uv.* 5, there is a larger number of introductory verses or of verses descriptive of the contents of the whole, before the legendary beginning; in the case of *uv.* 7 these are placed after the legendary beginning. Both of these *uv.* (5 and 7) differ from the others in the following particular,—[375] they make use of the title *pāhuḍa* for their sections, a title which we have met with in the case of the 14 *pūrvas*. In the introduction of *uv.* 7 and in *uv.* 4 there is a direct reference to the *pūrvas*. These two *uv.* are peculiar in being identical or at least in representing two recensions of one and the same text. *Uv.* 5, 7 and 6 are mentioned together in *aṅga* 3, and share an introduction that is completely identical, mutual references in the text to each other, and above all in the concluding part of their titles, the common factor *pannatti*, *prajñapti*. A part of *uvaṅga* 3, the *dīvasāgarapannatti*, belongs to the same category with them, since it has on the one hand the same termination in its title, and on the other is mentioned in *aṅga* 3 with them. At the period of the *Nandī* and of that of *aṅga* 3 it appears to have enjoyed a separate existence. Finally the title of *upāṅga* 4, *pannavañā*, is to be brought into this connection, so that *upāṅgas* 3-7 may be regarded as a group which is bound together by external criteria. The word *pannatti* which is here the link between them, was found in the title of *aṅga* 5. The words *pannatta* (*prajñapta*) and *pannatti* (*prajñapti*) and the finite verb *prajñāpay* have such a special use in the *Bhagavati* and, as was discovered later, in the entire Jaina *Siddhānta*, that (*Bhag.* I, 368) I called attention to the [376] *Pannattivāda*, or *Prajñaptivādins*, who are mentioned by the northern and southern Buddhists⁶⁷¹ among the 18 chief sects of Buddhism at the time of the second council of Aśoka. According to Wassiljew, pp. 228, 244 (German transl. pp. 251, 268), this sect dates from the second century after Buddha's *nirvāṇa*.

⁶⁷¹ *°pannatti* is found in Pali as the title of a work. See Childers s. v. *pannatti* (*Abhidhammap*). Works of the name were produced by the later Jains. See (above p. 371) my remarks on the *śrāvaka* *prajñapti* of the *Umāsavāti* (mi) *vācaka*.

Upāṅgas 8-12 form a second group closely connected with each other (see above). They form, as tradition itself asserts, in reality but five chapters of a single *śrutaskandha*, and are counted as five special texts merely to complete the parallel with the twelve *aṅgas*. The title of *uv*, 8 is later on, e. g. in the *Vidhiprapā*, regarded also as the collective title of all five; and a special name, *kappiyāo*, *kalpikās*, is allotted to *uv*, 8. In the *Nandī* all the 6 titles are placed together.

According to the introduction of the *avacūrṇi* to the *Oghaniryukti* (see above, p. 217), the *daśapūrvins* gained especial honour in performing the meritorious service of composing *saṃgrahaṇī* to the *uvarṅgas* (or of composing the *uv*, and the *saṃgr*. ?), and therefore had just claim to the salutation (*namukkāra*) in the first verse of that *Niryukti*. Tradition calls Ajja Sāma the author of the fourth *uvarṅga*, the *Pannavanā*; see verse 4 of the introduction to that *uvarṅga*. There is, however, another, who in this passage characterizes himself as the real promulgator, and introduces himself with the word "I".

[377] In the case of the first *uvarṅga*, secondary additions are, according to Leumann, clearly demonstrable. The second *uvarṅga* appears however to have suffered more, and the present text may, in fact, be a different one from the original. The reader is further referred to my remarks made on *aṅgas* 8-10 and especially on *aṅga* 10,

In the remarks of the redactor scattered here and there in the *aṅgas*, there were many references to the *upāṅgas*, their titles being directly mentioned or the names of particular divisions cited. In the *upāṅgas* *vice versa* there is no lack of reference both to the *aṅgas* and to other *upāṅgas*. Apparently we must recognise in these remarks of the redactor a hand aiming at unity (see above, p. 228),—a hand which has dealt uniformly with the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas* in that form of the text which both at present possess.

The varying statements in the MSS. in reference to the extent of each of the *upāṅgas* are as follows : *up*, 1 has 1320 *granthas*⁶⁷²—2, 2079,—3,4750,—4,7785—5. (2000 ?)⁶⁷³—6,4454,—7,1600,⁶⁷⁴—8,12, 1109.

⁶⁷² The statements vary here e. g. between 1167 (Kielhorn's Report, 1880-81, p. 50) 1200, 1267, 1320 and 1500. Leumann counts 1220.

⁶⁷³ The statement is here omitted ; cf *uv*, 7.

⁶⁷⁴ Other statements are : 1854, 2000.

XIII, The first *upāṅgam*, *uvavāiyam*, *aupapātikam*, of renewed births. The explanation of the name by *aupapātika* is (see above, p. 323, Leumann, p. 2) an incorrect Sanskrit rendering, since the formation is from *√pad+upa* and not from *√pat+upa*. The work is divided into two parts, which are however, not separated by any recognized dividing line. The first, which is greater in extent than the second [378], treats in great detail of the appearance and sermon of Mahāvīra in Campā under king Kūṇiya Bambhasāraputta,⁶⁷⁵ and of the pilgrimage of the king to Mahāvīra. The many *varṇakas*, which, on such occasions as this, are found in the legendary introduction to the *aṅgas*, *uvavāṅgas*, occur in this instance in their full form. They are consequently cited elsewhere merely by their introductory words; and for anything beyond this, reference is generally made to our text. The law proclaimed by Mahāvīra is here (§ 57) designated partly as *āgāradhamme* and partly as *āgārasāmāie*. See remarks on page 244 *ad aṅga* 1. The second part, which contains the essence of the work, is in extent scarcely more than a third of the whole, and looks, as Leumann says, like a more detailed treatment of *Bhag.* 1,1,77 (see *Bhag.* 1,162). It is divided into divisions of tolerably small compass, which all possess a form equally solem. These small divisions are not equal in extent nor are they counted on to the end. At the end there are 22 *kārikās*, which describe the abode &c. of the Siddhas, viz. of those that have escaped migration of souls. We find the teaching of Imdabhūti by Mahāvīra treated of, partly in a general way, partly in reference to 15 definite categories of men as regards their *uvavāyā* among the *neraiyas*, &c., up to the heavenly worlds, and to the final perfection and residence of the blessed in the Isipabbhārā *puḍhavi*, Dr. Ernst Leumann has given a detailed account of its contents in the introduction to his edition of the text ("the *aupapātikasūtra*," Leipzig., 1883), accompanied by an excellent glossary.

Among the interesting facts contained in the middle part of the work, the following is of especial importance. In § 76 there is an enumeration of alien sects, [379] *parivvāyā*, viz., the *Saṃkhā* *Jogī* *Kāvilā*⁶⁷⁶ *Bhiuccā*⁶⁷⁷ *haṃsā*⁶⁷⁸ *paramahaṃsā* *bahuudagā* *kulivvayā*⁶⁷⁹ *Kaṇhaparivvāyā*⁶⁸⁰. In immediate connection with this is an enumera-

675 cf. *chedasūtra*, 4,10.

676 *Kapilo devatā yeṣāṃ*, *Sāṃkhyā eva nirīśvarāḥ*.

677 *Bhrigur loke prasiddha ṛṣivīśeṣas, ṛṣyai 'va śiṣyāḥ Bhārgavāḥ* (!).

678 In reference to the following names see Wilson *Sel. works* 1,231 (ed. Rost).

679 *kuṭivrataḥ*; *kuṭicara* in Wilson, also in the *Āruṇikop. Ind. Stud.* 2,179.

680 *Nārāyaṇabhaktikā iti kecit*.

tion of the 8 representatives of each class⁶⁸¹ from the Brāhmaṇa caste ; *tattha khalu ime aṭṭha māhaṇaparivvāyā bhavaṃti Kaṇṇe*⁶⁸² *ya Karakaṇṇe ya Ambaḍe ya Parāsare/Kaṇṇe Dīvāyaṇe ceva Devagutte ya Nārahe*⁶⁸³//, and from the warrior caste : *tattha khalu ime aṭṭha khattiyaparivvāyā bhavaṃti, taṃ . Silāi Masihāre*⁶⁸⁴ *Naggai Bhaggai Tiya (Tikā ?) Videhe rāyā Rāme Bale 'ti ya.* After this follows an enumeration of the works of Brahmanical literature which is identical in every particular with that in the fifth *aṅga*⁶⁸⁵. See above p. 304.

The sage Ambaḍa,⁶⁸⁶ who is enumerated among the 8 *māhaṇaparivvāyās*, must have played no unimportant *role* in the opinion of his Jain colleagues or enemies, either at the time of the composition of this *upāṅga* or at that of those who interpolated the statements in reference to him. There have been inserted two detailed legends concerning him, the first of which deals especially with his [380] scholars,⁶⁸⁷ the second with himself, with his second birth in the person of the boy Daḍhapainna, and with his final perfection. Here occurs an enumeration of the (§107), 72 *kalās*, which are in fact essentially the same as those in *aṅga* 3, and (§ 105) of the foreign peoples from whom the female attendants of the boy (as in *aṅga* 6) came. These names are in general identical with those enumerated in *aṅgas* 5 and 6, and are also mentioned in a previous passage (§ 53) where the maid-servants of the queen are treated of. The list is as follows — *baḥūhim khujjāhim Cilāthim vāmaṇihim vaḍabhihim Babbarihim Paṇṇasiyāhim (bali°) Joṇiyāhim Palhaviyāhim Isiṇiyāhim Cāruṇiyāhim (Vāru° Thāru°) Lāsīyāhim Lauṇsiyāhim Damilihim Siṃhalihim Ārabihim Pulṇḍihim Pakkaṇihim Bahalihim Maruṇḍihim Sabarihim Pārasihim nāṇādesthim*. For v. 1. see Leumann, p. 60.

The 18 *deśibhāṣās*⁶⁸⁸ unfortunately are merely mentioned here

⁶⁸¹ *Kaṇṇā* (*Kaṇḍv-ā* ?) *Kaṇṇe* refers, it is true, to *kaṇva* as Leumann affirms in his glossary) *dayaḥ ṣoḍaśa parivrajakāḥ lokato' vaseyāḥ*.

⁶⁸² *Kaṇṇe* var. 1.

⁶⁸³ These Jains, possessed by the desire of changing everything, have not allowed even the name of the old Nārada to remain unaltered. Some MSS. have even Nārabhe.

⁶⁸⁴ var. *Masim°*, *Masam°*, *Masah°*, also °hāre. The Maṣṇāra name of a country in the *Ait. Br.* may perhaps be compared.

⁶⁸⁵ *saḍaṃgavi* is here too explained by : *saḍaṃgavidaḥ* and *satthitāṃtavisāraā* by : *Kāpiliyataṃtrapamḍitāḥ*.

*⁶⁸⁶ Also Ammaḍa, Ammaṭṭha,—This name must be derived from Amrata, short form of Āmrabhāṭa.—L.

⁶⁸⁷ Who once wandered *jeṭṭhāmūlamāsammi* along the Gaṅgā from Kaṇṇipillapura to Purimātāṃ nagaram. The name of the month is explained as follows : *jyeṣṭhā mūlam vā (!) nakṣatram paurnamāsyām yatra syāt sa jyeṣṭhāmūlo māsaḥ, jyaiṣṭhaḥ*.

⁶⁸⁸ See below pp. 399, 400 for the 18 different methods of writing.

(§ 109) and not enumerated by name. We might readily conjecture that the 18 foreign peoples, just mentioned, were here referred to, though the expression *deśī* is not in harmony with such an assumption. For the expression *desibhāsavisārae*, which we meet with here, we find a fuller form in *aṅga* 6 (cf. above, p. 313) *aṭṭhārasavihipagāradesibhāsavisārae*. Dr. Leumann has had the kindness to inform me that the commentary has at least the appearance of referring this to the 18 modifications of one *deśibhāṣā* and not to 18 special languages; *aṣṭādaśa vidhiprakārāḥ* [381] *pravṛttiprakārāḥ aṣṭādasabhir vā vidhibhir bhedaḥ pracāraḥ pravṛttir yasyāḥ sā, tathā tasyām deśibhāṣāyām sabhedena varṇavaltirūpāyām viśāradaḥ paṁḍitaḥ*. By the *annaṭṭhiya* (§§ 26,99) of the text, i. e. according to the scholia *anyayūthika* (see p. 299), which are opposed to the *niggantha pāvayaṇa* (§ 16) of the genuine doctrine of the Jains, we are to understand the *śākyādayaḥ*. By the *ceiyas* (§ 99) we must understand the *arhaccaityāni jinapratimāḥ*, and by the *ājiviyas* (§ 120) the adherents of *Gośāla*.⁶⁸⁹ The seven *pāvayaṇāninagās* (§ 122) i. e. representatives of the seven schisms, which, to use the expression of Abhayadeva, *Jināgamaṁ niñnūyate* (! *niñnūvate* ?) *apalapamti ca*, are enumerated one by one in the text. They are as follows:—*bahurayā, jivapadesiyā, avvattiyā sāmuccheiyā, dokiriyā, terāsiyā* (see p. 351), *abaddhiyā* (*avvaṭṭhiyā* var. 1.). Abhayadeva characterizes them according to their order as *Jamālimatāmusārīṇaḥ, Tiṣyaguptācāryamatāvisamvādināḥ, Āśādhācāryaśiṣyamātāmtapāhtināḥ, Puṣpa (ṣya) mitramatāmusārīṇaḥ*,⁶⁹⁰ *Gaṁgācāryamatānūvartināḥ, Rohagupta*⁶⁹¹ *matānūsārīṇaḥ, Goṣṭhā-māhila-matāvalambināḥ*; on this see p. 275. on *aṅga* 3, p. 355-6 on *pūrvas* 7-9 and below my remarks on *Āvaśy. Nijj. 8, Uttarajjh. 3,9*.

[382] There is a commentary by Abhayadeva, a *vārttikam* or *avacūri* by Pārśvacandra. In reference to the difference of the constituent parts which were united to form this *uvamgam*, the reader is referred to Leumann, p. 20, who has made some pertinent remarks upon the subject.

*689 On this point cf. the interesting statements in Nemicaṇḍra's *pravacanāsāroddhāra*, § 94, v. 739-41. Leumann tells me that these statements are found earlier, viz., in *Silāṅka* on *aṅga* 1, 2,2 and in Abhayadeva on *aṅga* 3,2. They are as follows:—*niggaṁtha-Sakka-tāvasa-geruya (gairukāḥ)-ājiva paṁcahā samaṇā || tammi ya niggaṁthā te je Jīṇasāsāṇabhavā muṇiṇo||Sakkā ya Sugayasissā, je jaḍḍhā te u tāvasa giyā | je dhāurattavattā tidaṁḍino geruyā te u || je Gośāla-mayam anusaṁamti bhāṇamti te u ājivā | samaṇattena bhuvane paṁca vi pattā pasiddhim ithe||* Here then all the five kinds of śramaṇas are represented as possessing equal authority; *geruā* is doubtless for *gairikās* "ruddles," according to their *dhāurattavattā*, cf. *Bhag.* 1,255.273, where, "metals and jewels," is an error. The first line of the above quotation (*niggaṁtha.....samaṇā*) is drawn from *Nisūrabhāṣya* XIII. 163a—L,

690 Or *Aśvamitra*; on *Puṣyamitra*, see pp. 348,356.

691 Or *Chalua*.

XIV. The second *upāṅgam*, *rāyapaseṇaiyyam*, which is always translated by *rājaprasñīyam*. This is perhaps to be explained as a complete misunderstanding of the Prakrit title by which this text is always cited in those passages from the hand of the redactor which refer to our text in the *aṅgas*, etc. For *paseṇaiyyam* cannot properly be *praśñīyam*, since the latter words rather pre-supposes a Prakrit form *pañhiyam*. *Paseṇaiyyam* seems, according to the conclusion at which I arrived *ad Bhag.* 1,382, to refer to the name of king Prasenajit who is well-known in the legends of the Jains.⁶⁹² There is, however, one important objection to this conclusion, — there is no mention of this king in our text, which mentions a king Paesi but no Pasaṇai. In as much as the authenticity of the form of the name *paseṇaiyyam* cannot be gainsaid,⁶⁹³ there remains but one possibility open : that the original title of the text has been preserved and either the name of Paesi has been substituted for that of Pasaṇai⁶⁹⁴ (see p. 384) in the text, or there has been substituted an entirely different text for the whole of the old one. [383] Though the latter conjecture savours of boldness, we are not without analogous examples as we have seen in the case of *aṅgas* 8-10. Our first means of explanation appeals much more to our sympathy, especially as we have a perfect parallel in a later legend. We possess two recensions of the *Samyaktva-kāumūdīkathā*, in the first of which the scene is laid at the time of “Śreṇika, son of Prasenajit”, in whose place Uditodaya, son of Padmodbhava appears in the second. This is, however, brought about in such fashion that Śreṇika is referred to in a two-fold introduction. The legend in question appears to be old and to antedate the two existing recensions of the *Samyaktva-kaumudīkathā*.

The Sanskrit translation of the title *Rāyapaseṇaiyyam* by *rājaprasñīyam* is very far from being in harmony with the contents of the work. The burden of the very smallest portion of its extent is in our text the *questions of a king*. The questions play here no greater role than in any other of the legends similar to this in which a king requests instruction. The irreconcilability of this Sanskrit title with the content of the work itself makes *cō ipso* for the conclusion that the title is nothing but a mere makeshift to conceal the original contents.

It is, therefore, of no little significance that a beautiful conjecture

⁶⁹² See e. g. *aṅga* 8, p. 320.

⁶⁹³ In *Nandī*, *Pākṣikas*, and *Āvi*. the name is *rāyapa (ppa) seṇiya* ; *Svi.* and *V.* have °*seṇaiya* ; the passages in the texts showing the hand of the redactor always have the form °*seṇaiyya*.

⁶⁹⁴ Leumann is of the opinion (*Aupap.* p. 2) that the name *Rāyapaseṇaiyya* arose by “connection with Rājā Prasenajit by a popular etymology”. It seems to me, however, that *Rāyapaseṇaiyya* is the *prius* and *rājaprasñīyam* the *posterius*.

elaborated into an investigation by Dr. Leumann has shewn that one of the Pali texts of the Buddhistic *Tipiṭaka* viz. the *Pāyāsi-suttam* (Dīghanikāya 1,22),—is especially closely connected [384] with that part of our *upāṅga* which treats of king Paesi. It is apparent, then, that we must assume either a common foundation for both or the use of a special Buddhistic work as a ground-work. That the original text of the *Rāyapaseṇaiyyam* might easily have suffered a transformation, is indicated by the irreconcilability of this title with the Sanskrit translation and with the contents. Thus the old name Prasenajit gave place to that of our text Paesi (Pāyāsi in Pali).

It is noteworthy that at the conclusion of the work there is an exclamation of reverence addressed to the Jinas, to the *suyadevayā* (*śruta*°) *bhagavaī*, to the *pannatti bhagavaī*, and to the *bhagavat arāhat Pāsa*. Joined to this exclamation are some very corrupt words, which are perhaps to be restored as follows,⁶⁹⁵ *Passasuyassa vāṇte*. It is at least certain that Pāsa, and not Mahāvīra, is glorified in this paragraph. Could this not be a residuum of the original text, which had a right to the title *rāya paseṇaiyya* and which perhaps treated of the relations of King Prasenajit and Pāsa? Pāsa, it should be noticed, appears as a teacher in *up.* 10, 11. The seer glorified in our present text is at least called *Pāsāvaccīyya*, i. e. scholar of Pāsa; and appears in a recital put in the mouth of Mahāvīra as the teacher of king Paesi. In the other legends, in which [385] any such *Pāsāvaccīyyas* occur, they are invariably characterized as converts to the teachers of Mahāvīra. See above p. 300. Malayagiri attempts to find this reference to the *Pāsāvaccīyyas* a special proof of the connection of *upāṅga* 2 with *aṅga* 2, which, he maintains, treats of the views of the foreign *pāṣaṇḍas*.

We were for some time left in doubt whether the references in the *aṅgas* to the *Rāyapaseṇaiyyam* were in reality all contained in the *Rāyapaseṇaiyyam* (cf. Jacobi *Kalpas*, p. 107); but Leumann has shown that this doubt is without foundation. See above, p. 299. But, granted the actual occurrence of all these citations, this fact only makes for the conclusion, that, at the period of these remarks by the redactor, the substitution, which I assume, was already a *fait accompli*. Nor does this exclude the assumption that our text originally possessed a content that was really in harmony with its title.

⁶⁹⁵ (...*namo bhagavao*) *arahao*, *Pāsassa. passe supasse, passavāṇi namo* e A, *arahanto passe supasse passavāṇte namo* E, *arahanto passe supassa vāṇte namo* E, *arahanto passe suyassa vāṇte namo* G.

The subject of the largest portion (almost two-thirds) of the existing text, which after the *pañcanamukkārā* begins with the customary legendary introduction *teṇaṃ kāleṇaṃ*, is as follows :—The god Sūriyābha, who has his throne in the Sohammakappa, makes a pilgrimage with a numerous retinue to Amalakappā, the city of king Sea (Śveta) in order to offer his reverence to Mahāvīra (who is abiding in that city), especially by means of music, dancing and singing.⁶⁹⁶ Furthermore, the information is treated of which, in long spun-out details, is imparted in reference to Sūriyābha, his synonymous *vimāna* and all his splendour, by Mahāvīra to Goyama (Iṃdabhūti) who questions him on these points. [386] The discussion of the subject consists in reality of a mere heaping together of compounds ; and the sentences often extend over several pages. It is idle to talk of this as style, since it exceeds even the widely extended license which is customary in these sacred texts. We recall Bāṇa's *Kādambarī* in this connection, though the latter possess a wealth of poetic thoughts and images which elevates it above this dreary and insipid hodge-podge. We have, however, the right to propound the question whether there may not be a genetic connection between works like the *Kādambarī* and this species of Jain literature, since at least the confused style of the Indian novel may have been influenced by Jain legends of this sort.⁶⁹⁷

On page 205 of the edition⁶⁹⁸ (of the text of 296 pages printed in India), Mahāvīra finally comes to the point and informs us how Sūriyābha reached this glory of his, and of his first birth as king Paesi (Pradeśī) in Seyaviyā. The latter sent his charioteer Citta [387] with presents to his vassal Jiyasattu at Sāvattthī in the land of Kuṇḍālā.⁶⁹⁹ At that place Citta heard the sermon of the “*Pāsāvaccijje Keṣī nāmaṃ kumāre*,”⁷⁰⁰ and was so much edified thereby that after his return home

⁶⁹⁶ 32 *naṭṭavihi*, 4 *vāitta*, 4 *geya*, again 4 *naṭṭavihi* and 4 *naṭṭābhinaya* are given here in great detail. The commentator, Malayagiri, however, offers scarcely any explanation on this point.

⁶⁹⁷ It is certain that Indian fables are greatly under the influence of the simple *jātaka* tales of the Buddhists. Likewise, the modern stories as *Sinhāsanadvātriṅśikā* etc. are without doubt influenced by the *kathānakas* which were gradually cultivated more and more by the Jains. It is noteworthy, that in Bāṇa as in the *Daśakumāra*, the style of which is much better than that of Bāṇa, the same persons are frequently born thrice. This three-fold birth is the special delight of the Jain legends. Our text, in this very place, affords an example of this fact. Cf. the verse quoted, *Ind. Stud.* 16. page 156 from the *Anuvogadv.* in reference to the *abbhuraśa*.

⁶⁹⁸ This quarto edition contains the commentary of Malayagiri and a gloss in *Bhāṣa*. The text gives the year *Samvat* 1732 (!) the gloss 2732 (!). Itāvāgrāmā is mentioned in the latter as being the scene of the events narrated.

⁶⁹⁹ Reference to this point is found in *upāṅga* 8.

⁷⁰⁰ See *Uttarajjh.* Chap. 23. See the statements of Dharmaghoṣa in his *Kupakṣaka-*

he induced his master Paesi to let him drive him to the sanctuary, where Keśī happened to be preaching at that very time. Citta brought about that conversation between Paesi and Keśī to which the translation of the name *Rāyapaseṇaiyyam* by *Rājaprasāṇīyam* refers. This conversation, which starts with the question in reference to the relation of the *jīva* to the *śarīra*, reaches in the printed text from page 242 to page 279 and contains, therefore, about an eighth part of the whole. In reality, however, there is more than an eighth, since the beginning contains a good deal of commentary.

With the relation of the former birth of Sūriyābha as Paesi, Mahāvīra connects his prophecy in reference to his future birth as Daḍhapaṇṇa. This prophecy is in all essentials completely identical (though somewhat more detailed) with that form of the history of this person, which we met with in *up.* 1 and in *up.* 8 (cf. also *Bhag.* 11,11)⁷⁰¹. We have then discovered here a fact that is likely to cast a somewhat suspicious light upon the history of the text of *up.* 2. The enumeration of the 72 *kalās* (p. 290) varies here but inconsiderably ; and Malayagiri does not help us by giving any explanation of the names. The enumeration of the foreign peoples is in essential agreement with *Bhag.* 9,33 (above p. 302), with the single exception [388] that here, too, the *Caṇḍīyā* (*Vau*°, *Paü*°) and the *Joṇiya* have been included in the list. There are, however, some few variations in the names and in the order of their succession. See Leumann, *Aup.* p. 60. On page 52 *cīnapitṭharāsi* is adduced among the redstuffs, and likewise in *up.* 3 ; cf. *cīnapaṭṭa* in *aṅga* 10, p. 333.

The commentary of Malayagiri dates, according to Aufrecht, *Catalogus*, p. 396b, from the year (Vīra ?) 1772 ; according to Leumann this is merely the date of the *ṭabā* based upon Malayagiri.

XV. The third *upāṅgam*, *jīvābhigamasūtram*, = instruction, in dialogue form, of Goyama (Imḍabhūti) in reference to the different forms and groups of animated nature. This instruction is not placed in the mouth of Mahāvīra, but in that of a person who is not designated. The introduction is composed without any legendary ballast, and reads as

uṣikādīya (1,7), in my treatise on this subject page 22, *Journal of the Berlin Acad. of Sciences* 1882, p. 812, in reference to modern descendants of this Keśikumāra, who themselves claim this title until the end of the XVI century.

⁷⁰¹ s. Leumann, *Aup.* p. 75 fg.

follows :—*Iha*⁷⁰² *khalu Jīṇamayam Jīṇāṇumayam Jīṇāṇulomam Jīṇapp-aṇītam Jīṇaparūviyam Jīṇakkhāyam Jīṇāṇucinnam Jīṇapannattam Jīṇa-desiyam Jīṇapasattham aṇuvītiyam (?) tam saddahamāṇā tam pattiya-māṇā tam roemāṇā therā bhagavarito Jivājivābhigamam nāma 'jjhaya-nam pannavaimsu. In up. 10 these therā bhgavarito are adduced by Mahāvīra himself - cf. chedasūtra 4. The introduction then proceeds to give, in response to the question *se kiṃ tam jivābhigame ?* a species of division of the entire work. No smaller sections, except some,⁷⁰³ are marked off in the text. [389] The various views of those⁷⁰⁴ are here enumerated⁷⁰⁵ who characterize the *jīva* either as *duviha* (to 17a of the MS.—ms. or fol. 1081—consisting of 212 leaves) or as follows,—as *tiviha* (to 34a), as *caūvviha* (to 184a ; this is the chief part, almost $\frac{3}{4}$ of the whole,⁷⁰⁶ as *pañcaviha* (to 186a), as *chavviha* (to 193a), *sattaviha* (to 193b), *aṭṭha*^o (to 195a), *ṇava*^o (to 195b), and *dasaviha* (to 197b). Then the same *paḍivatti*, follow in the same order, but according to another guiding principle. Within this system there are innumerable groups, species and sub-species of each of the *jīvas* according to their properties and relations. The contents is remarkably dry and offers but little of genuine interest. Very frequent are the references to the fourth *upāṅga*, which is quite similar to it in contents and form. At present it is impossible to decide which text has the better claim to priority. Many single verses and sometimes whole series of *gāthās*, or *kārikā*-like verses are inserted.*

The section which treats of the *dīvas* (and *samuddas*) (i.e. 89b to 167a) appears at the date of *aṅga* 3 and of the *Nandi*⁷⁰⁷ to have had a separate existence under the name *dīvāsāgarapannatti* which is mentioned twice in *aṅga* 3. See p. 268. This section unfortunately contains almost nothing of real geographical value [390] and nothing but fantastic conceptions concerning mythology. This holds good in reference to the astronomical (if we may use the expression) remarks concerning the different numbers (!) of the suns, moons and stars in each of the *dvīpas*, which appear to harmonize completely with the statements of the fifth (or seventh) *upāṅga*. See *Ind. Stud.* 10, 283. The 28 *nakṣatras*

702 This is preceded by a reverential exclamation *namo Usabhadīyānam cauvvisāe titthagārānam*, an unusual form, which appears to belong to the text itself and not to emanate from the copyists.

703 In the MS. chiefly used by me the conclusion of an *uddesa* is given three times

704 *ege evam āhaṃsu.*

705 In nine groups (*paḍivatti, Vidhiprapā*), introduced in a way that is quite identical in each separate case.

706 We find treated here the division into *neraiya* to 52b, *tirikkhajoniya* to 59b, *maṇussa* to 74b, *deva* to 183a, and then a few further remarks to 184a.

707 In the *Vidhiprapā* there is a *saṃgrahaṇi* on it cited among the *painnayās*.

consequently begin with Abhijit and not with Kṛttikā. There are no legends whatsoever. Dr. Leumann sends me the following detailed statement of the contents of this *upāṅgaṃ* :—

I. Introduction ; II. Two-fold division of creatures : 1-10 *thāvarā*, 1-5. *puḍhavikkāiyā egimḍiyā*, 6-7. *āukkāiyā eg.*, 8-10. *vaṇassaikkāiyā eg.*, 11-26 *tasā*, 11. *teukkāiyā eg.*, 12. *vāukkāiyā eg.*, 13. *beimḍiyā*, 14. *teimḍiyā*, 15. *caūrimḍiyā*, 16-26. *paṃcimḍiyā*, 16. *neraiyā*, 17-20. *sammucchima tirikkhajoṇiyā*, 21-24. *gabbhavakkaṃtiyatir*, 25. *maṇussā*, 26. *devā*, 27. *tasā* and *thāvarā* (in general) ; III. Three-fold division of creatures : 1-6. *itthiyā*, 7-12. *purisā*, 13-18. *napuṃsagā*, 19-26. the three together and among themselves ; IV. Four-fold division of creatures. A geographical text is inserted called the *dīvasamuddā*. 1. *paḍhamo neraiya-uddeso*, 2. *bitiyaneraiya uddesao*, 3. *tāio nārāya-uddesao*, 4. *tirikkhajoṇiya-paḍh. udd.* 5. *tirikkh. udd. bō.*, 6. *maṇussā*, 7. 31-33. *devā*. 8-28. *dīvasamuddā*. 8-16 the Jambudīva, the inmost part of the world, of circular form. 8. Description of the above, in general the same as that of Sūriyābhavimāṇa in *Rājapr.* 9. the gate of the east, *Vijaya dāra*. 10. The residence *rāyahāṇī* of the god Vijaya who rules there. 11. [391] The walk of reverence of Vijaya within his *vimāṇa*, 12. The duration of the existence of Vijaya, 13. The gates of the three remaining regions of the world : *Vejayamta dāra*, *Jayamta dāra* and *Aparāiya dāra*, and the distance of the *dāras* from each other. 14. Jambuddīva as bounded by the Lavaṇa sea which surrounds it on all sides like a ring, 15. Explanation of the name Jambuddīva, 16. Number of the constellations moving over Jamb., 17. The Lavaṇa sea, the first ocean surrounding Jambuddīva like a ring ; the description here corresponds to that of Jamb. and from this point on is in the same strain, 18. The Canda-dīva and Sūradīva of the different parts of the earth and oceans 19. Appendix to 17 : Ebb and flow etc., 20. The second part of the globe, Dhāyaisaṇḍa, that in circular form is contiguous to the Lavaṇa sea ; then the second ocean Kāloda which, in the form of a ring, is adjacent to Dhāy. ; and finally the third part of the globe. Pukkharavara, contiguous to Kāloda, 21. The Samāya or Maṇussa *Khetta*, consisting of the above mentioned two first parts of the globe and the first two oceans together with the inner half of the ring of the third part of the globe, which is separated from the outer half by the circular mountain, Maṇussuttara. 22. The following parts of the globe and oceans which are connected with one another as rings : Pukkharoda, Vāruṇavara dīva, Vāruṇoda, Khīravara dīva, Khīroda, Ghatavara dīva, Ghatoda, Khodavara dīva, Khododa. 23. The following world-ring, Nandīsaravara dīva, 24. The following oceans and world-rings ; Nandī-

saroda, Aruṇa dīva, etc., to Hāravarobhāsoda. 25. The remaining oceans and world-rings up to Sayambhūramaṇa dīva and Sayambhuraṇoda. 26. The names of all these parts of the globe and oceans. 27. The [392] waters and aquatic animals of the different oceans. 28. In reference to the *dīvasamuddā* in general (*nāmadhejja*, *uddhārasamaya*, *pariṇāma* and *uvavāya*). 29. 30. A brief insertion, perhaps an appendix to the *dīvasamuddā*. 29. About *pariṇāma*. 30. Concerning the ability of gods to catch an object that has been thrown, to split a hair (? *gaḍhiittae*), to lengthen or to shorten one. 31-33. *devā* continuation ; (see 7), 31. *joisa-uddesao*. 32. *paḍhamo Vemāṇiya-udd.* 33. *bīo Vemāṇiya-udd.*⁷⁰⁸ 34. Final collective statements (duration of existence, etc.) in reference to the four divisions of creatures. V.-X. Five-fold to the ten-fold division of creatures. XI. Introduction to the following analogous divisions of all creatures. XII.-XX. Two-fold to ten-fold division of all creatures.

XVI. The fourth *upāṅgaṃ*, *pannavāṇa* (*prajñāpanā*) *bhagavaī*, likewise treats of the different forms, conditions of life, etc., of the *jīva*.⁷⁰⁹ It is divided into 36 *payas*, (*padas*), of which several (15,17,23,38) consist of from two to six *uddeśakas*. According to the fourth of the nine verses of the introduction, it is the work of Ayya Sāma (Ārya Śyāma, also Śyāmārya), who at the same time is called the "twenty-third *dhīrapurisa*" i. e. after Vīra (after Sudharmasvāmin, according to Malayagiri. [393] This statement causes no little difficulty. According to Klatt, *I, l.* p. 247^b and 251^b (9,23) and in the *Journal of the German Oriental Society* 33,479 the modern Jain lists of teachers place, with some few difference,⁷¹⁰ Śyāma in the fourth century after Vīra ; but the "twenty-third successor of Vīra is placed by one list immediately before Devardhigaṇi, 980 after Vīra., and is regarded by the other as contemporaneous with the destruction of Valabhī (*Valabhībhaṅga*), 845 after Vīra. The *Gurvāvalī* of the Tapāgaccha expressly enumerates Śyāmārya as a contemporary of the ninth patriarch ; and in both of the old *Therāvalis* of the *Nandī* (or *Āvaśyaka*) and of Merutunga he is enumerated as the

⁷⁰⁸ This concluding title, says Leumann, is incorrectly placed after Chapter 34 instead of after 33 in the Berlin MSS and in those of Prof. Monier Williams.

⁷⁰⁹ Cf. in the Schol. on the *Nandī* : *jivādīnām padārthānām prajñāpanām yatra sā prajñāpanā, saī 'va vṛhattarā mahāprajñāpanā*. Two texts of this name are referred to there, a simple *pann* and a *mahāpann*. The latter is adduced as the sixth *upāṅgaṃ* by Kashinath Kunte (p. 227) p. 5 and p. 7, who calls it, however, "obsolete and extinct". He does not mention the *candapannatti*.

⁷¹⁰ The *Paṭṭ* (*āvalī* of *Kharataragaccha*) dates his birth 376 (or 386) after Vīra ; in the same year the *Gurv* (*āvalī* of *Tapāgaccha*) assumes his death to have occurred. He was also called *Kālaka* and was one of the three celebrated teachers of this name. See Jacobi, *Journ. Germ. Orient. Soc.* 34,251 ff.

13th (not the 23rd) successor of Vīra. This apparent contradiction is done away with by the explanation of Bhāu Dāji, referred to p. 217ⁿ, according to which the eleven gaṇadharas of Vīra are regarded as being included in the designation of Śyāma as "23rd" successor. This method of including the gaṇadharas has however not been traced elsewhere.

The text begins with the *paṃcanamukkāra*, followed by the following glorification ; *eso paṃcanamukkāro savvapāvapaṇāsaṇo|maṅgalāṇaṃ ca savvesiṃ paḍhamam hoi maṅgalaṃ||*. This glorification is to be ascribed to the last *daśapūrvin*, *śrī Vajra* (584 Vira) according to modern tradition. See *Kup.* 811 (21) on this point also the same passage in reference to the question whether in the last *pada* we must read *hoi* or *havai*,⁷¹¹ about which there is fierce contention among the Jain theologians.

[394] Then follows⁷¹² in nine verses the real introduction of which Jacobi (*Journ. Germ. Orient. Soc.* 34,231) says "it is manifestly the production of Devarddhigaṇin, the redactor of the *Siddhānta*." The first verse praises Mahāvīra ; the second characterizes the *pannavāṇā savva-bhāvāṇaṃ* as *uvadaṃsiyā* by him (*bhagavayā*) ; the third and fourth pay reverence to that saint, Ajja Sāma, the "23rd *dhīrapurisa*," whose wisdom, perfected by listening to the *pūrvas*, gave to his scholars this *śruta*-jewel after he had brought it up from the *śruta*-sea : *vāyagavaravaṇisāo tevī-satimeṇa dhīrapuriseṇa|duddharadhareṇa*⁷¹³ *muṇiṇā puvva-suyasamiddhabuddhi*⁷¹⁴*||3|| suyasāyārā viṇeūṇa jeṇa suyarayaṇaṃ uttamaṃ dinnam sīsaga-nassa, bhagavato tassa namo Ajja Sāmassa||4||*.

In verse 5 an "I" promises to describe (or proclaim) the work in the same way as the '*bhagavanti*' has described it ; and the work is characterised as "dripping with *dr̥ṣṭivāda*" : *ajjhayaṇam iṇam cittam suyarayaṇam diṭṭhivāyaṇisamdam*⁷¹⁵*|jaha vanniyam bhagavayā aham avi taha vaṇṇaissāmi.||5||* It is, of course, clear⁷¹⁶ that some one else than the previous speaker is to be understood by this "I" ; and Jacobi's [395]

711 Thus in the beginning of the *Kalpasūtra*, see Jacobi, p. 33, and *Āvaśy.* 9,132.

712 The preceding is omitted by Malayagiri, whose commentary begins here.

713 Jacobi translates "undergoing a severe test". I propose "holding that (in his head) which is difficult of retention" ; cf. the use of *dhārae* p. 304n (*Bhag.* 2,245n).

714 *buddhiṇam* var. 1., construed by Jacobi with *vāyagavara*, as if we had *°varāṇam*.

715 *dvādaśasyā 'm̐gasya nisyamdam iva*. The expression *diṭṭhivāyaṇisamdam* recurs in the words "aggeṇiya-puvvanissanda" at the end of the *siddhapāhuḍa*. See above, page 355.

716 Malayagiri refers "*bhagavayā*" to Mahāvīra and not to Ajja Sāma as the one who in the text carries on the dialogue with Goyama. According to his conception then the work of Ajja Sāma begins with this verse ; and this is probably correct.

conjecture, mentioned above, must be referred and indeed limited to v. 1-4 alone in so far as these verses appear as a prelude of secondary origin. In the four verses which then follow are contained titles of the 36 sections :—

1. *Pannavaṇā*, 2. *ṭhāṇāim*, 3. *bahuvattavvaṇ*, 4. *ṭhiī*, 5. *viśeṣā ya/*
6. *vukkamī*, 7. *ussāso*, 8. *sannā*,⁷¹⁷ 9. *joṇī ya*, 10. *carimāim*||6||, 11. *bhāsā*,
12. *sarīra*, 13. *pariṇāma*, 14. *kasāe*, 15. *'m̐diya*, 16. (‘- is wanting) *ppaoge ya/*
17. *lesā*, 18. *kāyaṭṭhiī ya*, 19. *sammatte*|(samyaktva), 20. *aṃtakiriyā ya*||7||,
21. *ugāhaṇāsaṃṭhāṇe*,⁷¹⁸ 22. *kiriyā*, 23. *kamme i yāvare* (?), 24. *kamassa*
baṃdhae, 25. *vedassa baṃdhae*, 26. *kamassa vedae*,⁷¹⁹ 27. *veyaveyae*||8||,⁷²⁰
28. *āhāre*, 29. *uvaoge*, 30. *pāsaṇayā* (*darśanatā*), 31. *sannī*⁷²¹ (*saṃjnin*),
32. *saṃjame ceva*/33. *ohī* (*avadhī*), 34. *paviyāraṇā*⁷²² (read *°raṇā ya*), 35.
veyaṇā (*vedanā*), 36. *tatto samugghāe*||9||.

Then comes the text *κατ' ε'ξοχη'ν* which begins with the questions *se kim taṃ ajivapannavaṇā* ? It consists furthermore of the questions of Go-
(yama) and the answers probably of Mahāvīra, though it is uncertain whether Mahāvīra be meant or not, since there is absolutely no addition of a legendary colouring. These questions and answers are couched in the style and manner of the dialogues in the *Bhagavati*, and though there is here a connecting thread (which we do not find in the *Bhagavati*), every *padam* forming a connected whole, nevertheless, there is, as a rule, [396] no genetic succession of the *padas*, despite the fact that Malayagiri makes every effort at the beginning of every *padam* to restore⁷²³ the connection with what has gone before. Many *gāhās* are found in the middle of the text, and many of the *padas* begin with a short statement of contents clothed in *gāthā* form—*dāragāthā* (*dvāragāthā*). There are no legends whatsoever. The “contents” is as dreary as that (cf. above p. 389) of the third *uvaṅga* which is closely connected with it, is dogmatic, speculative or even fantastic, and contains but little of general interest. There is much, however, that is important in the first book in the section on Man, who is divided into two classes : *milikkha* and *āriya*. First there is an enumeration of 53 Mleccha peoples, secondly an enumeration of 25½(!) Aryan peoples with their

⁷¹⁷ *āhārāi dasasaṇṇāpayam*, *Vidhiprapā* (V).

⁷¹⁸ *agāhaṇāpayam* V.

⁷¹⁹ 25 and 26 are transposed in BCV ; in V we read *kammaveyagapayam* 25, *veyaga-baṃdhagapayam* 26; *veyagapayam* 27.

⁷²⁰ The metre is faulty in v. 8.

⁷²¹ *maṇovinnāsaṇṇā payam* 31 V.

⁷²² *paviyāraṇāpayam* 34 V.

⁷²³ Malayagiri claims in the beginning of his discussion of the subject that there is a special connection between this *upāṅga* and *aṅga* 4.

chief cities, and lastly an enumeration of 18 manners of writing. All this possesses some chronological value which would be more apparent if the names had not been so corruptly handed down to us. Malaygiri offers us no assistance in the case of the first and third enumeration.

In the list of the *Milikkhas* (*Milakkhas*) the names are frequently the same as those cited, p. 332 from *aṅga* 10, and are arranged in the same order of succession. Various differences of detail are, however, not wanting, and in fact the names here make a less favourable impression upon us and seem to be of less antiquity⁷²⁴. They are :⁷²⁵ *Saga* [397] *Javana Cilāya Savara Pappara* (*Babbara* BC) *Kāya* (only *ya* BC) *Murumdo* 'dda (*ḍḍha* C) *Bhaḍaga-Niṇṇaga Pakkaṇiyā Kulakkhā Koṇḍa*⁷²⁶ (*Goṇḍa* C) *Sihara* (*Sihala*) *Pārasa Godhova* (*Gādhodam̐ba* B, *Gadhāi* C) *Damila Vilala* (*Villaṇa* B) (*Cillala* C) *Pulimda Hārosā Doriva* (*Tova* B, *Doca* C) *Boṭṭhakāṇa* (*Vokkāṇa* BC) *Garṇḍahāravā* (*hārāga* B) *Pahāḷiliya* (*Bahayaliya* B, *Pahaliya* C) *Ayyala Rāma Pāsa Paūsā Nalayā* (*Navayā* C) *ya Barṇdhuyā ya Suyali koṇkaṇa gā Meya* (*Mopaniya* B) *Palhava Mālava Maggarī* (*ra* BC) *Abhāsiyā Nakvavīṇā* (*Kaṇavīra* B) *Lhasiya* (*Lhā*^o B) *Khagga* (*Kkhasa* B) *Ghāsiya* (*Khāsiya* B) *Noha* (*Nedū* B, *Naddu* C) *Ramaḍha*⁷²⁷ (*ṭha* B) *Dom̐bilaga* (*Do*^o C) *Laūsa* (*osa* C) *Paosa Kvokvatā* (! *Kakkveyā* B, *Kakveya* C) *Arakāga* (*Aravāga* BC) *Hūṇa Romagā Bharu Maruya Visalāpavāsī* (*Cilāyavisavāsī ya* B, *Vilāyavisayavāsī yā* C) *evamādi, se 'ttam̐ Milakkhā*.

The *āriyas* are divided into nine groups, the first of which is formed by the *Khettāriya*, and is in *gāthā* form. It is as follows :—

*Rāyagiha Magaha, Campā Aṅgā taha, Tāmalitti Varṅgā ya/Kām-
caṇapūram̐ Kalim̐gā, Bāṇārasi (!) ceva Kāsī ya //*

⁷²⁴ The *Čiṇa* have disappeared or their name is concealed under that of another people. The name of the *Arava* has received another form—*Aravāyā*—and its position has been changed.

⁷²⁵ Malaygiri has merely : *śakadeśanivāsinaḥ Śakāḥ, Yavandeśanivāsino Yavanāḥ evaṃ sarvatra, navaram amī nānādeśa lokato vijñeyāḥ*. The names are found partly in the thematic form and partly in the Nom. Plur.—In Nemicaṇḍra's *pravacanasaṃroddhāra* § 274 v. 1594-7 we find 38 names, among which only 20 agree with those given here ; and there are important variations. His enumeration decked out in a modern dress is as follows :—*Saga Javana Savara Vavvara Kāya* (*Kāyāḥ*) *Marum̐do* 'dda (*Murum̐dāḥ Udrāḥ*) *Goḍa Pakkaṇayā* | *Aravāgā* (*Aukhāga* C, *Aksāgāḥ* !) *Hūṇa Romaya Pārasa Khasa Khāsiyā ceva* || 94 || *Dum̐vilāya Laūsa* (*Lakuśāḥ*) *Bhokkasa Bhillim̐dha* (*Bhillā Am̐dhvāḥ*) *Pulimda Kum̐ca Bhamararuyā* (! *Bhrāmararucāḥ*) | *Kovāya* (*Korpakāḥ*) *Čiṇa Čam̐cuya* (*Čināḥ Čam̐cukāḥ*) *Mālava Damilā* (*Draviḍāḥ*) *Kulagghā* (*Kulārghāḥ* !) *ya* || 95 || *Kokaya Kirāya Hayamuha Kharamuha Gaya-Turaya-Mim̐dhayamuhā* (*Mim̐dhakamukhāḥ*) *ya* | *Hayakannā Gayakannā anne vi anāriyā bahave* | 96 ||. It is of interest that the name *Aravāga* has been completely misunderstood.

⁷²⁶ B. omits.

⁷²⁷ An acceptable reading instead of *Marahaṭṭha* (!) in *aṅga* 10.

[398] *Sāya Kosalā, Gayapuram ca Kuru, Soriyam Kusatthā* (°dda B, tta) ya⁷²⁸ | *Kaṁpillam Paṁcālā, Ahicchattā, Jamgalā ceva* ||

Bāravaḥ Soratthā, Mihila Videhā ya, Vattha (ccha B) Kosambī | *Nandipuram Saṁdibbhā* (Ilā BC),⁷²⁹ *Bhaddilapuram eva Malayā ya* ||

*Valrāḍa*⁷³⁰ *Vattha (ccha B), Varanā Atthā (cchā BC), taha Mattiyāvaḥ* | *Dasannā/Sotti yamaḥ* (°vaḥ C) ya *Cedi, Viibhayam (Viya°) Simdhu-sovira* ||

Mahurā ya Sūrasenā, Pāvā Gambhī (! *Bhaṁgī BC*) ya *Māsapuri Vaddhā* (*Vatthā BC*) | *Sāvattthī ya Kuṇālā, Koḍivarisam va* (°sim ca B) *Lāṭā* (°dha C) ya ||

Seyavīyā vi ya nayarī Keai-addham ca āriyam bhaṇiyam/pacc' (*pacch' C, lec B, etth' D—atra*) *uppatti jinānam cakkīnam Rāma-Kaṇhānam* ||

These names represent a later stage than the 16 names in *āṅga* 5 (p. 304), but date back in all probability to a remote period. Pāṭaliputra is omitted here but found in *āṅga* 11 (p. 337, 338). [399] It appears to be an old reminiscence (or perhaps is a trace of the influence of the *Rāmāyaṇa*) that one half of Kekaya is called Āryan. The other half is concealed under the name of the Kakveya (C, where *āṅga* 10 has Kekaya), cited among the *Milakkhas*. Bāṇarasī is modern—cf. *Bhag.* 2, 222—but is found in this form also in *āṅga* 5.

The second group of the *āriyas*, the *jāti-āriyā*, deserves also to be noted here : *se kim tam jātiāriyā ? chavvihā pannattā, tam, Ambatthā ya*

⁷²⁸ *Kuśārtheṣu Sauriyam*, Malayagiri. In Nemicandra who, l. 1, § 275 v. 1598-1603 quotes the above verses directly, the name is *Kusatthā*, or *Kusajjā*; in the scholiast *Saurikanagaram Kuśārtho deśaḥ*.

⁷²⁹ *Samdibhyo Samdilyo vā deśaḥ*, Nem. Schol.

⁷³⁰ *Vatṣesu Vairāṭapuram* (the *Vatṣa* were already mentioned once in [conjunction with *Kosambī*], *Varaṇesu Acchāpurī, Cediṣu Saktikāvati; Viṭabhayam Simdhu-ṣu Sauvireṣu* (! by this separation of the *Sauvira* from the *Sindhu* the next three cities are displaced) *Mathurā* (!), *Suraseneṣu Pāvā* (!), *Bhaṁgeṣu Māsapuri Vatthā* (! by means of this compound the copyist hopes to extricate himself from his dilemma) *Kuṇāleṣu Śrāvastī, Lāṭaṣu Koṭivarsam, Svetāmbikā* (!) *nagarī Kekayaṇapadasya 'rdham, etāvad ardhāṣadvinsatījanapadāt makam kṣetram āryam bhaṇitam*, Malayagiri.—Instead of the second *Vaccha* Nemicandra has the correct reading *Maccha*; instead of *Varanā* he reads *Varuṇa* and explains as follows :—*Varuṇo nagaram Acchā deśaḥ, anye tu Varuṇe, Acchāpurī 'ty āhuḥ*; for No. 23 he has *Māsapuri Vatthī* (*Vaddhā C*), and in the schol. : *vartto deśaḥ anye tu..... Vaddhā itī at the end ; jatt'h' uppatti*.

Kalindā Videhā Vedamāyā (°gāyā BC). *Hariyā Vamcuṇā* (Camē° C *ceva cha eyā ibbhā jātito, se jātiāriyā*. What is the meaning of the last three names ?

The sixth group of the *āriyās* is formed by the *bhāsāriyā*. We find here again the enumeration of the 18 manners of writing, which we met with (p. 280) in *āṅga* 4, is, where, however, the form in which they were cited is not so correct as here. The names in this very interesting passage are as follows (together with the variants from ABC)—*se kiṃ taṃ bhāsāriyā ? je naṃ addha-Magahāe bhāsāe bhāseriṃti, jātha ya naṃ baṃbhī livi* ("the sacred writing") *pavattai ; baṃbhīe naṃ livi aṭṭhārasavihalikkhavihāne*⁷³¹ *paṇṇatte, tāṃ, baṃbhī, Javanāliyā Dāsāpuriyā*⁷³² *Kharoṭṭhī Pukkharasāriyā*⁷³³ *Bhogavaiyā Pahārāiyā* (Paha° B Eha° C) *ya aṃtarakariyā (aṃtakkar° B) akkharapuṭṭhiyā*⁷³⁴ *veṇaiyā*⁷³⁵ *niṇhaiyā aṃkalivī*⁷³⁶ *gaṇitalivī*⁷³⁷ *gamdhavvalivī*⁷³⁸ *ayāsaliyā*⁷³⁹ *māhesari*⁷⁴⁰ *Dāmili*⁷⁴¹ *Polimḍā*⁷⁴² *se taṃ bhāsāriyā*. Malayagiri has on this merely 3 [400] *brāhmī-Yavanānī* (!)'ty *ādayo lipibhedās tu saṃpradāyād avaseyāḥ*. It is evident that here too we have to deal with an ancient enumeration, since we find five of these names among the 65 names of writing mentioned in *Lalitavistara*, Chap. 10, p. 143 fg. (ed. Rajendra Lal Mitra, see also Foucaux, *Transl.* p. 123) These names are as follows, *brāhmī* (at the head in the *Lalavist.*), *Kharoṭṭi*,⁷⁴³ *Puskarasāri*,⁷⁴⁴ *Drāvīḍalipi*, *gamdhavvalipi*, and a few other names as *gaṇanāvartālipi*, *antarikṣadevalipi*, *madhyākṣaravistāralipi* are not far removed from the

731 °vihe leha (A, kha BC) vi°4.

732 dasāuriyā (uri BC) 4.

733 kharoṭṭhiyā / kharasāhiyā 4.

734 in 4 in another order, *pahārāiyā* (rāi° BC) *uvvattariyā akkharapuṭṭhiyā bhogavattā* (°vayatā BC).

735 veṇaiyā BC in 4.

736 aṃkalavī A in 4,

737 4 is omitted.

738 4 then adds *bhūyalivī*.

739 ādamsalivī 4.

740 mehasaralivī A, māhesarilivī BC in 4.

741 dāmilivī livi A, dāsīlilivī B, dāmīlilivī C in 4.

742 volimḍa A, liṇḍimlivi B, lidimlivi C in 4.

743 Is *Kharoṭṭha* who, according to Wassiljew, is called by the Chinese Buddhists the first astronomer, honoured here under this name ? Schiefner long ago referred to the *Kharoṭṭhi lipi* of the *Lalitavistara* in this connection. Wassiljew attempts to find in *Kharoṭṭi* the name of a Xarustr mentioned in an Armenian chronicles who together with Zoroaster is said to have invented astronomy in Chaldaea. See *Ind. Streifen* 3, 8, 9 or another conjecture on this subject.

744 The grammarian Puskarasādi may be recalled in this connection.

names enumerated here. The antiquity of these names becomes at once apparent if we compare them with similar enumerations of kinds of writing which comprise quite different names (though they hold fast to the number 18). In the *Kalpāntarvācyāni* we find (on *Kalpas.* § 209) the following peculiar verse in reference to acquiring a knowledge of writing through the help of Jina :—

Lehaṃ lihivihāṇaṃ jīṇena bambhī dāhiṇakareṇaṃ/gaṇiaṃ saṃkhāṇaṃ suṇḍarī vāmeṇa uvaiṭṭhaṃ||, then an enumeration of the 72 *kalās*, which is followed by the following statements in reference to writing, the first of the 72 ; *lekhaṇaṃ lipayaḥ* 18, *tad yathā : haṃsalipi bhūtalipi yakṣa° rākṣasa° Uḍḍī Yāvaṇī Turaskī Karī (?) Drāviḍī Saimdhavī Mālavī nāḍī nāgarī Lāṭe Pārasī animittalipi* (*icchāsamketādirūpā* gloss) *Cāpakki Mauladevi*. A second and more modern enumeration *ibid.* reads :— [401] *deśādiviśeṣād anyathā vā* 18 : *Lāḍī Coḍī Dāhalī Kānhaḍī Gūjarī Sorāṭhī Marahaṭhī Kaumkāṇī Khurasāṇī (!) Sasī (?) Siṃhalī Hāḍī Kīrī Hammīrī (!) Paratīrī Māgadhi Mālavī Mahāyodhī* In this enumeration the introduction is of especial interest, since it calls the *addha-Magahā bhāṣā*, the language of the *bambhī livi*. —See p. 221.—No weight is to be laid upon the statement, which the text evidently intends to make; that all the 18 methods of writing mentioned above were brought into use for the *bambhī livi*. This passage and that of the *Lalitavistara* must be regarded as of paramount importance for the history of Indian writing, though these accounts contain much that can be recognized as purely fictitious.

XVII. The fifth *upāṅga*, *sūriyapannatti* (*sūryaprajñapti*) *bhagavati*, in 20 *pāhuḍas* (*prābhṛta*) of which 1 has eight, 2 three, and 10 twenty-two subdivisions called *pāhuḍapāhuḍa*. This strange name *pāhuḍa* is found beside here only in the *puvva* contained in the *diṭṭhivāa*. By the use of this word a special connection between the *diṭṭhivāa* and this *upāṅga* is *co ipso* rendered probable.⁷⁴⁵ Cf. also the direct statement in the introduction to *up.* 7. In discussing *aṅga* 3 I have remarked (p. 269) that its mention of a *sūrapannatti* designated as *aṅga-bāhira* had reference to this *upāṅga*, though it could not be regarded as certain that the present form of this *upāṅga* was thereby attested for that period. If it is doubtful whether the present form of this *up.* existed even at the date of *Nandi* [402] in which the *sūrapannatti* also is enumerated among the *anarṅgapaviṭṭha* texts ; but there are two other texts enumera-

⁷⁴⁵ In *up.* 6—see p. 414—a division into *vatthus* is ascribed. as seems probable, to our text. The name *vatthu* at least recalls the *pūrvas*.

ted together with (or immediately after) the *sūrap.*, treating in all probability of the same subject, which are at present discussed in books 1 and 9 (see note 1, pages 406, 407). Perhaps the double mention of the *sūrap.* in *Āvaśy. Nijj.* 2,6 and 8 54, is to be referred still farther back, though it is still *in dubio* whether this mention refers to the present text or not. In the first of these passages, the author says of himself that, besides other texts, he desired to provide both the *sūriapannatti* and the *isibhāsiya* with a *nijjutti*. If tradition is correct, Bhadrabāhusvāmin is to be regarded as the speaker ; and Malayagiri in the commencement of his comm. on *uv.* 5 makes especial mention of a lost *niryukti* of Bhadr. on the fifth *uvaṅga*. In the second passage both of the texts just mentioned⁷⁴⁶ are adduced⁷⁴⁷ together with the *kāliasuam* (the 11 *aṅgas* according to the schol.) and the *diṭṭhivā* as the four *anuyogas*, i. e. objects of study. In this passage the *isibh.* occupy the second place, the *sūrap.* the third, the *diṭṭhivā* the fourth. The *sūrap.* occupies here manifestly a very important position. The importance of the work is in fact very great, as is apparent from the thorough-going report I have made concerning it in *Ind. Stud.* X. 254-316. In it we find the most remarkable statements concerning the astronomy of the Jains arranged in a systematic form of presentation. [403] Apart from these most peculiar lucubrations, this account is of especial interest inasmuch as it displays remarkable close affiliations with the Vedic calendar-text called *Jyotiṣam*, with the *Nakṣatralakṣaṇa* and the *pariśiṣṭas* of the *Atharva-Veda*. The quinquennial *yugam*, sun and moon, and especially the 28 *nakṣatras*, are placed in the foreground. The planets are known (Jupiter and Saturn with their periodic times), though they assert a very unimportant position and are not cited in the Greek order. There is no mention whatsoever of the zodiac. The 28 *nakṣatras* begin with Abhijit, and the *yugam* consequently begins with the summer and not with the winter solstice. The *libido novandi* of the Jains, which has intentionally changed almost entirely everything which they enjoyed in common with the Buddhists or Brāhmaṇs, is here very apparent. In reality, the Jains are but tolerably fitted out with intellectual gifts. In order to conceal and compensate for this lack of originality they seek to possess something that is their individual property, and to attain this end they do not hesitate to indulge in the wildest dreams of fancy. In the province of astronomy they have given full reins to their imagination. The polemical spirit, manifested especially in the *sūrap.* against other opinions (*paḍivatti*), proves that they are

⁷⁴⁶ *isibhāsiyāmin* is explained by the schol. here by *uttarādhyayanādini* : on 2, 6 by *devendrastavādini*. See pages 239, 281, 429, 432, 442.

⁷⁴⁷ An imitation of this passage is the one quoted from *Śīlāṅka* on p. 258.

perfectly aware of the opposition between their own views and those generally accepted. The beginning of the *nakṣatras* with Abhijit as the sign of the summer solstice, [404] which Malayagiri presumably refers back to Pādaliptasūri⁷⁴⁸ (1,1,286), pre-supposes Aśvinī as the sign of the vernal equinox (1. c. pp. 304, 305). It is based, therefore, upon the rectification of the old Kṛttikā series, which had already taken place, and which upon occasion (see 20.17) appears as the old traditional series. It is an open question whether Greek influence made itself felt in this rectification ; at any rate we have to deal here with an indigenous stage of Indian astronomy antecedent to the authoritative and preponderating influence of the Hellenes. It is probable, therefore, that the period opened up to us by these astronomical conceptions, is the period embracing the first few centuries of our era.

G. Thibaut, in two treatises on the *Sūryaprajñapti* in the *Journal As. Soc. Beng.* 1880 pp. 107-127, 181-206, has collected some facts of especial interest in this connection, facts which make for the connection of the contents of the *Sūryapr.* with the corresponding statements in the Tcheou Pey, see Ed. Biot in the *Journal Asiatique*, 1841, pp. 592-639, the second part of which Biot holds to be not later than the second century A. D. Thibaut does not attempt any answer to the question whether or not there is here any historical connection. If such a connection be proved, the Chinese must be regarded as the borrowers, through the medium of Buddhism, with which Jainism was frequently confused by the Chinese. The opposite opinion appears entirely removed from the domain of possibility by the actual facts of the case. [405] The text has been handed down to us contaminated by many corruptions. The numerous *gāthās* contained in it often appear with entirely uninflected noun-forms (used in the nominative or accusative) in apabhraṃśa fashion. The nom. sing. of the first declension mostly ends in *o* and not in *e*. The numerals appear in a form that is excessively curtailed. If all these are *peccata ab origine*, they are besides secondary corruptions of the text which are easily traceable. Several *gāthās*⁷⁴⁹ stood originally at the end of several §§ in Book 1 ; the MSS containing the express statements : *attha..... gāthān bhāṇitavvāu*, but the words of the *gāthās* have disappeared. Even Malayagiri is unable to restore them, since they were no longer extant when he wrote *saṃprati kvā 'pi pustake na dṛśyamīte*, 1. c. p. 266n.

⁷⁴⁸ In the year Vira 437 according to the *theravāḍi* of the Kharatarag. see Klatt, p. 23.

⁷⁴⁹ 1,3 states their number to be 140.

The text begins with the legend (and in fact in the customary formula : *teṇaṃ kāleṇaṃ*) that Īmdabhūti, at the time of king Jiyasattu in Mihilā, requested that he should be instructed (by Mahāv.) in....., and then follows in 15 gāthas⁷⁵⁰ a complete statement of the contents of the 20 or the 33 sub-divisions in books 1, 2, 10. The redaction is, therefore, the result of the activity of one individual. Books 10 and 15 close with the formula *tti bemi*, which we met with in the case of *aṅgas* 1-3. Is it possible from this fact to conjecture [406] that originally they existed separately, before the author incorporated them in his work ?⁷⁵¹ In 1, 3 there is a reference in the text to the *Jambuddivapannatti* which here in turn cites our text. I here reproduce from my treatise cited above a short statement of the contents.

Book 1 in 8 chapters, *maṇḍalāi*, the circles traversed annually by the sun,⁷⁵² viz. :—

1. *vaḍḍhāvaḍḍhī muhuttāṇaṃ*, increase and decrease of the number of hours for day and night.
2. *addhamāṇḍalasaṃthīi*, the position (of the two suns)⁷⁵³ in the semicircle traversed by each daily.
3. *ke te cinnam pariyaṇai* ? how does one sun traverse the space traversed by the other ? and how great is this space ?
4. *amtaraṃ kiṃ caraṇti* ? in what intervening space do the two suns course ?
5. *ogāhai kevaīyaṃ* ? how great a surface does each dip into (illuminate) ?
6. *kevaīyaṃ vikampai* ? how large a tract does each pass over every day ?
7. *maṇḍalāṇaṃ saṃthāṇe*, the figures of the orbits described by them.
8. *vikkhambho*, compass and extension of the revolutions of the sun.

⁷⁵⁰ Sec. 1. c. pp. 261, 275, 285.

⁷⁵¹ See the next note and note 1, page 407.

⁷⁵² *maṇḍalappaveso* is enumerated in the *Nandī* as a separate text.

⁷⁵³ See Colebrooke, *Miscell.* 2, 223—4 in reference to the two suns of the Jains, etc.

Book II. in three chapters, *tiricchā kim gacchai*, how does the sun go sideways ?, viz. :—

[407] 1. Eight different antagonistic opinions in reference to the rising and setting of the sun.

2. Of the passing of the sun from one circle to another, etc.

3. Of the speed of the sun's motion through each of its 184 circles.

Book III. *obhāsai kevaiyam* ? how much (space) is illuminated (by sun or moon) ?

Book IV. Of the *seyā*, *svetatā*, the luminous body and field of illumination of the sun and moon.

Book V. Of the resistance which is met with by the light of the sun (20 different *pratipattis*).

Book VI. Of the nature of the sun's light, and of the continuance of the power of its beams.

Book VII. Who draws to himself (absorbs) the light of the sun ?

Book VIII. Of the rising of the sun, or of both the suns, in Jambudvīpa, and of the 4, 12, 42, 72 suns in the other dvīpas.

Book IX. Of the amount of shade in the different seasons.⁷⁵⁴
See *Ind. Stud.* 10, 284.

Book X. in 22 chap. (about $\frac{1}{2}$ of the whole). Of the connection of the moon with the *nakṣatras*, viz. :—

1. *āvaliya*, the order of succession of 28 *nakṣatras* beginning with Abhijit.

2. *muhuttage*, the number of hours for the connection of each of the *nakṣ.* with the moon or with the sun.

[408] 3. *bhāgā*, the parts of the day or night (or of the heavens) which belong to each of the *nakṣatras*.

⁷⁵⁴ *porisimāṇḍalaṁ* is cited in *Nandī* as a separate text.

4. *jogasā*, more exact statements in reference to the time of day in which the *nakṣatras* come into conjunction with the moon and the length of this conjunction.
 5. *kulāim*, the family connections of the *nakṣ.* with the months.
 6. *purnamāsī*, the days of the full moon; how and with which *nakṣatra* these end during each of the five years of *yuga*.
 7. *sanivāe*, the mutual harmonious concatenation of the days of the new and full moon.
 8. *saṁḥīi*, figures of the *nakṣ.*
 9. *tāraggam*, number of stars of the *nakṣ.*
 10. *netā*, leader, i.e. which *nakṣ.* lead which month ?
 11. *caṇḍamaggam*, relation of the *nakṣatras* to the 15 day-circles of the moon.
 12. *devatāṇa ya ajjhayaṇe*, the tutelary divinities of the *nakṣatras*.
 13. *muhuttāṇaṁ nāmayāi*, the names of the 30 *muhūrtas*.
 14. *divasarāi*, the names of the 15 days and the 15 nights of the *karmamāsa*, calendar month.
 15. *tihī*, *tithayaḥ*, ditto of the lunar month.
 16. *gottā*, the families of the *nakṣ.*
 17. *bhoyaṇāṇī*, the foods which are good during each of the *nakṣ.*— That the *nakṣ.* begin here with Kṛttikā (!), is due to the influence of the well-known material that is here treated of.
 18. *āṭccacāra*, course (of the *nakṣ.*) with the sun or with the moon during the *yuga*.
- [409]19. *māsā*, names of the months of the world and those above the world (*lokottara*, chiefly of climatic contents).
20. *pañca saṁvaccharāi*, the five years, viz. :—
1. the *nakṣatra* year with 12 periodic months of $327\frac{5}{8}\frac{1}{4}$ $\nu\chi\theta\eta'\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$
 2. the *yuga* year, lunar year of $354\frac{1}{8}\frac{3}{2}$ $\nu\chi\theta\eta'\mu\epsilon\rho\alpha$

3. the *pamāṇa* (*pra°*) year, of which there are five kinds. In addition to the two just mentioned, the *ṛtu* year (*sāvāna*) of 360 *νυχθη'μερα*, the solar year of 366 *νυχθη'μερα* and the lunar leap-year of $383\frac{4}{5}$ *νυχθη'μερα*.
4. the *lakṣaṇa* year, divided into the same five groups as above ; there are, however, in addition certain requisites or characteristics.
5. the year of Saturn (30 years), during which Saturn completes his circuit through the 28 *nakṣ*.
21. *joisassa sayadārāim*, the gates of the *nakṣatras* (in what quarter of the heavens they bring good fortune).
22. *nakkhattavijae* (*vicayaḥ*), transit of the sun and moon through the 28 *nakṣ*.

Book XI. Of the beginning of the five lunar years belonging to the *yuga*.

Book XII. Of the five kinds of year, which were discussed in 10, 20 on *pamāṇasarihvatsara* ; they receive a much fuller treatment here.

Book XIII. Of the waxing and waning of the moon.

Book XIV. When is moonlight the brightest ?

Book XV. Of the rapidity of the five classes of constellations—sun, moon, planets, *nakṣ* and *tārā*—According to Leumann cf. also *Jiva*, 4, 31, 12.

[410] Book XVI. Of the properties of moonlight.

Book XVII. Of the fall (passing away) and *uvavāya* (resurrection) of the genii of the moon, sun, etc.

Book XVIII. Of the height of the constellations above, and their distance from, the earth—cf. *Jiv*. 4, 31, 3 (L).

Book XIX. Of the number of the suns, etc., in *Jambūdvīpa*, etc. ; cf. *Jiv*. 4, 16, 17, 7. 20, 5, 10, 15, 21 (L).

Book XX. Of the nature and substance of the five classes of constellations.

There is a commentary by Malayagiri.

XVIII. The sixth *upāṅga*, the *Jarībuddivapannatti*.

We have seen (above p. 268) that in the third *aṅga* 4,⁷⁵⁵ a work of this name was cited, if not as *upāṅga*, at least as *aṅgabāhira*. In that *aṅga* we find the same minute division of time which we meet with here; hence the existence of this *upāṅga* is assured even if its present form is different from that then in vogue. In our text upon a definite occasion there is a special reference to *up.* 5 and *up.* 7, each of which in turn cites our *upāṅga*. It is, therefore, probable that these works are synchronistic, supposing that the citations in this instance are not, as usually the case, the work of the redactor.

The legendary introduction to this *upāṅga* is wholly identical with that which commences [411] *upāṅgas* 5 and 7,—*upāṅgas* which are connected by a very close tie. This introduction is inserted between *upāṅgas* 5 and 7 in a very remarkable manner. Our *up.* is, however, different from these, in that, like *aṅgas* 1-3, it concludes with the formula *ti bemi*, which, it must, however, be confessed, is found at the end at least of books 10, 15; see p. 405.

There are no sub-divisions in the text itself, whence the *Vidhiprapā* calls it *egasarā*. The commentary, however, recognizes seven sections which it calls by the strange title of *vakṣaskāra*.⁷⁵⁶

The mythical geography of *Jarībuddiṭṭa*, interfused with many legends, forms the contents of this *upāṅga*. The chief part— $\frac{2}{3}$ of the whole—concerns the description of the seven *vāsas* (*varṣa*) and of the six *vāsaharas* (*varṣadhara*). The description of *Bharaha vāsa* which is placed in the fore-front comprises at least $\frac{2}{3}$ of the entire account. The legends of king Bharata, from whom it takes its name, claim a good half of the entire section. The detailed account of *Bharaha vāsa* in the different gradations of the past and present (in all 4), and in the future (in all 8), is preceded by a minute description of the divisions of time and extent; of which we have already (in *aṅga* 3) met the first, from *āvaliyā* to *sīsapaheliyā* (or to *usappiṇi*)—see above, p. 268. One

⁷⁵⁵ In 3, 1, however, only the titles of *upāṅgas*, 7, 5 (and the title of a part of *up.* 3) are mentioned. The title of our *up.* finds there no mention whatsoever.

⁷⁵⁶ This recurs e. g. in Hemaharsa's *nyāyamañjūṣā*.

difference is, however, noticeable :—Here⁷⁵⁷ the increase is by hundreds after the millennium, [412] after 100,000 years by 84's (*caūrāsītivāsasaya-sahassāim se ege puvvaṃge*), and from this point on by 8,400,000 (*caūrāsītivuvvaṃgasaya...sahassāim se ege puvve*); in *aṅga* 3, however, we find no more exact statement in reference to the manner of the progression⁷⁵⁸ (*vāsakoḍī 'ti vā, puvvaṃgā ti vā, puvvā ti vā*).

As the result of the above we may observe one divergence as regards *up. 5*, where in book VI. (see *Ind. Stud.* 10, 282), the word *puvva* occurred in the signification of a million years, and the increase from that point on (without any special mention of the names in question) simply passing by *paliovama* and *sāgarovama*, up to *osappiṇī*, merely by 10's.

The enumeration of the 72 *kalās* in a legend of *Usabha* is not mentioned in detail; its beginning and end alone being mentioned. The women of the foreign peoples known to us from the *Bhagavati*—see p. 302—are enumerated as servants of king Bharaha :—*Tate naṃ tassa Bharahassa raṇṇo bahūo khuyya*⁷⁵⁹ *Cilāti-vāmaṇi-vaḍabhīo-Babbari-Vāisiyāo Joniyā-Palhāviyāo, Isiṇiyā-Thāruṇiyā (Thārukiniā, Cārubhaṇiyā) Lāsiya Lāsiya Damili Sihali taha Āravi Pulimḍi ya Pakvaṇi Vahali Marumḍi* [413] (*Mura°, Muro°*) *Savarīo Pārasīo ya appigatiyāo caṃḍaṇa-kalāsahatthayayāo...*

According to the commentary, the first four *vakṣaskāras* treat of the following subjects :— The first, of the *Bharata-kṣetra-svarūpaṃ*; the second, of its special relations during the 14 temporal divisions, *Bharata-kṣetrasavarūpavarṇanaprastāvanāgatāvasarpiṇy-utsarpiṇīdvayarūpa-kūlacakravarṇano nāma*; the third, of the legends concerning king Bharata, *Bharata-kṣetrapravṛttinimittāvirbhāva Bharatacakricaritrav.nāmā*; the fourth, of the remaining 6 *vāsas*, or 6 *vāsahas*,⁷⁶⁰ *kṣudra Himavadādi-*

⁷⁵⁷ So also in the *Anuyogadvārasūtra*, see *Bhag.* 1.427. See *Ind. Stud.* 13,168. *Ind. Streifen*, 3,3, *pañcandaṇḍachattrapr.* p. 17 in reference to the customary use of the number 84.

⁷⁵⁸ According to the scholiast, we must assume that the relations of modality in *aṅga* 3 are identical with those here :—*pūrvāṇi pūrvāṃgāny eva caturāśītivarṣalakṣaṇagunitāni*; *pūrvāṇi caturāśītikalakṣaṇagunitāni trūṭitāṃgāni bhavaṃti.....*

⁷⁵⁹ *kubjāḥ kubjikā vakrājanghāḥ, Cilātyāḥ cilātadeśotpannāḥ, vāmanikā atyaṃti ahrasv-omatahādayakoṣṭhā vā, vadabhikā madahakoṣṭhā vadha (vakrādhaḥ ?) kāyā vā; bakuśadeśajāḥ; tsinikāḥ thārukiniāḥ; lāsakadeśajāḥ, lakuśadeśajāḥ; tatra cilātyādayo 'spādasa tattadeśodbhavatvena tattannāmikā jneyāḥ, kubjādayas tu tisro viśeṣanabhūtāḥ*; see Leumann in the glossary to the *Aup.*

⁷⁶⁰ Then follows : 2. The mountain (*vāsaharapavvāe*) *culla Himavānte*, 3. in *Hemavāe vāse*, 4. mount *mahā-Himavānte*, 5. in *Harivāse vāse*, 6. mount *Nisaha*, 7. in

varṣadharairāvatāmtavarṣavarṇano nāma. The fifth treats, in legendary form, of the birth and consecration of a *tīrthakṛt*, *tīrthakṛjjanmābhiṣekadhikārav*. The sixth, unfortunately, gives but a very short review of the divisions, extent, mountains, temples, lakes, rivers, etc, of Jambūdvīpa, *Jambūdvīpagatapadārthasaṁgrahav*.⁷⁶¹ The seventh deals with astrological and chronological matters, *jyotiṣkādhikārav*., and especially with the number, etc., of the moons, suns and stars in Jambūdvīpa. Herein it is in very close agreement with the *sūrapannatti* and *camdapannatti*, both of which are cited at the end. The answer to the questions under consideration found at the end is based chiefly upon the discussion : *pañcamasue paḍhame uddesāe*, by which [414] *Bhagavati* 5, 1 is doubtless meant. It closes in treating of the sun : *icc esā Jambūdivapannatti sūrapannattivatthusamāseṇaṁ samattā bhavatt*. Then, in close conjunction with the above, it, in like manner, treats of the moon, and concludes : *icc esā Ja°tīl camdapannattivatthusamāseṇaṁ s. bh*. The expression *vatthu*, which occurs here twice, belongs to the *puvva* sections—see page 361. It does not occur in the existing texts of *upāṅgas* 5 and 7, which are divided into *pāhuḍas*, a term which, it must be confessed, is similar to the *pūrvas*. Next follows a discussion in reference to the five different kinds of year (see above p. 409), viz. : 1. The *nakkhatta* year (and by this is meant the revolution of Jupiter through the 28 *nakṣatras* ;⁷⁶² in *up*. 5 (see *Ind. Stud.* 10,299), this is cited merely as a *pakṣāmtaram*. 2. The lunar *yuga* year. 3. The *pamāṇa* year with its five groups as in *up*. 5. 4. The *lakkhaṇa* year in five groups. The scholiast says that in the first of the five, the *nakṣatra* year, the commencement is made with *Kṛttikā* and not with *Abhijit* ! The scholiast on *up*. 5 at least makes mention of *Uttarāṣāḍhas*—cf. *Ind. Stud.* 10,301, note 7, 5. The year of Saturn or its revolution through the 28 *nakṣatras*. Then follow the months, days, hours and the *karaṇa*, which last was omitted in *up*. 5. The fourth *karaṇaṁ* is here called *thiviloṇa*, *strivilocana*, or *thiloṇa* (so also in the *Gaṇiyyā* v. 42) and not *taitila*. The names are as usual :—*Bavaṁ bālave kolavaṁ thiviloṇaṁ* [415] *garāi vaṇijaṁ viṭṭhī* (these 7 are *cara*) *saūṇī caūppaya ṇāgaṁ kiṁtthugghaṁ* (these 4 are *thira*). The beginning with *Bava* is the one which usually occurs elsewhere ; but in the quinquennial *yugam*, contrary to other statements, everything has been changed. Of the

Mahāvīdehe vāse, 8 mount *Nelavaṁte*, 9 in *Rammāe*, *vāse*, 10 mount *Ruppi* (*Rukmin*), 11 in *Hiraṇṇavāe vāse*, 12 mount *Sihari* (*Sikharin*), 13 in *Erāvāe vāse*.

⁷⁶¹ 2½ leaves (75b to 77a) in a MS of the text embracing 95 leaves, of which the fifth section embraces 66a to 75b. A *gāhā*, which summarizes the contents, forms the introduction. This *gāhā* is at the head of a *saṁghayaṇi* in 29 *āryā* composed in very free Prakrit, by Haribhadrasūri. See above pp. 371, 372.

⁷⁶² *jaṁ vā vahassaṁ mahaggahe duvālasahiṁ saṁvacharihiṁ savvanakkhattamaṁḍaleṁ saṁcārī se taṁ nakkhattasaṁvachare*.

two *ayanas* the summer solstice is in the first place, the rainy season is first among the seasons, *Sāvaṇa* (*Śrāvaṇa*) first among the months, the *bahula*, among the *pakkha*, the day among the *ahoratta*, and *Abhijit* among the *nakṣatras*. Then follows a special discussion of the *nakṣatras*,—their position as regards the moon, their divinities, the number of their stars, their *gotta*, their form, etc., just as in the *Nakṣatrakalpa* or in *upāṅga* 5; and partly in the form of *gāhā*. The names of the *nakṣatras* appear here in their secondary form as in *up.* 5, in *āṅga* 3—see *Ind. Stud.* 10,286 and above p. 268 :—*Savāna* (instead of *Śroṇā*), *Dharitṭhā* (instead of *Śravisthā*), *Bhaddavayā* (instead of *Proṣṭhapadā*), *Pussa* (instead of *Tiṣya*). The conclusion is formed by all sorts of remarkable statements in reference to sun, moon, stars, the extent of their *vimāṇa*, etc.; Mars (*iṅgālae viyālae lohitaṅke*) and Saturn (*saṇichare*) are regarded as belonging to the court of the moon; cf. *Bhagavati* 1,401,2,225. Jupiter was referred to above; but there is no mention of Mercury, Venus, and the Zodiac.

The commentary is by Śānticaṇḍra, scholar of Sakalacandra, who lived at the time of the 58th patriarch of the Tapāgaccha Hīravijayasūri (Sāṃvat 1652), recognized by śrī Akabbarasuratrāṇa (Sultan). This commentary⁷⁶³ is very verbose, but in the introduction it contains numerous matters of interest in reference to the relations of each of the [416] 12 *upāṅgas* to that one of the *āṅgas* which had a corresponding position among the series of twelve, and in reference to the commentaries thereupon—Śīlāṃkācārya (on *āṅgas* 1.2), Abhayadeva (on *āṅgas* 3-11 and *up.* 1), Malayagiri (on *up.* 2-7), Caṃdrasūri (on *up.* 8-12), and finally see above p. 224—in reference to the period of advancement suitable for the study of each of the *āṅgas*. The full statement in reference to the mutual relation of the *āṅgas* and *upāṅgas* is :—*tatrā 'ṃgāni dvādaśa, upāṃgāny api aṃgaikadeśaprapaṃcarūpāṇi prāyaḥ praty-aṃgam ekaikabhāvāt tāvaṃty eva, tatrā 'ṃgāny ācāraṃgādīni pratitāni, teṣāṃ upāṃgāni krameṇā 'muni; ācāraṃgasyau "papātikam 1, sūtrakṛ-daṃgasya rājapraśnīyaṃ 2, sthānāṃgasya jīvābhigamaḥ 3, samavāyā-ṃgasya prajñāpanā 4, bhagavatyāḥ sūryaprajñaptiḥ 5, jñātādharmakathāṃgasya jambūdvīpaprajñaptiḥ 6, upāsakadaśāṃgasya caṃdraprajñaptiḥ 7, aṃtakṛddāśāṃgādikānāṃ drṣṭivādaparyāmtānāṃ paṃcānāṃ apy aṃgānāṃ nīrayāvalikāśrutaskāṃdhagatakālpikā-dipāṃcavargāḥ paṃco 'pāṃgāni, tathā hi; aṃtakṛddāśāṃgasya kālpikā 8, anuttaropapātikadaśāṃgasya kālpāvataṃsikā 9, praśnavyākaraṇasya puṣpitā 10, vipākāśrutasya puṣpacūlikā 11, drṣṭivādasya Vṛṣṇidaśā 12, iti.*

⁷⁶³ The date of its composition is Sāṃvat 1651 (A.D. 1595); the work was, however, revised for Vijayasena nine years later.

XIX The seventh *upāṅga*, *caṁdapannatti*.

We have, before, frequently observed that a text of this name is twice cited in *aṅga* 3, and in conjunction with texts whose titles belong to *upāṅgas* 5, 6, or to a portion of *up.* 3 ; that the order of succession of the titles in *aṅga* 3 (7, 5, 6) does not agree with the present position of these texts, viz. the title of the *caṁdapannatti* is there, and, in fact, in both the passages which concern this matter, placed before the others. The *caṁdapannatti* is cited in the text of *up.* 6, as before remarked. [417] Taking these facts into consideration, it is in the highest degree remarkable that the existing text is almost completely identical with that of *up.* 5, differing from it, for example, in about the same way as the two schools of the white *Yajus* differ from each other. The introduction is, however, quite different. The beginning consists of 4 *āryā* strophes, of which 1 and 2 sing the praises of Vīra etc. ; v. 3 characterizes the work in the same words as are found in *up.* 4, introd. v. 3 and 5 i.e. as *puvvasuyasāraṇīsaṁdam* see p. 394— and v. 4 traces back the *joisarāyapannatti* to the questions of Gotama Iṁdabhūti. Then follow upon these four strophes the same 15 verses in an interrogatory tone, which in *up.* 5, too, state the contents of the 20 separate divisions (*pāhuḍa*) and subdivisions *pāhuḍa-pāhuḍa*. From this we can draw the conclusion that there is complete identity of subject and method of treatment. The legendary introduction, which refers the whole to a conversation between Mahāvīra and Indrabhūti, follows upon these 15 verses, and displays a few minor differences. From this point on, the text is similar to, and in fact, almost identical with, that of *up.* 5, with the exception of a few linguistic (e. g. *rāi*, night, for *rayaṇī*, *ratana*, *rajanī*) and stylistic differences. Our text is, here and there, somewhat briefer, which is compensated for by references to *up.* 3 and 6, which are lacking in *up.* 5. An exact comparison of the text of each will doubtless disclose many matters of difference between the two. Nevertheless, the inter-relation of the two is a fact, the remarkable character of which [418] is enhanced when we consider that Malayagiri composed a special commentary on this *upāṅga* also, which was essentially the same as that composed by him on *up.* 5, and that in neither of his commentaries does he say anything in reference to the mutual relation of both texts and commentaries. (The statement just made appears to be correct, though I have not made here an examination of Malayagiri's com. *ad amussim*).

Until new facts come to light that will solve this mystery, we must be content to accept the present situation. In the passage in *up.* 6 in which *up.* 5 and 7 are cited—see above p. 414—the text reads as if the

first had reference solely to the sun, the second solely to the moon. Our texts of *up.* 3 and 7, however, treat both uniformly and in a completely similar manner.

XX-XXIV. The eighth to the twelfth *upāṅgas* *nirayāvaliyāo*, *nirayāvalikās*.

Under this collective name are comprised five small texts of legendary contents (*vāggas*) in one "*śrutaskandha*". The first of these either has the special title of "*śrutaskandha*"; or is called *kappiyāo*, *kalpikās*. The titles of the others are *kappavaḍaṁsiyāo*, *pupphiyāo*, *pupphacūliyāo* or *cūlāo*, *Vaṇhidasāo*. Each of the first four has 10, the fifth 12 *ajjhayaṇas*.⁷⁶⁴ In the introduction to the first, all these five texts are characterized—see 372, 373—as *uvaṅgāṇaṁ pañca vaggā*. We have seen above that this epithet recurs in the interior of no other one of the texts held to be *upāṅgas*. [419] It must, therefore, be deemed a probable supposition, if we assert that this epithet at the time of the composition of these five texts was restricted to them alone in their totality since they belonged together from the very beginning. Their present position at the end of the 12 *upāṅgas* is to be explained by their legendary contents, which shows them to be perfectly adapted to serve as a pendant to the legendary texts of *aṅgas* 7-11,⁷⁶⁵ and tradition has—see pp. 373, 416—brought them into connection with these *aṅga* texts and especially with 8-12. They share with these not merely the common form of legendary introduction; they are referred back to Sudharman and Jambū; they have the names *ukkheva* and *nikheva*, usual in the customary introductory and concluding formulae; they shew the division of each into ten *ajjhayaṇas*, and lastly they have the same form of the citation of a text, i.e. the first *ajjh.* only is quoted entire and the catch-words suffice for those that follow. We may well call them an appendix bound to *aṅgas* 7-11 by a very close tie. Their interconnection is, furthermore, attested by external evidence:—Their names are placed together in the enumeration of the *anaṅgapavittṭha* texts in the *Nandī*, though the order of succession varies somewhat, the series there being 20, 22, 21, 23, 24, while between 20 and 22, as a separate text, the *kappiyāo* are inserted, which in the *Vidhiprapā*, [420] as in Śānticaṇḍra on *up.*

764. *Avi.* and *Svi.* : *aṁtagaḍadasādīpaṁcaṇhaṁ aṁgāṇaṁ nirayāvaliyā-suakkhaṁdho uvaṅgaṁ, tammi pañca vaggā : kappiyāo kappavaḍaṁsiyāo pupphiyāo pupphacūliyāo vaṇhidasāo, caṁsu dāsa ajjhayaṇā, paṁcome-bārasa.*

765. As regards *aṅga* 10 I have mentioned on page 329 my conjecture that from the inter relation of *up.* 8-12 and *aṅgas* 7-11 we have additional testimony for the view that *aṅga* 10 too originally possessed a legendary character. See, however, p. 334 n.1

6, see p. 416, appear merely as the name of the first of these 5 *upāṅgas*. In the Scholiast on the *Nandī*, however, and in the *Nandī* itself they are regarded as an independent text existing by the side of the other five : *narakāvāsās tadgāmināś ca narā yatra varṇyaṁte* ; *kalpikāḥ saudharmādikalpavaktavyatāgocarā grāṁthapaddhatayaḥ* ; *evam kalpāvatam-sikā jneyāḥ* ; *yās tu gṛhavāsamukulana (!) tyāgena jīvāḥ saṁyamabhavapūṣpitā bhūṣitā bhūyas tattiyāgato duḥkhāvāptimukulena mukulitās tattiyāgataḥ pūṣpitāḥ pratipādyamte tāḥ pūṣpitāḥ* ; *tadviśeṣapratipādikāḥ pūṣpacūḍāḥ* ; *Arṁdhaka-Vṛṣṇidaśanām siddhigamanādila-kṣaṇānām pratipā-dakā grāṁthapaddhatayaḥ*.

In the account of Rāj. Lal Mitra, l.c (above, p. 227), there is no mention of the *Vanḥidasāo*, *nirayāvali* and *kappiyā* are enumerated as two separate *upāṅgas* (8 and 9), and *Kappavaḍḍisaya*, *Pupphiyā*, *Pupphacūliyā* as Nos. 10-12. In Kashinath Kunte's report the order is *nirayāvalikā*, *Vanḥidasā*, *Kappavaḍḍisīyā*, *Pupphiyā*, *Pupphacūliyā*.

It must, furthermore, be noticed that Abhayadeva on *aṅga* 3,10 is of the opinion that several of the 10 *ajjh.* of the *dīhadāsā* cited there are especially closely connected with the *narakāvaliśrutaskandha*—see pp. 273,423ⁿ. If this is the case, it supports the probability that the contents is of ancient date, which is indeed great on other grounds. The relation of the five extant texts is as follows :—

XX. *up.* 8, *uvarṅgāṇaṁ paḍhame vagge*, the *nirayāvaliyāo*, or *kappiyāo*, treats of the ultimate fortunes of the ten princes Kāla etc.,⁷⁶⁶ sons [421] of the Aṅga king Seṇiya of Campā. These princes accompanied their half-brother Kūṇiya⁷⁶⁷ in his campaign against his grandfather, Ceḍaga of Vesālī, the Videha king, who refused to deliver up the own brother of Kūṇiya who had fled to his court. Kūṇiya on this account had declared war against Ceḍaga, who, in order to meet the impending danger, summoned nine Mallati (Mallaki) and nine Lecchati (Licchavi) kings and all 48 Kāsī-Kosalayā gaṇarāyāṇo (cf. *Bhagav.* 7, 9. p. 301), and opposed 57,000 elephants, etc., to the 33,000 of the eleven princes (3,000 for each). The mothers⁷⁶⁸ of the ten princes, Kālī, etc. (see *aṅga* 8, above, p. 321), each ask in turn of Mahāvīra whether they are destined to behold their sons alive again. Mahāvīra in reply not only informs Imḍabhūti into what hell each must descend after he has fallen

⁷⁶⁶ Kāle, Sukāle, Mahākāle, Kaṇhe, Sukaṇhe, Mahākāṇhe, Virakaṇhe, Rāmakaṇhe, Piṣuṇakaṇhe, Mahāsenakaṇhe.

⁷⁶⁷ Son of Cellanā, wife of Seṇiya.

⁷⁶⁸ Stepmothers, Cullamāue, of Kūṇiya.

in the battle—hence the title of the *upāṅga*—and his future fate, but also relates the antecedent history of king Kūṇiya himself, beginning at that point when his mother was three months pregnant. The expulsion of his father Seṇiya from the throne at his hands is then related and his father's death in prison. We possess in its complete form the text of the first *ajjh.* alone, the second being finished off in six, the remaining eight in two lines.

The reader is referred to Jacobi's introduction to the *Kalpās*, p. 2 for Seṇiya Bhimbhisāra,⁷⁶⁹ i.e. Śreṇika Bimbisāra and his son Kūṇiya Bāmbhasāraputta,⁷⁷⁰ i.e. Ajātasatru, [422] contemporaries of Buddha, and also in reference to the synchronistic conclusions which may be drawn in reference to Mahāvīra. It is placed beyond the shadow of a doubt, that the Bauddhas and the Jainas possess herein a common heritage, and that genuine historical traditions form the foundation of the recital. Whether it is necessary to separate Mahāvīra from Buddha is another question—cf. *Bhagav.* 1,441. The traditional connection of Mahāvīra with Nātiputta, Buddha's opponent, can also be regarded as the result—cf. p. 240—of an intentional variation caused by sectarian hatred. The *Nirayāvalī* has been edited by S. Warren, Antwerp, 1879, on which see H. Jacobi in *Journ. Germ. Orient. Soc.*, 34, 178 ff. There is a commentary by Candrasūri.

The enumeration of the women of non-Aryan peoples,⁷⁷¹ distinguished in the text merely by *vahūhiṃ khuyyāhiṃ jāva*, is quoted by Candrasūri in the same form which we meet with in *Bhag.* 9,33 (see p. 302), etc. The citation *jahā Citto tti*, points to *up.* (2), *jahā Pabhāvatī* to *āṅga* 5,11.

XXI. *up.* 9. *varga* 2. *kappāvaḍaṃsīāu*, *kalpāvaṭaṃsikāḥ*, treats of the ten sons⁷⁷² of prince Kāla, etc., all of whom were converted to asceticism, as were their grandmothers Kālī etc., and who [423] reached

⁷⁶⁹ See *ajjh.* 10 of the *daśāśrutaskandha*.

⁷⁷⁰ See introduction to *up.* 2. More exact information in reference to his history is found in the scholiast on *Āvaśy.* 18,144, cf. *Bhag.* 7,9 (Leumann).

⁷⁷¹ *kubjikābhīḥ vakrajaṃghābhīḥ, cilātibhīḥ anāryadesotpannābhīḥ, vāmanābhīḥ hrasvaśarirābhīḥ vaḍabhābhīḥ madahakoṣṭhābhīḥ Varvaribhīḥ Varvaradesasāmbhāvābhīḥ, Vakuṣikābhīḥ Yonakābhīḥ Paṇhavikābhīḥ Isinikābhīḥ Cārukinikābhīḥ Lāsi-kābhīḥ Dravidibhīḥ Simhālībhīḥ Āravibhīḥ, Pakvaṇibhīḥ Vahalibhīḥ Mūrumābhīḥ Śavaribhīḥ Pārasibhīḥ nānādesābhīḥ vahuvidhānāryaprayadesotpannābhīḥ*; cf. p. 412.

⁷⁷² *Paūme, Mahāpaūme, Bhadde, Subhadde, Mahābhadde, Paūmabhadde, Paūmasene, Paūmagumme, Nallīṇigumme, Anānde, Nāṃdaṇe* (but this makes 11 names! Is one to be referred to a son of Kūṇiya?)

their respective heavens.⁷⁷³ The account consists almost entirely of mere catch-words or of references. Emphasis is often laid upon the *sāmāia-m-ādītām ekkārasa amgām*.

XXII. *up. 10. varga 3, pupphiāu, puspikāh* (or *°tāh*), treats, with reference to *up. 2*, of the ten gods or goddesses⁷⁷⁴ who came from their heavenly worlds⁷⁷⁵ to pay reverence to Mahāvīra, who thereupon tells to Goyama their previous history. They were in a former birth all turned or converted to the study of the *sāmāia-m-ādītām ekkārasa amgām*, either by the arhant Pāsa or by the Ayya Suvvātā or by the *therā bhagavanto* (see *up. 3*). These former births, as *māhaṇa, gāhāvati, satthavāhe* etc., occurred in Sāvattī, Vāṇārasi (!), Maṇivaia, Vemḍaṇaṇā, Mihila, Hatthiṇapura, Kākamdi. The enumeration of the Brahmanical sciences here is similar to that in the *Bhagavati* (above, p. 303); and their names are similarly explained by the scholiast.

XXIII. *up. 11. varga 4, pupphacūlāo, puspacūdās* ⁷⁷⁶ ten other histories of a similar nature. We possess the first alone, the *Bhūtā nāmaṃ dārīā*, former birth of the Siridevī,⁷⁷⁷ is brought by Pāsa to believe in the *niggamthaṃ pāvayaṇaṃ*. The other histories have entirely disappeared with the exception of the names, [424] which are found⁷⁷⁸ in the *gāhā* in the introduction; the goddesses (not gods) who are here mentioned are for the most part mere personifications of ethical qualities.

XXIV. *up. 12. varga 5, Vāṇhidasāo, Vṛṣṇidasās*, in 12 *ajjhayaṇas*; 12 similar histories, of which we possess none but the first, the mere names by which the others were called having been preserved.⁷⁷⁹ The conversion of twelve princes of the race of Vṛṣṇi is here treated of as having ensued through the influence of the arhan Ariṭṭhanemi. The first history deals with Nisaḍha, son of Baladeva, nephew of king Kaṇha-

⁷⁷³ Seated in the *Kalpāvatansaka Vimāna*, Kashinath K.

⁷⁷⁴ *Caṃdejoisimḍe, Sūre, Sukke, mahāgahe* (planet Venus), *Bahuputtīā, Punnabhadde, Maṇibhadde, Datte, Sive, Bale, Aṇādhite*; four of these names, see p. 273, among those of the *dhadasāu*.

⁷⁷⁵ Seated in the celestial chariot (*Puṣpaka*), Kashinath.

⁷⁷⁶ Contains an account of the female disciple of Mahāvīra Svāmi, named *Puspacūlā*, and of her female attendant, Kashinath.

⁷⁷⁷ See p. 273 n.

⁷⁷⁸ *siri, hiri, dhiti, kiṭṭhi, vuddhi, lajjā, ilā devī, surā devī, sarassai devī, gaṇḍhadevī*; —The Siridevī comes to honor Mahāvīra. *jahā Bahuputtīā*

⁷⁷⁹ *Nisaḍhe, Mahānisaḍhe, Anigahe, Vede, Paḡaṭi, Jutti, Dasarahe Daḍharahe, Mahā-dhaṇu Sattadhaṇu, Dasadhaṇu, Sayadhaṇu*.

Vāsudeva in Bāravati.⁷⁸⁰ In his former birth he was converted or turned to the study of the *sāmāia-m-ādīai ekkārasa aṅgāim* by the *Siddhatt-hānāmam āyariyā*. A prophecy in reference to his future birth is added to the above recital. At the end the five texts are again called the “*uvaṅgāṇi*” or the 5 *vargas* of one *śrutaskandha* : *nirayāvaliāsutakkhaṁ-dho samatto, samattāṇi a uvaṅgāṇi, nirayāvaliā-uvaṅge ṇaṁ ego suakkhaṁ-dho paṁca vaggā paṁcasu divasesu uddissanti*.

This last statement in reference to the number of days which are necessary to teach or to recite them, is found [425] in exactly the same form in the corresponding *aṅgas*—see p. 280. The three *sāmāyārīs*, contain detailed statements in reference to each.

The historical value of these legends is, apart from the traditions contained in *uv.* 8, without doubt very slight indeed. The largest portion of their contents is as purely fictitious as was the case in *aṅga* 6 fg. (see p. 338). Nevertheless, since they contain information (e.g. in respect to the activity of Pāsa, which preceded that of Mahāvīra), we may claim for them a value as regards our estimation of the relations under which we have to consider the life and works of Mahāvīra.

We have seen above that the uniformity of the contents, and the homogeneous method of treating it in all the five texts, make for the conclusion that they originally formed but one text. Tradition calls them merely the five parts of one *śrutaskandha*. Their enumeration as five separate texts was caused by the desire to have the number of the *uvaṅgas* correspond to that of the *aṅgas*. The fact is that the special limitations of the number of the *aṅgas* to eleven which is found in *uv.* 8-12 must be regarded as a strange contradiction of the desire to assimilate the number of the *uvaṅgas* to that of the *aṅgas*. The title *vagga* belongs also to *aṅgas* 6 and 8, as an appendix or supplement to the latter of which two, these five texts may have come into existence. The history of the first *vagga* here (*uv.* 8-12) is, to a certain extent, an elucidatory supplement to the last of the *vaggas* there, i.e. in *aṅga* 8.

[426] The third group of the texts of the *Siddhānta* is formed by the ten *painnas prakīrṇas*.

⁷⁸⁰ At the head of 10 *Daśāra* : Samuddavijaya etc., 5 Mahāvīra : Baladeva etc., 16,000 kings ; Uggaseṇa etc., 3½ *koṭi* of *kumāra* : Payyunna etc., 60,000 *duddamta* (?) : Sambaya etc., 21,000 *vīra* : Virasena etc., 16,000 *devī* : Ruppini, etc. and many thousand *gaṇiā* : Aṇaṅgasenā etc. The same court is found according to Leumann in *aṅga* 6, p. 526, 1231, and *aṅga* 8 1.

It is as yet undetermined how old is the position of the *painnas*, *prakīrṇas* as the third part of the *Siddhānta* and what caused their location there. In *Āvi*, there follow upon the *uvarṅgas* first the *cheagg-aṁthas* and then the *painnas*. In *Svi*. and *V*. the *painnas* come directly after the *uvarṅgas*, but the *cheda* texts (with the exception of *mahānistha* which is reached after the *painnas* are done with) have been placed before (between *aṅgas* 4 and 5), as if their position at that point belonged to them. Is the mere fact that the *painnas* are more numerous the reason that in the *present* arrangement of the parts of the *Siddhānta* (see p. 226) they have been placed before the *cheasuttas*? They are certainly very much inferior to the *cheasuttas* both as regards inner worth and external extent.⁷⁸¹ The joint name *painna*, by which they are united, does not occur in any other place in the *Siddhānta*, except in their own text, so far as I have been able to observe. The word *painna* is found, it is true, in the *Nandī* as *saṁjñā*, but in another, far more universal signification, viz., as a means of denoting all those texts not contained in the *aṅgas*. In the passage of the *Nandī* 84,000 or even 8,400,000 *painnagas* are spoken of !

The texts now extant called *painnas* in the pregnant sense of the word, bear a name, which, denoting "scattered", "hastily sketched" pieces, well suits their real nature as a group of texts corresponding to the Vedic *pariśiṣṭas*. Like the *pariśiṣṭas* they are, with a few exceptions, composed in metre ; [427] and in fact in *āryā*, the metre which is usual in the *kārikā* insertions in the *aṅgas*, etc. They are different from the texts, which we have considered upto this point, in that the nom. sing. masc. first decl. regularly ends in *o* and not in *e* (for exceptions see on 5 and 7). This is a proof of their later origin.

In the usual enumeration of the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts in *Nandī*, *Pākṣikas*, and in the three *Sāmāyārī* we meet with but six of the ten separate titles of the present *painna* group. In the works just mentioned, the titles of 1, 3, 4, 10 are lacking, texts which bear a decidedly secondary stamp. (The scholiast on the *Nandī* appears also in the case of No. 2 to have had before him quite a different text from the one we possess).

These ten texts did not originally enjoy the distinction of being the representatives of the *painna* group ; and that they arrived but gradually

⁷⁸¹ Their collective extent is only about 1 900 *granthas*.

at this honor is attested by manifold testimony going to prove that considerable dissent at present exists in regard to the representative position claimed by them.

In *Āvi.* the enumeration on this point is in three very imperfect *gāthā* : *saṃpai painnagā*, *naṃdī* 1, *aṇuogadāra* 2, *ārapaccakkhāṇa* (2)3, *mahāpaccakkhāṇa* (9)4, *devimdatthaa* (7)5, *taṃḍulaveyāliyaṃ* (5)6, *saṃthāra* (4)7, || 1 || *bhattaparinnā* (3)8, *rāhaṇapaḍāga* 9, *gaṇavijjā* (8)10, *aṃgavijjā* 11, *ya | caūsaraṇa* (1)12, *dīvasāgarapannattī* 13, *joisakaramḍaṃ* 14 || 2 || *marāṇasamāhī* 15, *tiṭthogālī* 16, *taha siddhapāhuḍa-painnaṃ* 17 | *narayavibhattī* 18, *caṃdāvijjhāya* (! 6)19, *paṃcakappa* 20 || 3 ||

Here then are twenty names, with but one exception (10 *vīratthaa*) all belonging to the present group. There are five names which recur elsewhere in the *Siddhānta*—(1, 2, 13, 17, 20—; [428] two names which at least were mentioned in connection with the *Siddh.*—14, 15,—; and finally there are four names found nowhere else except here—9, 11, 16, 18. It is of especial interest to observe the ascribing of *Nandī* and *Aṇuoga* to the *painna* group as being placed before them. This reference recurs in similar fashion in *Svi.*, where the enumeration is but fragmentary and limited to the mention of : *nandī* 1, *aṇuogadārā* 2, *devimdatthau* (7)3, *taṃḍulaveyāliyaṃ* (5)4, *caṃdāvivvīyāi* (! 6)5, *ārapaccakkhāṇa* (2)6, *gaṇivijjāi* (8)7, *painnagānam*. It then speaks of *sesāṇi* but does not enumerate them. In V. the *painna* texts are treated of on two occasions. In the first case we find, for some reason inexplicable to me, in the discussion in reference to the 15th book of *aṅga* 5, an enumeration of ten texts, which are not stated to be *painnas*, though the titles of six are found among the titles of the 10 *painnas*. At the head (the action in question is called *nāndī-m-āiṇaṃ varidaṇaya*) we again find *nandī* and *aṇuoga*; then follow *devimda* (7)3 *taṃḍula* (5)4, *caṃdāvejja* (! 6)5, *gaṇivijjā* (8)6, *marāṇa* 7, *jhāṇavibhatti* 8, *āura* (2)9, *mahāpaccakkhāṇa* ()10. Of these No. 7 is doubtless identical⁷⁸² with *marāṇasamāhī* in *Āvi.* and No. 8 corresponds to a section in 2. See below. The second passage in V. is that in which the *painnas* are directly discussed; [429] and in this passage they appear in the forefront together with *nandī* and *anuoga*.⁷⁸³ Fifteen names are there men-

⁷⁸² The *marāṇasamāhī* is also mentioned elsewhere. See pp. 429, 431. We might well recall the *marāṇavibhatti* in connection with the *marāṇa*, or the *marāṇavisohi* in the enumeration of the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha*, or *aṅgabāhira* texts in *Nandī* etc. All these texts refer without doubt to euthanasia; cf. *painna* 2.

⁷⁸³ The connection with both is, however, very slight, for in v, 61 of the *jogavihāṇa* we find the express statement; *devimdatthaya-m-āi painnagā*, the connection of *nandī* and *aṇuoga* being ignored.

tioned, among which are all the ten members of the present list, though arranged differently, but at the end they are called only *icc-āi* : *sarṇpayam painmagā* : *nandī* 1, *aṇuogadārāim* 2..., *devimḍatthaya* (7)3, *taṇḍulaveyāliya* (5)4, *maraṇasamāhi* 5, *mahāpaccakkhāṇa* (9)6, *āurapaccakkhāṇa* (2)7, *sarṇthāraya* (4)8, *caṇḍāvijjhaya* (6)9, *bhattaparinnā* (3)10, *caūsaraṇa* (1)11 *vīratthaya* (10)12, *gaṇivijjā* (8)13, *ḍīvasāgarapannattisaṇḍagahaṇī* 14, *gacchāyāra* 15, *icc-āi painmagāṇi*. Of the three additional texts mentioned here No. 5 is mentioned in *Āvi.* and elsewhere—see p. 428—as belonging to the *painnas* ; the case is similar with No. 15. No. 14 belongs to the text referred to as No. 13 in *Āvi.*, a text which possesses a considerable antiquity—pp. 268, 389. Is the *saṇḍagahaṇī* on it mentioned here indentical with the *Jaribudvipasaṇḍagrahaṇī* of Haribhadra mentioned p. 413 (on *upāṇga* 6) ? In connection with the above discussion V. treats of the *isibhāsiyāim* (see pp. 259, 281, 402), and allots to them 50⁷⁸⁴ *ajjhayaṇas*. We have already observed that Haribhadra on *Āv.* 2, 6 identifies the *isibh.*, quoted there, with the “*devendrastava* etc.”, but on another occasion identifies the *isibh.* with the *uttarajjhayaṇa*. We read therefore in V. that the *isibh.* were regarded by some as belonging to the *uttarajjh.* [430] *uttarajjhayaṇesu eyāim aṇṭabbhavarānti*, to which the *mahānisīthajogavihi* is joined in V.

In the *Vicārāmṛtasamgraha* (see p. 355) as in the three *sāmāyārī* there is an enumeration of the *painnages*, which begins with *Nandī* and *Aṇuoga*. Nineteen and not 10 *painnas* are here enumerated, but of these only the first three are given a name. The passage, which is interesting for other reasons, reads in the very corrupt MSS : *aṇga* 11, *upāṇga* 12, *chedasaṇḍagaha* 5 (!) *mūlagraṇṭha* 4 *pramūkhāḥ*, *pratiniyatā eva graṇṭhāḥ kalpabhāṣyādyuktasūtralakṣaṇopetāḥ, yataḥ kvā'pi yogavidhaudrśya-mānesu naṇḍy-amuyogadvārā''-turapratyākhyānādy-ekonaviṇṣatiprakīrṇakeṣu keṣāṇ cid eva jītakalpa-paṇcakaḥpādīnāṇ viracayītāro jñāyāṇte nāmagrāhaṇ, na sarveṣāṇ, yeṣāṇ kartāro na jñāyāṇte tāni gaṇadharakṛtāni*. Here then, *āturapratyākhyānam* (2), and not *devendrastava* (7), comes after *nandī* and *amuy*, at the head of the remaining *painnas*. Here as in *Āvi* the *paṇcakaḥpā* and, in connection with it, the *jītakalpa* seem to be counted among the *painnas*, whereas—see below—they are generally held to belong to the *chedasūtra*.⁷⁸⁵

I have been able to discover no further information that would prove the connection of *nandī* and *aṇuoga* with the *painna* group. The lists

⁷⁸⁴ In *aṇga* 4,44 only 44 *ajjh.* are allotted to them in conjunction with the *devaloga-cuyabhāsiya*.

⁷⁸⁵ Either the *paṇc.* or the *jītak.* appears as No. 6. The *Vicārām*, however, recognizes only five *chedasamghas*. See above.

and MSS. of the *painna* group, which I possess, pay no attention to these two texts, [431] and limit the *painnas* to a smaller number, generally to ten.

The enumeration in the *Ratnasāgara* (Cale. 1880) is as follows :—*Caūsaraṇa* (1)1, *saṁthāra* (4)2, *taṁdula* (5)3, *Caṁdāvijjiyā* (6)4, *gaṇa-vijjiyā* (! 8)5, *devavijjiyā* 6, *Virathuva* (10)7, *gacchāyāra* 8, *j(y)otiṣkaraṁḍa* 9, *mahāpaccakkhāṇa* (9)10. Three names found in Bühler's list (2, 3, 7) do not occur here. To compensate for this omission there are 3 texts mentioned, of which one, No. 6, is quite unknown ; the second, No. 8, is found in the V., and the third, No. 9, is referred to even in *Āvi.* among the *painnas*.

In the enumeration of Rajendra Lal Mitra and of Kashinath, see pp. 226, 227, we find the list of Bühler (arranged 1, 2, 3, 9, 5, 6, 8, 7, 4). No. 10 is omitted and replaced by *maraṇasamāhi*, the acquaintance with which name we had already made in *Āvi.* and V., and which here occupies the eighth position (between 8 and 7).

I possess a MS. of the *dasapainnas* which contains a recension varying from that given in Bühler's list. The first page having disappeared, a page which does not belong there has been inserted in its place. It is, therefore, doubtful whether the first part is *caūsaraṇam* (I) or not.⁷⁸⁶ The arrangement of the following parts is (2, 3, 4, 8, 6, 9,⁷⁸⁷ 5). Instead of 7 we have the *gacchāyāra*, [432] which we find in V. (see p. 429) and *Ratnasāgara* (p. 431); but there is nothing to compensate for the omission of 10.

The foregoing considerations prove conclusively that it is a matter involved in uncertainty what texts really belong to the *painna* group, a fact that must be held to render this secondary character a matter of great probability. All that can be drawn from the contents of the present 10 *painnas* makes for the same conclusion.

A considerable portion of the 10 *painnas* refers to the proper sort of euthanasy, the confession necessary for this end and the abjuration

⁷⁸⁶ Though the extent of the *caūsaraṇa* with its 63 *gāthās*, appears to be very large for one leaf, it is, nevertheless possible that the missing leaf may have contained this part, since this MS has upon each page 19 lines of 74 *akṣaras* so that the 2800 *akṣaras* of the front and reverse side would be entirely sufficient for these 63 *gāthās*.

⁷⁸⁷ No. 9 has here not 86 but 31 verses.

of everything evil. Several portions, however, treat of different subjects, viz. :—5 physiology, 7 mythology, 8 astrology, 10 hymns. That portion which is of mythological content recalls the *Atharvaparīṣiṣṭa*, though the *Atharvaparīṣiṣṭa* must precede the *painnas* in order of time, since the latter contains the Greek terms *hora* and *dikkāṇa*.

It is difficult to give a review of the contents of most of these small texts, since we possess no commentary. The character of some portions (1, 5, 6-8) is very dissimilar from that of others ; 6-8 are of a similar type, which marks them out as a separate inter-dependent group. A peculiar characteristic of this group is that the author speaks of himself in the first person, and addresses his listeners in the plural or singular. In No. 7 a woman is the object of his instruction ; and this *painna* has a special claim to antiquity since it is said to be identical with the *isibhāsiyāim* mentioned in *aṅgas* 3 10 4,44 ! See p. 429. It is, however, possible that another text [433] of the same name is there referred to. In the summary which I now give I follow the extant usual list of the 10 *painnas* which is found in Bühler.

XXV. The first *painnam*, *caṭṭsaraṇaṁ*, *catuḥsaraṇaṁ* ; in 63vv. The first seven verses⁷⁸⁸ refer to the *saḍḍāvaśyakam*, the six daily duties necessary for the purification of life. See above pp. 161^a, 244.

1. The *sāmāiam*, *sāmāyikam*, explained in the text itself by *sāvajja-jogaviraṭ*, desistance from all evil.⁷⁸⁹ Cf. the use of this word to denote the first *aṅga* also in *up.* 1,57 (*ib.* 123, 125 *sāvajjajogavahiya*).

2. *caṭṭvīsaiṭhaa*, *cāturviṅśatistava*, explained *ibid.* by : *ukkittaṇṇā*, praise of the virtues of the 24 Jinas.

3. *vaṇḍaṇaa*, explained by *guṇavāo paḍivatti*, honor of the guru.

4. *paḍikkamaṇaṁ*, *pratikkramaṇaṁ* confession (to the guru), explained by *khaliyassa nimḍaṇṇā*, censure of past misdeeds, conjoined with the intention of not committing the offence again.⁷⁹⁰

⁷⁸⁸ The first verse reads : *sāvajjajogaviraṭ ukkittaṇṇā guṇavāo ya paḍivatti | khaliyassa nimḍaṇṇā vaṇaṭigicchā guṇadhāraṇā ceva || 1 ||*. It recurs in similar form in the *Anuyogadvāras*, etc.

⁷⁸⁹ *sahā 'vadyena pāpena vartaṃta iti sāvadyāḥ, yogā manovākkāyavyāpārās, teṣāṃ viratir nivṛttiḥ*.

⁷⁹⁰ *na punaḥ kariṣyāmi 'ty abhyupagamanam* ; hence the name, the meeting, *pratipam kramaṇaṁ*. The *pratikkramaṇaṁ* is (see Jacobi, *Kalpas.* p. 117) divided into five parts ; 1. *daivasikam* (we must accept this and not *devaśikam* as the reading in Jacobi's text) i. e. to be done daily ; 2. *rātrikam* nightly ; 3. *pākṣikam* semi-monthly ; 4. every four months ; 5. annually.

5. *kāussagga, kāyotsarga*, expiation, explained by : *vaṇatigichā*, healing of wounds, further purification of those who have been absolved by confession.

[434] 6. *paccakkhāṇaṃ, pratyākhyāṇaṃ*, explained by : *guṇadhāraṇā*, the observance of all virtues, or really the casting off of all evil.

The following must be noticed as regards the six *āvaśyakas*, which we will discuss later on when treating of *Nandī, Anuyogadv., Āvaśy*. It was to be expected that the explanations given for 1 and 6 should have changed their respective positions, i. e. *sāmāya* should have been explained by *guṇadhāraṇā* and *paccakkhāṇa* by *sāvajjajogaviraṭ*. Had this been the case a better logical arrangement would have been effected, viz. :—1. good action, 2. confession of the commission of misdeeds, 5. compensation for the misdeeds committed, 6. desistance from all further sins. Do not these very names seem to indicate that this was the original arrangement ? The two *āvaśyakas*, cited in the second and third place, interrupt the connection between 1 and 4-6, and are consequently probably to be regarded as secondary additions.

In v. 8⁷⁹¹ the fourteen dreams are enumerated which the mother of a *tīrthakṛt* dreams before his birth, an enumeration which is tantamount to a list of his fourteen excellencies or virtues.

With verse 9 the text *per se* begins (the preceding portion is doubtless a secondary addition) by the author announcing his purpose... *vaṇḍiṇiṃ Mahāviraṇi | kusalāṇubamādhībamādhurāṇi ajjhayaṇaṇi kittaiṣṣāmi ||9||*. Here we have the older name of the text, since the *caṭṭsaraṇaṇi*, as will soon be shown, forms but a part of its contents. [435] In a MS, which contains all the 10 *painnas* and which is preceded by an introduction in reference to the sacred number four, the name of this *painna* is stated to be *kusalāṇubamādhajjhayaṇaṇi* and not *caṭṭsaraṇaṇi*.

In v. 10 is described the three-fold contents of the following portions, and an explanation given for this division that refers to the name adduced in v. 9 : *esa gaṇo aṇavarayaṇi kāyavvo kusalaheṭṭi || 10 ||* At the head stands 1. the *caṭṭsaraṇagamaṇaṇi* (from which the customary title of this *painna* has been borrowed), i. e. the prayers by means of which fourfold protection can be obtained : the *arihaṃta* (*arhant*, v.

791 *Āvaśy*. 2,276, see Jacobi on *Kalpasūtra* Jin. § 4.

13-23), the *siddha* (v. 23-29), the *sāhu* (*sādhū*, v. 30-40) and the *dhamma* (v. 41-48). Then follows 2. *dukkāḍagarihā*, a penitential system (v. 49-54) of confession to the guru, and 3. *sukaḍāṇumoana*, the joy arising from a good deed (v. 55-57). Then come promises of reward and a verse (62) which has compassion on him, through whom *caūramgo Jīṇadhammo na kao, caūramgaṃ saraṇam avi na kayam*. The concluding verse contains the summons *iya...vīra bhaddamtam eam ajjhayanam jhāesu (dhyāya)*. The commentary considers that this implies also a reference to the name of the author Virabhadra, presumably a *sādhū*, one of the 14,000 who joined Vīra.⁷⁹²

[436] There is a commentary by Somasūmdara from the Tapāgaccha; according to the *Gurvāvalī* of this *gaccha* (see Kl. 256) born *samv.* 1430, died 1499, A. D. 1374-1443.

In contradistinction to the triad of the Buddhists *buddha*, *dharma* and *saṃgha* we find here a quadripartite arrangement. The *saṃgha* is divided into two parts, the earlier and the present saints, the *siddha* and the *sādhū*. The Buddhistic *saṃgha*, as is expressly stated in that of the *Avesta*, has reference merely to the pious of the present, who, it may be remarked, are divided in the *Avesta* according to sex : *yenhe hātām...yāōnhām cā tāś ca tāōś ca yazamaide*. The "Holy Ghost" of the Christian trinity, the origin of which we ascribed (*Ind. Streifen* 3, 534) to gnostic connection either with the trinity of the Parsees or with that of the Buddhists, embraces all time.

XXVI. The second *painnam*, *āurapaccakkhāṇam*, *āturapraty°*, c. 70 vv. with an insertion in prose after v. 10 treats 6 of the *renunciatio* of the *moribundus*, the *paṇḍiyamarāṇam*, the genuine euthanasia, cf. *Bhagav.* 2,1,48,76 (my treatise, 2,266-7,299). The introduction consists of enumerations of the five *anuvvayas* (*pāṇivahaveramaṇa* etc.), and of the *guṇānvayas* and *sikkhās*.⁷⁹³ In v. 8 there is a citation from the third *painna* : *jo bhattaparinnāe (bhaktaparakīrṇake) uvakkamo vitthareṇa niddi-ṭṭho*⁷⁹⁴ / *so ce 'va bālapaṇḍiya maraṇe neo jahājuggam || 8 ||* In v. 10 the proclamation of the [437] real intention of the author : *itto paṇḍiya / paṇḍiyamarāṇam*⁷⁹⁵ *vucchaṃ samāseṇam || 10 ||*

792 *yo 'sau Virabhadrasādhuh śrī Virasaktaḥ caturdaśa-sahasramadhyavartī tasye 'dam etad adhayanam, evaṃ śāstrakartuḥ samāsagarbham abhidhānam uktaṃ; asya cā 'dhyayanasya Virabhadrasādhukṛtāvajñāpanena yasya jīnasya yāvantaḥ sādhaḥ pratyekabudhā (see pp. 265, 334) api tāvaṃta eva prakīrṇāny api tāvaṃti bhavaṃti 'ti jñāpitam bhavati (! see below on the Nandī).*

793 In the *Vicārāṃṭtasamgha*—see p. 430—the *āurap°* is placed after *nandī* and *anuyoga*, at the head of the *painnas*.

794 See Windisch in *Jour. Germ. Or. Soc.* 28,226 (1874).

795 *itaḥ paṇḍitānām viśesato 'pi paṇam procyate saṃkṣepataḥ.*

The prose paragraph which follows contains a general formula for confession and renunciation, beginning with the words : *icchāmi bhamte uttamaṭṭham* (! *uttamārtham pāpānām prakāram*, gloss) *pratikramāmi*, and closes with 63 *jhāna*, *dhyāna*, formulas, beginning, *annānam jhāne*.⁷⁹⁶ Joined to these are corresponding formulas composed in *gāthās*. The methods of counting the verses vary greatly in the different MSS., since in some the prose part is counted in as 13 verses, so that the total sum is 84 verses ; and differences of another nature are also apparent. The scholiast on the *Nandī*, it may be remarked in passing,⁷⁹⁷ in his enumeration of the *anāga pavitṭha* texts, held another text than the present one to be the *āurapaccakkhānam* !

[438] XXVII. Third *painnam*, the *bhattaparinnā*, *bhaktaparijñā*, in 172 vv., treats of the *bālaparindiyamarānam*. Cf. the citation just made from v. 8 of the second *painna*. This *painna* contains ethical precepts⁷⁹⁸ which refer constantly to the *Jinasāsanam*, *Jiṇavayaṇam*, the *Jinapaṇiya* (*praṇīta*) doctrines, while at the same time it cites its own title ; cf. (v. 9-11, 14, 18, 35, 169, 171). In the verse before the last, this *painna* is said like *painna* 1 to refer back to (the doctrines of) Vīrabhadda, though it is perhaps better to assume that Mahāvīra himself is referred to in this verse :—*ia jo īsarā-jīṇa-vī-rabhaddabhaṇiyāṇusārīṇīm* (!) *īṇam-o/ bhattaparinnam dhanno paḍharṇti nisunarṇti bhāvaṇti || 171 || sattarisayam Jiṇāna va gāhānam samayakhittapannattam/ārāhamto vihiṇā sāsayasukkhām lahai mukkhām || 172 ||* According to this concluding verse the text should contain only 170 verses, but perhaps the two concluding verses are a secondary addition. The plural of the verbs in v. 171 in opposition to those in the singular *jo...dhanno* is at least very peculiar. Instead of the Sanskrit °*sārīṇīm* (°*sārīṇām* B ! both times with *m*) °*sārīṇīm* is doubtless the better reading.

⁷⁹⁶ *jhāne* is always construed here with the accus., i. e. probably as 1 p. sing. *ātm.* of a denominative (*dhyānay*) ? A collection of examples of these *dhyānas* is to be found in the introduction of Harṣakuśala's commentary on the fourth *painna* ; *dhyānabhedas tu likhyaṇte ; annānājhāne, atra māsatūsadīṣṭāntah*. Harṣakuśala recognizes the number of these formulas as 64. The words before *jhāne* appear in thematic form, as *pūrvapadāni*, and not as accus. Cf. the *Jhānavibhatti* above, p. 428.

⁷⁹⁷ The scholiast has here : *cāritrasya vidhiḥ : gilānakiraṇāṭīyam giyaṭṭhā paccakkhāvīṇti diṇe 2 dāvvaḥāsam kareṭṭā amte a savvada paṇayāe bhattatheragam | jāṇattā ṇittīṇhassa bhavacarimappaccakkhānam kārave(m)ti tti ityādi yatra varṇyate ; mahāpratyākhyānam yatro 'ktam*. Even if the name *āturapratyākhyānam* is not directly mentioned, the meaning and the position of these words between the explanations of the titles : *caraṇavihi* and *mahāpaccakkhānam* makes most decidedly for the conclusion that this very corrupt statement of contents, the metre of which cannot be restored, belongs to the title *āura*° which in the text is between these two titles. On *giyaṭṭhā* see below (pp. 450, 464, 478), on the *chedasutta*.

⁷⁹⁸ Directions as to how a man should abstain from food, Kash.

XXVIII. Fourth *painnam*, *saṁthāra*, *saṁstāra*, in 122 vv., treats of the bed upon straw. Cf. *Bhagav.* 2,1,70,74 (my treatise 2, 293, 297) as a preparation for the *paṁḍiyamaraṇam*, the proper euthanasy. The title *saṁthāra* is frequently referred to throughout the text; cf. v. 1, 3, 4,15,21,27,30 etc.), thus e.g. *saṁthārammī nibaṁdham guṇaparivāḍim nisāmeḥa* // 1 //. This was the case with *painna* 3.

[439] In v. 32-44 the qualities of the man are described who intends to ascend the *saṁthāra*, the second hemistich recurring throughout as a refrain; ...*āruhai jo saṁthāraṁ suvisuddho tassa saṁthāro*. In v. 56 fg. there are cited all manner of instances of those who died *saṁtharam ārūḍhā*. Thus, the flower-gatherer (? *pupphacūlā*) *Ajjā* in *Poyaṇapura* v. 56 *Sukosalarisi* v. 63, examples from *Ujjeṇī* v. 65, *Rohīdagaṁ naya-ram* v. 68, *Pāḍaliputta* vv. 70,73 *Kosaṁbī* v. 78, *Kuṇālanagara* v. 80, the names *Kurudatta* v. 84, *Gayasukumāla* v. 85, *Cilāiputta* v. 86, *Maṁkhali* v. 87. It concludes: *eva(m) mae abhithuyā saṁthāragaimdakham-dham ārūḍha | susamaṇanarimḍacaṁḍā suhasaṁkamaṇaṁ sayā dimtu* // 122 //.

XXIX. Fifth *painnam*, *taṁḍulaveyāliyam*,⁷⁹⁹ in verse, prose and again in verse. The contents are of an anthropological and physiological nature, and are briefly stated in the introduction:—

vocchaṁ painnagam iṇaṁ taṁḍulaveāliyaṁ nāma // 1 //
*suṇaha gaṇie*⁸⁰⁰ *dasa dasā (disā A) vāsasayāussa jahā vibhajjaṁti,*
saṁkalie vogasie jaṁ cā'yum sesayaṁ hoi // 2 //
jattiyamitte divase jattiyā rāi muhuttam ussāso |
gabbhammi vāsai jīvo āhāravihim ya vecchāmi // 3 //

Then follows the statement that the *jīva* [440] remained in the womb 277 full *ahorattas* and one-half of an *ahoratta* (cf. *Aup.* § 104) – (26 verses + 3). The prose treats especially of the life and development of the embryo in the womb, striking parallels to which are found in the statements in *Nirukti* 14,6,7, and the *Garbhopaniṣad* (*Ind. Stud.*

⁷⁹⁹ It is uncertain how we are to translate or explain this. In *aṅgas* 2,1,2 *veyāliya* is = *yaīdārika*, in *dasaveāliya* = *vaikālika*. In ms. or fol. 1075 the title is translated by *taṁḍulavaitālikam*; and also in *Kashinath* (the state of a child in the womb, its birth, etc.),

⁸⁰⁰ *jyotiḥśāsti* e, gloss.

2, -65). The subject is treated in the form of a dialogue, in antique form, between Mahāvīra and Goyama. The nominative often ends in *e* and not in *o*, so that we may suppose an older source is the base of this recital. Then follows an enumeration of the *dasa dasāo* (*disāo* A), ten "ages of man" (cf. *Ath.* 3,4,7) : *bālā*, *kiṭṭā* (A, *kiḍā* B, *viḍḍā* C), *maṇḍā*, *balā*, *pannā*, *hāyaṇi*, *pavaṇcā*, *pabbhārā*, *mummuhi* (A, *ma°* B, *su°* C), *māyaṇī*. These are then treated separately in metre. The text then returns to prose and treats, in connection with the *āyus*, of the divisions of time : *āvaliyā*, *khaṇa* up to the *koḍākoḍīu*, i.e. millions of years, after which it discusses the multiplicity of bodily relations and of the nature of the body in general. Next come the dry measures based upon the *māgahao pattho*, cf. *Ath. par.* 35,3 (my treatise on the *Jyot.* p. 80 ; *Aupap.* § 80,98) measures of length, of time, the number of the bones, sinews and other parts of the body, of all manner of diseases, of women, &c. Here and there we find verses inserted though they are not counted in continuously with the rest. At the conclusion we find 18 verses :—

eyam soun sarirassa (metre !) *vāsāṇam gaṇiyapāgaḍamahattham* /
mokkhaṇimassa iha (metre !) *samattam saḥassapattassa* (metre !) || 17 ||
eyam saḍaḍasariram jāi-jarā [441] *maṇaveyaṇābaulam* / *taha pattaha*⁸⁰¹
*kāum je*⁸⁰² *jaha mucchaḥa savvadukkhāṇam* || 18 ||.

XXX. Sixth *painnam*, *caṇḍavijjhayam*,⁸⁰³ in 174 vv. In the introduction, a *dāragāhā* (v. 3), with a conspectus of the contents. Vv. 4-19 treat of *vinaya* in general, vv. 20-35 of the qualities of a teacher, *āyariyagūṇa*, vv. 36-51 of the scholar, *sīsagūṇa*, vv. 52-65 of the impediments (?), *niggahagūṇa*,⁸⁰⁴ in the way of the *vinaya*, vv. 66-98 of perception, *nāṇagūṇa*, vv. 99-114 of the conduct of life *caranagūṇa*, v. 115 fg. of death, *maṇagūṇa*. All these sections are clearly separated by a verse which marks the end of one and the beginning of another (20, 35, 52, 66, 98, 115). Thus, e.g. v. 20 : *vinayassa guṇavisesā ee mae vaṇṇiā samāseṇam* / *āyariyāṇam ca guṇe egamaṇā me nisāmeḥa* || 20 || In v. 173 the contents is repeated or recapitulated as in the *dāragāhā* and the concluding verse is closely connected with that of *painna* 6 :

⁸⁰¹ Cf. *pattihi* in Hāla.

⁸⁰² See Hem. 2,217, Hāla 524 in *Bhuv* (p. 189).

⁸⁰³ The name is obscure: *viyyaya* in A, but *vijjhaya* in B. *Nandī*, *Pākṣika* and in the three *sāṇācāri*; once in *Avi.* °*vijjhāya*, in *Svi.* °*vivvryai* (a poor MS) and °*vejja* in V; Kashinath has; *candāvijaya*, an account of witchcraft, magic and mysticism (!).—The right Sanskrit equivalent of the title is *Candraka-vedhya* which, as *Ogha-niryukti* 1142 shows, is the same as *rādhāvedhya* 'aim-striking'.—L.

⁸⁰⁴ *niggayagūṇa* vv. 3, *niggahagūṇe* in vv. 52 and 173.

*tahapattaha kāurñ je jaha muccaha gabbhavāsavasahiṇaṃ | maraṇapu-
ṇabbhavajammanaduggaiviṇivāyagamaṇāraṃ || 174 ||.*

XXXI. Seventh *painnaṃ*, *deviṇḍatthaa*, *deveṇḍrastava* ; in 300 vv. A systematic enumeration of the 32 *deviṇḍas*, and of all the gods according to their [442] groups, dwelling places &c.⁸⁰⁵ The Nom. Sing. M. of Decl. I ends frequently in *e*, perhaps because the contents partially follows the statements in the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*. The divisions are here, as in the case of *painna* 6, distinctly separated ; and the author here, too, speaks of himself in the first person, and addresses not unfrequently (cf. p. 458) a *surindarī*, *suaṇu*, as the one for whom his work is intended.⁸⁰⁶

A patent contradiction to this secular method of treatment is found in Haribhadra on *Āvaśy.* 2, 6, where the author proclaims himself to be the composer of a *nijjutti* : *isibhāsiṇaṃ*, and explains this word by *deveṇḍrastavādināṃ*. We have seen above (pp. 259, 281, 429) that on 8,4 he referred it to the *uttarajjhāṇa*. That our text should be so honoured as to be brought into connection with a work of such an important title as the *isibhāsiya* (cf. *aṅgas* 3,10,4,44) and to have been thought worthy of a *nijjutti* at the hands of the author of the *Āvaśya-niryukti* (whoever this may have been), seems utterly impossible if we take into consideration the secondary character of this small mythological manual (see above pp. 280, 432). It is, however, worth our attention to note the fact that also in *Svi.* V. (see above, p. 428 fg.) the *painnas* are frequently said to begin with a text of this name.

[443]. The table of contents in v. 7. ff. reads : *kayare te vattisaṃ devīṇḍā ? ko va kattha parivasā ? kevaīyā kassa thi ? ko bhavaṇaparigga-
ho kassa ? || 8 || kevaīyā nu vimāṇā ? bhavaṇā nagarā ca hurñti kevaīyā ?
puḍhaviṇa ca vāhuttam uyyattavimāṇa vinno (?) vā || 9 || kāraṇti ca kāleṇā (!)
ukkoṣaṃ majjhimaṃ jahannaṃ ca | ussāso nissāso udāhi (?) viṣo va ko
keṣiṃ ? || 10 ||* and closes : *deviṇḍanikāyāṇaṃ thao (iha) samatto apari-
seso || 300 ||.*

805 Panegyrics on the Tirthakara's by Deva and Indra (!), Kashinath.

806 The introduction states the situation in explicit terms : *koi (ko ?) paḍhama-
paṭṭasammi sāvaṃ samayaniceiya-vipahāṇu (?) metre) vannei vayam uyāram jiya-
māṇe Vaddhamāṇammi || 3 || tassa thupāṇṭassa (V stu, Cl. 9) jīṇaṃ sāmāyakaḍā
piyāsu haṇisaṇṇā | pañjaliuḍā abhimuḍi suṇai vayam Vaddhamāṇassa || 3 || Like-
wise in v. 7 : *sā piyam bhaṇai*, and in v. 11 : *padipucchio piyāe bhaṇai : suaṇu !
taṃ nisāṇieha*. Further on frequently : *vaṇṇihimi* or *vannehim* (! *vaṇṇayisyāmi*),
vucchaṃ, *vucchāmi*, &c.*

XXXII. Eighth *painnam*, *gaṇivīyyā*, *gaṇividyā*, in 86 vv. The contents is of an astrological character.⁸⁰⁷ It begins : *vucchaṃ balābalavihiṃ navabalavihisuttasamciu pasatthaṃ/jiṇavayaṇabhāsiyam iṇaṃ pavayaṇasatthammi jahadiṭṭhaṃ ||1||*, and treats according to the *dāragāhā* (v. 2) : 1, of the days, *divasa*, vv. 3-8,—2 of the lunar days, *tihi*, vv. 9, 10,—3 of the *nakṣatra*, vv. 11-41,—4 of the *karaṇa*, vv. 42-46—5 of the planets, *gaha-divasa*, vv. 47, 48,—6 of the hours, *muhutta*, vv. 49-58,—7. of the omens, *saiṇabalam* vv. 59-63—8. of the horoscope, *laggabalam*, vv. 64-72, and 9 of the signs, *nimitta*, vv. 73-85 — The context corresponds in character with the statements of the *Atharvaparīṣiṣṭa*. The names of the *nakṣatras* represent a secondary stage⁸⁰⁸ as *upāṅgas* 5-7. The *karaṇas* are, however, recognized here as in *up.* 6, though the fourth [444] is called, as in *up.* 6, not *taitila* but *thiloaṇa*. In the discussion in reference to the *lagna* the word *horā* is found (v. 66) and, as it appears (the passage is corrupt), also the word *dikkāṇa* (vv. 67, 69), so that we have a patent instance of Greek influence.

The second collection of the *dasapainna* (see above p. 431) allots only 31 vv. to the *gaṇivīyyā*. Of the verses here only the following recur there : 1—14, 21—32, 35, 37, 74, 82 ; §§ 4—8 are entirely wanting, § 3 has instead of 31 vv. only 14, and § 9 instead of 13 only 2.

XXXIII. Ninth *painnam*, *maḥāpaccakkhāṇam*, in 143 vv. A general formula designed for confession and renunciation. It begins : *esa karemi paṇāmaṃ tiṭṭhayaṇāṇaṃ aṇuttaragaṇaṇaṃ |... || 1 ||.../ saddahe jinapannattam paccakkhāemi (a) pāvagaṃ || 2 || jaṃ kiṃ cī ducariyaṃ tam ahaṃ nimdāmi savvabhāṇaṃ | sāmāiyaṃ ca tivihim karemi savvaṃ nirāgāraṃ || 3 ||*. The verses frequently close as groups with the same refrain e.g. *paṇḍiyamaṇaṇaṃ marīhāmi* (future) vv. 41-48, *pāvagao marīhāmi* v. 50, *rakkhāmi mahavvāe paṇca* vv. 68-76, *sāhaṃti* (or *sāheum*) *appaṇo attham* vv. 80-84, *vosirāmi, tti pāvagaṃ* vv. 116-120. The formula uses the first person alone ; *nimdāmi garihāmi, vosirāmi, vosire, khāmemi, paccāikkhāmi* (!). It concludes *eyam paccakkhāṇaṃ anupāleuṇa suvihio sammamāṇvemaṇiya vva devo haviyya ahavā visiyyiyya ||143||*. It, therefore, opens up as the prospect of the reward of correct performance of confession, entrance among the *vemaṇiya* gods or complete dissolution (*viśīryeta*).

⁸⁰⁷ The *avacūri* on the *Nandī* explains as follows : *gaṇividyā jyotiṣkaṇimittādi-pari-jñānarūpā, sā hi samyak pariñāyamānā pravrajānosāmāyikāropānopasthāpānāsrutoddesanujāgūṇāropānādisānujñāvihārādiprayojaneṣu upayogini.*

⁸⁰⁸ The name *jīṭhamūla* (see *Ind. Stud.* 10,286) is found here (v. 11) see p. 380.

XXXIV. The tenth *painnaṃ*, *vīrathaa*, *vīrastava*, in 43 vv. Enumeration of the names of the *siri* Vaddhamāṇa [445] (v. 4). It begins : *namīūṇa jinaṃ jayajīvabamdhavaṃ bhaviyakusumarayaṇiyaraṃ* / *Viram giri-mḍadhīraṃ thuṇāmi* (staumi) *payatthanāmehiṃ* || 1 ||. It concludes : *iya nāmāvali saṃthuyā siri Vīrajiṇiṃda maṃdasuṇassa* (ṇassa ?) *viyara karuṇā Jinavara* / *sitapayamaṇahatthiraṃ* (?) *Vīra* || 43 ||.

The *gacchāyāraṃ*, which in V., in the *Ratnasāgara*, and in the second collection of all the *painnas* that I have before me, is cited as a part of the collection (see pp. 429, 431) contains in 138 vv. general rules of life, especially those for the *bhikkhu* and *bhikkhūṇi*, in the form of a lesson to Goyama, who is several times mentioned in it. It begins : *namīūṇa Mahāvīraṃ* / *gacchāyāraṃ kiṃci uddharimo suasamuddāo* || 1 || *atth' ege Goyamā ! pāṇid* / *je ummaggapaiṭṭhi* / *gacchammi saṃvasittānaṃ* / *bhamai bhavaparaṃparaṃ* || 2 ||. The metre is almost everywhere *śloka*, though two syllables are often counted as one, one short being cast away ; so for example in v. 15 : *saṃgahovaggahaṃ vihiṇā* / *na karei a jogaṇi* / *samaṇaṃ samanīm tu dikkhittā* / *sāmāyārīṃ na gāhae* || 15 || *vihiṇā, samaṇaṃ, samaṇīm* are to be read as dissyllables.

At the end it is called (see verse 1) an extract from the *mahānisiha-kappa* and the *vavahāra*, sources which explain the use of the *śloka* here : *mahānisihakappāo/vavahārāo tahe 'vaya sāhu-sāhuṇi-aṭṭhāe* / *gacchāyāraṃ samuddhīraṃ* || 136 || *paḍhamasuṇi sāhuṇo, eam* / *asajjhāyaṃ vivajjium* / *uttama suanissamdaṃ* / *gacchāyāraṃ suuttamaṃ* || 137 || *gacchāyāraṃ suṇittānaṃ* [446] *paḍhittā bhikkhu bhikkhūṇi* / *kuṇamtu jaṃ jahābhaṇīaṃ* / *icchaṃtā hīaṃ appaṇo* || 138 ||.

The fourth group of *Siddhānta* texts is composed of D. the six *chedasūtras*.

So at least according to Buhler's list (see above, p. 226). In the *Āyāravihi* and in the *Ratnasāgara* (Calc. 1880) these assert a prior place —between the *upāṅgas* and the *painnas*. The name *chedasūtra*⁸⁰⁹ (*cheda*, cutting section ?) can be explained in many ways. There is no authentic explanation that I have been able to discover. This name recurs in the texts in question as infrequently as in the paragraphs in the MSS. The first time where it is mentioned, so far as I know,⁸¹⁰ is in the

⁸⁰⁹ An older form of the name is perhaps *chasua*, *chedasruta* ; thus in a citation in the *Vicārāmyāsaṃgraha* : "nisiḥam-āyassa cheasuassa" ; *chedasaṃgha*, too, is found in the same place (see p. 430), where it is said that they are five in number.

⁸¹⁰ The name of the second group of the *cārittaguṇapramāṇa* in the *Anuyogadvāra-sūtra* - *chedavaddhāvāniacar*—may be recalled in this connection.

Āvaśy. nījj. 8,55 : *jam ca mahākappaṃ*⁸¹¹ *jāni a sesāni chea suttāni*, from which passage it is clear that then, besides the *mahākappaṃ*, there existed several other texts belonging to this group (*kalpādīni* Schol.) ; and in another passage of the above cited work (16,100) there are enumerated three texts, which, at present, still bear this name and which state that they were divided⁸¹² just as we find them. They appear [447] to belong together after a fashion and to form a united group. In the enumeration of the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts in the *Nandī*, in the *Pākṣikasūtra* and in the three *sāmācārīs* we find these texts arranged in the same order (*dasāṇaṃ, kappassa, vavahārassa*). In the *sāmācārīs*, in the passage in reference to the number of days necessary to learn them, we find that but one *suyakkhamdha* is allotted to them all : *kappavavahāradasāṇaṃ* (so *Āvi.*, *Svi.*, *dasākārāṇaṃ V.*) *ego suyakkhamdho*. The *Vidhipr.*, however, states that some (*kei*) “*kappavavahārāṇaṃ bhinnāṃ suyakkhamdham icchamti*.”

The title *cheasutta* is not mentioned in this list of the *anaṅgapaviṭṭhas* or *anagabāhiras*, which cites, in addition to the three texts held to be *cheasuttas*, two others immediately afterward, one name alone intervening. These additional *cheasuttas* are *nisīha* and *mahānisīha*, which now stand at the head of the *chedās*. The *mahākappasuam* (see p. 478), too, is found in the list, but in a different place—about 24 places previous. From this we draw the conclusion that the author of the list did not regard the *mahākappasuam* (see p. 478) as belonging to these *cheasuttas*.

The *mahākappa*^o is mentioned in no other passage. In all other passages, where the *chedasūtras* are enumerated, the *nistham* is invariably placed at the head of the list. Thus in *Āvi.*, where the number of days necessary for learning the *chedasūtras* is stated, [448] there are enumerated as the “*cheaggamṭha*” (here placed between *upāṅgas* and *painnas* ; see p. 446) the seven names : *nisīha, dasā, kappa, vavahāra, mahānisīha, paṃcakappa* and *jiakappa*. The *paṃcakappa* is mentioned also under the *painnas*. Cf. above, pp. 427, 430. The case is similar in *Svi.*, where, however, the name *chea*^o is omitted, and the discussion on this subject is inserted between that concerning *aṅgas* 4 and 5. In *Svi.* only *sīha*,

⁸¹¹ According to the Scholiast these texts are borrowed from the *diṭṭhiyā* (*aṅga* 12), and, consequently, are to be regarded as *ṛṣibhāṣita* : *mahākālpaśrutādinām apī ṛṣibhāṣitatvā(d) dṛṣṭivādād uddhṛitya teṣāṃ pratipaditavāt dharmakathānuyoga yvā* (°*gatvās ca*)? *prasamgaḥ*.

⁸¹² *dasa uddesanakālā dasāna, kappassa humti chac ceva | dasa ceva vavahārassa humti | sarve vī chavvisam ||*.

dasā, *kappa* and *vavahāra* are treated of together, *pañcakappa* and *jiakappa* not being mentioned, *mahānisiha* is disposed of at another place, viz. :—at the end of the entire *jogavihi* after the *painnas*. V. agrees herein with *Svi.* completely, with the exception that, as *Āvi.*, it adds *pañcakappa* and *jiakappa* to *nistha*, *dasā*, *k.* and *vav.* In the metrical portion at the close, the *jogavihāṇa-pagarana*, however, the first four are treated of either as to be learned together in 30 days or as '*savvāṇi vi cheasuttāṇi*' v. 22. In the next verse (23) there are statements concerning *jīyak.* and *pañcak.* (*mahānistha* is not discussed till vv. 63,64). In the *Vicārāmṛtas.* the *cheasuam* is called *nisiha-m-āiyam*—on *jitak.*, *pañcak.* see p. 430—; and in the commentary on the *śrāddhajītakalpa*—see below—*śrī nīsthādi chedagranthasūtra* is spoken of. We find that this agrees with Bühler's list (above, p. 226).

Besides this arrangement which places *nīstha* at the head we meet with statements in modern sources in which the number composing the series varies in many ways. The series, as we have seen above, was never fixed, continually varying between 4 and 7 members.

[449] In the *Ratnasāgara* (Calc. 1880) we find the following arrangement : *vyavahāravṛhatkalpa*, *daśāśruta*, *nīstha*, *mahānīstha*, *jītakalpa*. These names are the same with an exception in the case of *jītakalpa* (Bühler has *pañcakalpa* ; *Āvi.* has both names). The arrangement of Rāj. L. Mitra and after him that of Paṇḍit Kashinath Kunte, taking its rise from the *Siddhāntadharmaśāra*, is very remarkable. See my remarks on p. 227.

The uncertainty of modern tradition may, it is true, create an impression unfavourable to the age of the *chedasūtra* texts which we possess. On the other hand, there are sufficient arguments which permit us to ascribe a relatively ancient date to the chief group at least, i.e. the three texts : *dasā-kappa-vavahārā*. The order which I have here followed is, without doubt, the old arrangement, though, for convenience sake, I adopt that of Bühler from this point on : *vavahāra*, *dasā*, *kappa*. We must here consider the statements of tradition in reference to the origin and composition of these texts.

Haribhadra, on *Āvaśy.* 6,88, explains the third of the three forms of the *sāmācārī* which are mentioned in the text : *ohe dasahā payavibhāge*, the *padavibhāgasāmācārī* by *chedasūtrāṇi*, and, as we have seen above, p. 357, he states that this is *chedasūtralakṣaṇāṇ navamapūrvād eva nirvyūḍhā*. On *Āvaśy.* 7,64 he limits the equalization of the *padavīcārī* to

kalpa and *vyavahāra* (*sā ca kāhārarūpā*). The same statement exists in the *avacūri* composed A.D. 1383 by Jñānasāgara on the *Oghaniryukti* [450] *padavi°cāri kalpa-vyavahārau* ; and *pūrva* 9 (*vastu* 3, *prābhṛta* 20) is referred to as the source—see above, p. 357—whence this *Bhadra-bāhusvāminā nirvyūdhā*. The composition of these two texts, *kalpa* and *vyavahāra*, is frequently referred back⁸¹³ to Bhadrabāhu, who is said to have made use of the same sources as they. But in the *ṛṣimāṇḍalasūtra* (Jacobi, *Kalpas*, p. 11), (p. 472) the same is asserted of the third member of this group of texts, the *dasāu*. We have consequently here, as in the case of *upāṅga* 4, to deal with an author whose name is specially mentioned. Whether this claim is correct or not (we will refer to this question below), the connection with the *pūrvas* according to tradition, is significant.

The contents of the existing *chedasūtras* makes it probable that a large portion of them is of considerable antiquity. This content refers in general to the clergy and the rules of conduct prescribed⁸¹⁴ for them, though there is a large admixture of subsidiary matter of a legendary character (e. g. the entire *Kalpasūtram*). The first two rules, according to the existing order, refer to expiations and penances (*prāyaścitta*) ;⁸¹⁵ while all the rest contain general matters referring to discipline.

[451] There is other testimony of an external character which makes for the antiquity of the *chedasūtras*. The first of these is, as is well known, closely connected with *aṅga* 1, and is, in fact, called a part of the latter (p. 254). *Chedasūtras* 2, 4 bear the stamp of antiquity because they resemble *aṅgas* 1-4 as regards the introduction ; and because *chedas*, 2-5 resemble the same *aṅgas* as regards the conclusion.⁸¹⁶ The ancient date of *chedas* 4 is *co ipso* attested by the thoroughgoing mention of it and its ten sections in *aṅga* 3,10.

⁸¹³ The same is asserted of the *nistham* ; see p. 453n.

⁸¹⁴ It corresponds consequently to the *vinaya* of the Buddhists with which, despite all differences, it is closely connected in contents and in style of treatment.

⁸¹⁵ The expression *giatthā* in the last verse of Dharmaghoṣa's *śrāddhajītakalpa* (see p. 478), treating of the *prāyaścitta*, is explained in the anonymous scholiast there-upon by *giatthāḥ śrīniśithādicchedagramthasūtrārthadharāḥ* i.e. *giatthā* is explained by *chedagramthasūtra*. Dh. recommends to the *giatthā* the correction of his work, which he conceives of as being closely connected with the *chedasūtras*. This name *giatthā* does not agree particularly well with the form of the text of the existing *chedasūtras*, since a large portion of the latter is composed in prose, and *śloka* not *gāthā* is the prevailing form of metre in the metrical portions. Cf., however, the name of the sixth book of the second *chedas*.

⁸¹⁶ It must, however, be noticed that (p. 448) in *Svi.* and *V.* the *cheda* texts are treated of between *aṅga* 4 and *aṅga* 5.

The testimony is not so favourable in the case of *chedasūtra* 2. It must be ascribed to a somewhat later date from the fact that it contains a polemic against the *ninhaga*, a mention of the *dasapuvvin* etc. See below. We have exact chronological data for the *Kalpasūtram*, inserted in *chedas*. 4. See p. 472.

It is remarkable that there are old commentaries called *bhāṣya* and *cūrṇi*,⁸¹⁷ composed in Prakrit, the first kind of texts written in *gāthās*, the second in prose, on three of our texts :—*niśiha*, *vavahāra*, *kappa*. The Nom, Sgl. M. of the 1. Decl. ends invariably in *o* and not in *e* ; and extensive use is made of the insertion of an inorganic *m*. The Prakrit shows many traces of a later age, e. g., we find the thematic instead of the declined form. Furthermore, the fact that these *bhāṣyas* [452] are, for the most part, composed in *gāthās*, whereas the verses in the *chedasūtras* are mostly *ślokas*, deserves our attention.

The extent of each of the texts is as follows :—1. *niśiham* 812 (or 815) *grāṁthas*,—2. *mahāniśiham* 4504 gr.,—3. *vavahāra*, 500 gr.,—4. *daśāśrutaskandham* 800 gr., exclusive of the *Kalpasūtra*, that contains 1254 gr.,—5. *brhatkalpa* 475 gr.—6. *pañcakalpa* (is wanting).

XXXV. First *Chedasūtram* the *Nisihajjhayaṇam*. This name is explained, strangely enough, by *niśiṭṭha*, though the character of the contents would lead us to expect *niśedha*. In the scholiast on *Uttarajjh*. 26,2 *niśiṭṭhiyā* is paraphrased by *niśedhikī* ; and so in the scholiast on *Dasaveālia* 5,2,2 : *asamañjasaniśedhān niśedhikī* ; in the scholiast on *Āvaśy*. 7,1, and on *Amuyogadv*. introduction (2^b in A) where Hemacandra explains it by *śavaparisthāpanabhūmiḥ*. The statements in the text in *Āvaśy*. 7,33, fg. are decisive :—*jamhā tattha nisiddho teṇaṁ niśiṭṭhiā hoi* || 33 || ..*jo hoi nisiddhappā | niśiṭṭhiā tassa bhāvao hoi | avisuddhassa niśiṭṭhiā kevalamittam havai saddo* || 135 || : in 10,40,41 we read *baddham abaddham tu suam, baddham tu duvālasaṁganiddiṭṭham | tavvivariam abaddham, niśiṭṭham anisiṭṭha baddham tu* || 40 || *bhūe pariṇayavigae saddakaraṇam taheva anisiṭṭham | pacchannam tu niśiṭṭham niśiṭṭha nāma jahajjhayaṇam* ||41|| Scholiast here :⁸¹⁸ *iha baddhaśrutam niśiṭṭham anisiṭṭham aniśedham ca, tatra rahasya* [453] *pāṭhād rahasyopadeśāc ca pacchannam niśiṭṭham ucyate prakāśapāṭhāt prakāśopadeśāc ca 'niśiṭṭham, ...niśiṭṭham guptārtham ucyate*. From this we may indubitably⁸¹⁹ conclude that the explanation by

⁸¹⁷ See Jacobi *Kalpas*. pp. 16, 25.

⁸¹⁸ *padyaadyabandhanād baddham, śāstropadeśavad : dvād. ācārādiganipīṭakam .. lakṣaṇam : abaddham laukikam.*

⁸¹⁹ In the enumeration of the 10 *sāmāyārī* (*aṅgas* 3,10; 5,7. *uttarajjh*. 26, *Āvaśy* 7) the *avassaya* commandments, are always found together with the *niśiṭṭhiyā*, prohibitions (Leumann).

*niṣṭha*⁸²⁰ is simply an error, and is to be classed in the same category as the explanation of *uvavāiyam* by *aupapātikam* and of *rāyapasenālyyam* by *rājaprasāṇyam*.

Whether we are to understand our text under the *niṣṭhajjhay*^o mentioned in *aṅga* 4 (see p. 280) as part of the first *aṅga* or under the *niṣiha nāmaṃ ajjhayaṇam* in *Āvaśy.* 10,41 is a matter of doubt, since its title is perhaps not passive=*pacchannaṃ* (s. below), *guptārtham*, but active in sense. Nevertheless the statements, which (see p. 254 ff.) are found in *aṅga* 1 in relation to its fifth *cūlā* called *niṣṭha* (cf. also *niṣṭhiya* as the name of *ajjh* 2 of the second *cūlā*, *ibid.*) and in the introduction of the *niṣṭhacūṛṇi* in reference to the identity of the *chedasūtra* with this fifth *cūlā*,⁸²¹ make at least for the conclusion that tradition regards the *niṣṭham ajjhayaṇam* in our *chedasūtra* as originally forming a part of *aṅga* 1 and separated from it at a later period. This does not, of course, exclude the possibility that the text in question existed originally as it exists to-day in an independent condition, and that it was at a later period joined with *aṅga* 1, whence it was again separated.

In the *Nandī*—see below—[454] the *niṣṭham* is mentioned after *dasā kappo vavahāro* and before *mahāniṣṭham*. It is, therefore, certain that our text is referred to. The statements, which are found⁸²² in *Āvaśy.* 16,114 (s. p. 255n) in reference to the three-fold division of *niṣṭham* into three *ajjhayaṇas*, by name *ugghāyam*, *aṇugghāyam* and *āruvāṇā*, are not in harmony with the constitution of our text, which contains no trace of such a three-fold division, but on the other hand is divided into 20 *uddesakas*,⁸²³ containing hardly anything but prohibitions for the *bhikkṣu*.⁸²⁴ The words *ugghātiya* and *aṇuggh*^o are, it is true, made use of, but this does not presuppose a direct division into 3 *ajjh*.⁸²⁵ All these prohibitions commence with the following words (cf. the formula in the *Pratimokṣasūtra* of the Buddhists):—*je bhikkhu...kareṃ* and end with *kareṃtam*

⁸²⁰ Intermediate forms are *niṣidha*—see just above—and *niṣṭha* in the scholiast on *aṅga* 1.

⁸²¹ *Śīlāṅka*, in the introduction to the second *śrutask* of *aṅga* 2 says that the “*acāra-prakalpo niṣṭhaḥ*” is “*nirvyūḍha* from *purva* 9,3,20 (Leumann); see pages 357, 450n.

⁸²² Haribhadra makes no statements on this head, since he holds the verses to be *nigādasiddha*. Cf. the fivefold division of the *āyāra* in *aṅga* 3,5,2 into: *māste ugghāle*, *m. aṇugghāle*, *cāummāste u.*, *cā. aṇuggh.*, *cā. aṇugghāle.*, *ārovaṇā* (Leumann).

⁸²³ 1 with 48 paragraphs, 2 with 59, 3 with 74, 4 with 62, 5 with 76, 6 with 22, 7 with 37, 8 with 19, 9 with 26 etc.

⁸²⁴ According to Kash. Kunte the *niṣ.* treats “of the duties of *Sādhus*, and the fines and penalties to be imposed on them when they neglect them.”

⁸²⁵ The 20 *udd.* are, however, divided into 3 groups (1—5, 6—19 and 20; Leumann).

vā sātijjai.⁸²⁶ We have here then a fixed canonical rule, which makes upon us the impression of being very old. At the conclusion of the *udd.* a penitence of one or, as the case may be, of four months is prescribed : *taṃ sevamāṇe āvayyati māsiyaṃ parihāraṭṭhāṇaṃ ugghātiyaṃ* (or *aṇuggh°*, or *cāu°*) *ṇisahe*.

The 20th *udd.* treats especially of this penitence and appeals thereby to the first *udd.* of the *vavahāra*.

[455] At the end there are three *āryās*, in which Visāhagani is stated to be the writer (!) : *tassa lihiyaṃ nistham*. These *āryās* are counted as constituent parts of the text, since they are followed by the words *iti nisthajjhayaṇe viśamo uddesaṃ sammatto*.

There is a very detailed commentary (*bhāṣya*) in Prakrit in *āryās*, akin to the prose commentary, which Jinaprabhamuni, author⁸²⁷ of the commentary on the *paryuṣanā-kalpaniryukti*, mentions as his source of information under the name *nisthacūṛṇi*. The *bhāṣya* offers but little assistance in regard to the explanation of the words of the text, but contains general remarks concerning the contents of each of the *uddesakas*. It starts with a very lengthy introduction⁸²⁸ which at the end is called *peḍhaṃ*, i.e. *pīṭhaṃ*, cf. *pīṭhikā* in Malayagiri. Each of the paragraphs of the text is called *sūtram* in every case. This commentary does not discuss the three concluding verses of the text. The writer of the Berlin MS. (Ahmedabad *Saṃv.* 1629) belonged to the stock of Abhayadeva.⁸²⁹

XXXVI. Second *chedasūtram*, the *mahānistham*. Instruction of Goyama in reference to transgressions (*salla*) and punishments (*pāya-cchitta*, *pāchitta*), in 8 *ajjhayaṇas*, of which [456] *ajjh.* 1, 2 have a text composed partly in *ślokas* or *triṣṭubh*, (Nom. in o) and partly in prose (Nom. in e) ; and in *ajjh.* 3 ff. many *ślokas* are inserted. The single copy which I have by me, and that a very incorrect one, reproduces the text so very imperfectly that even the writer overcome by the difficul-

826. "Who does this or that and who does not do it." See Leumann, *Aup. Glossar*, p. 159s. v. *sajj*. (Pali *sādiyati*) "take", "receive", "accept", "permit".

827. A.D. 1307, see Jacobi, *Kalpās* p. 25 ; also author of the *Vidhiprapā*, above, p. 223.

828. Begins : *navabāmbhaceramaṃ aṭṭhārasapadasahassā veto (vedaḥ, see p. 457) / havati ya sapāṃcācūlo bahu bahutarao padaggaṇaṃ || 1 || āyārapakappassa tu... || 2 || āyāro aggaṃtiyapakappa taha culiā nisthaṃ ti... || 3 || pakappammi culiyāe nisthe ya... V. 1 is cited in the same form, by Śīlāṅka from Bhadr's ācārāniryukti according to Leumann.*

829. *Saṃvat* 1569 under Pātasāha Mahamūda.

ties in his way, at the conclusion of the first *ajjh.*, begs,⁸³⁰ in Prakrit, that the fault be not laid at his door. He says that it is not a *kulhiyam*, but a text *sui generis* with its mixture of verses, half-verses, prose and even single *akṣaras*. See my remarks on p. 472. If my explanation of his words be correct the writer speaks also of marginal glosses and of leaves that have fallen out from his original (*puvṣāyariṣa*, *pūrvādarśa*). Since these words too are very corrupt, they are not to be ascribed to the writer of the present MS., which is well written to say the least, but to an earlier scribe, whose comments have always been copied together with the text.

A statement in Sanskrit, of not less peculiar nature, but handed down in a very corrupt state, is found at the end of the fourth *ajjhayaṇa*, and is directed, not against the condition of the text, but against its contents. According to this statement Haribhadrāsūri had declared that it was impossible for him to believe some of the wonderful accounts contained in the text. [457] The writer first asserts that this scepticism of Haribhadrāsūri has reference solely to a few of these statements and not to the entire fourth *ajjh.*, or to the other *ajjh.* This scepticism, he says, was caused by the fact that in *aṅgas* 3, 4 and in *upāṅgas* 3, 4 nothing was said of these matters, “*na kathamcid idam ācakhye yathā*”. We must refer *yathā* to what follows, and regard the words as a kind of citation from *ajjh.* 4. The latter, however, does not suit the sense, which amounts to this :—cave dwellers are able to undergo hardships for a year. The meaning of the very obscure words at the end appears to be that since this *sūtram* according to ancient tradition is an *ārṣam*, and in this *śrutaskandha* there are contained many excellent “*gaṇadharoktāni vedavacanāni*”, it is the conclusion of the writer that there is no occasion for unbelief even as regards these remarkable statements.⁸³¹ The great Haribhadrāsūri⁸³² is undoubtedly

⁸³⁰ *mahānīśhasuyaskandhassa paḍhamam ajjhayaṇam salluddharaṇam nāma || 1 || eyassa ya kulhiyadoso na dāyavvo suharehiṃ | kiṃ tu jo ceva eyussa puvṣāyariṣo āsi, tattheva kattha ya silogo katthai silogaddham katthai payakkharam katthai akkharapaṇṭiyā katthai pattayaputtiyaṃ* (“marginal notes”?) *kat be tinni pannāni eva ghāi (?) bahu gaṃṣpa (gaṃṭha ?) parigaliyaṃ ti.*

⁸³¹ *atra caturthādhyayane bahavaḥ siddhāntikāḥ kecid ilyāpakāṇa(?) samyak sudadhyeyi (?) evāntair āśraddadhānair asmākam api na samyak śraddhānam ity āha Haribhadrāsūriḥ ; na punaḥ sarvaṃ eve 'dām caturthādhyayanam anyāni vā 'dhyayanāni asyaī 'va katipayai(?) parimitair ālāpakair āśraddhānam ity arthāḥ ; yataḥ sthāna-samavāya-jīvābhigama-prajñāpanādisu na kathamcid idam ācakhye yathā | preṭi(?) samīpāsthānam asti, tai (?) guhāvāsinaḥ tu manuṣjās, teṣu ca paramadhārmikāṇāṃ punaḥ punaḥ saptaśṣṭāvārān yāvād upapattes, teṣāṃ ca tair dārunair vajrasilāgharaṭṭa-samputair gilītanāṃ paripīḍyamānānāṃ api samvatsaram yāvāt prāṇavyāpattir na bhavati 'ti ; vṛddhāvādas tu punar yathāvad idam āṣam sūtram, vikṛtir na tāvad atra pratiṣṭā, prabhūtaḥ cā 'tra śrutaskandhe arthāḥ suṣṭv apīṣayena (?) sātīsayāni gaṇadharoktāni veda (see p. 455n) vacanāni, tad evam sthite na kimcid āśamkāntyaṃ.*

⁸³² See pp. 371, 372. In Jinadattasūri's *gaṇadharasārḍhaśata*, v. 55, 114 *payaraṇas* are ascribed to him ; and Sarvarājagaṇi cites in the scholiast the following works :

referred to here, [458] who must have played an important role at the date of this remark of the copyist, to whom the polemic appeared as a bitter necessity.

The wretched condition of the text is perhaps to be ascribed to the fact that the authority of the *mahānīśīthasūtra* found many opponents even among the Jains themselves. That the text is corrupt is manifested externally first of all in the imperfect tradition as regards its division. According to a special statement⁸³³ in the commencement of the third *ajjh.*, after v. 3, (a statement that perhaps did not belong to the text originally) the *mahānīś*, consists of 8 *ajjhayaṇas*, each of which contains a certain number of *uddesas*, which is stated. But in our MS. there is no trace whatsoever of any *uddesas*. In the first *ajjh.* there are between the beginning and the end some §§ numbers (31,33 and 16,17 for which 36,37 are to be substituted), [459] and at the end the number 49. These numbers do not, however, refer to *uddesa* sections, since these are generally of greater extent, as is proved in the case of our text from the number of *udd.* ascribed to *ajjh.* 2-7. We have no statement of the kind in the case of *ajjh.* 1. These numbers are nine for 2, sixteen for 3, eight for 4, ten for 5, two for 6, three for 7, ten for 8. Of the eight *ajjhayaṇas* only the first six are specially distinguished, four having special names, though only those ascribed to the first two *ajjh.* are in harmony with the contents. The sixth *ajjh.* closes on f. 70^a; the remainder is characterized at the close (96^b) as : *piiyā*, perhaps *bīiyā dvītiyā*, *cūliyā*, so that two *cūliyā* chapters are here indicated,⁸³⁴ which, if added to the 6 *ajjh.*, gives the desired number 8. In this faulty con-

paṃcavastūka upadeśapadapaṃcāsakā 'śaṭaka śoḍaśaka lokatāt(t) vanirṇaya dharmavimdu lokabimdu yogadīṣṭisamuccaya darśanasaptatikā nānācitraka vīṣanmithyātvamānṭhana paṃcasūtraka saṃskṛtātmānuśāsana saṃskṛtacaityavamādanabhāṣya anekāntajayapatākā 'nekaṃtapadapraveśaka paralokasiddhi dharmalobhasiddhi śāstravārttāsamuccayaḍiprakaraṇānim tatha āvaśyakavṛtti daśavaikālika vīṣadvṛtti laghuvṛtti pīṇḍanīryuktivṛtti jīvābhigama-prajñāpanopāṅgavṛtti paṃcavastukavṛtti anekāntajayapatākavṛtti caityavamādanavṛtti anuyogadvāravṛtti namdivṛtti saṃgrahāṇivṛtti kṣetrasamāsavṛtti śāstrāvārttāsamuccayavṛtti arhachricūḍāmaṇi samarādityacarita kathakośādisāstrāṇaḥ. Not so complete are the statements in the *Vicārāṃtasamgraha* which contains, however, a large number of the names. In the *Vic.* H's death is placed (§ 8 begin) in the year 1050 after Vira.

833 Probably in four āryās, though the metre or rather the text itself is very difficult to make out. The last verse reads ;—*nikhittavibhittapāṇeṇaṃ saṃghaṭṭeṇaṃ ime mahānīśīha (m) / varasuyakkhamādhāṃ vottavvaṃ ca āuttaḡapāṇeṇaṃ (?) ti ||* In the preceding verses the word *āmbile* is found three times : *taie solasa uddese aṭṭha tatheva āmbile / jam taṃ itaṃ cauttthe vipaṃcamāmmi (!) 'chāmi yambile || dasa, chaṭṭhe do, sattame tinni, aṭṭhame 'bile dasa a /*; this is probably a vocative to *āmbilā*, "little mother", and to be explained in the same way as *suṃdari* ! in *paiṇṇa* 7 (see p. 442).

834 The conclusion of the first *cūlā* is not directly marked off, but is to be placed on 80b, where a section closes with *bemi*.

dition of the MS. it is worth while to note the statements of the three *sāmācārīs* in reference to the *mahān. Āvi.* treats of this subject (see pp. 447, 448) in discussing the *cheaggantha*, and states that there were 8 *ajjh.* with 83 *uddesas*. The first *ajjhayaṇam* had then no divisions of this kind and was *egasraram*; the second had 9, the third and fourth 16 each, the fifth 12, the sixth 4, the seventh 6, the eighth 20. The difference between this account and the information to be drawn from the MS. is very great indeed. (See above) *Svi.* and *V.*, on the other hand (see p. 448), separate the *mahānīṣītham* from the other *cheda* texts, and treat, at the conclusion, of the *jogavihi* of the sacred texts after the *painnagavihi*. [460] They too agree with *Āvi.* as regards the number of *ajjh.* and *udd.* The seventh and eighth *ajjh.* are expressly called by *V. cūlārūva* (*donni cūlāo*, v. 64). Forty-three days are necessary to learn the *mahān.*, *teyālīsāe diṇehim ajjhayaṇasamattī*, but as two days are requisite for *suyakkhamdhassa samuddesa* and for *aṇuṇṇā*, the total number is 45. The *chedas* 1, 3-5 required together only 30 days. See page 448.

A statement in Wilson Sel. W. 1,341 (ed. Rost) is of particular interest :—"Vajrasvāmī⁸³⁵ instituted the *Mahānīṣītha*-sect"; and of equal interest are the remarks of Rajendra Lal Mitra (p. 227) in reference to three different recensions (*vācanā*) of the *Mahānīṣītha*. The question which is proposed in the introduction of chapter 22 of the *Vicārāmṛta-saṃgraha* substantiates the belief that the *Mahānīṣītha* is tolerably old. This question is :—how is it to be explained that the *prāyaścitta* prescribed in the *Mahānīṣītha* is not practised? The answer to this includes *chedas* 1, 3, 5 and reads :—*adhunā mahādasattvaiḥ kalpavyavahārānīṣītham-ahānīṣīthādīnām ekatarasyā 'pi grāṃhasyā' bhiprāyeṇa prāyaścittāni yathā caddoḍham (? 'vasoḍhum) na śakyamte atas te sarvagaccheṣu jītavya-vahāreṇa prāyaścittān(y) amucharamto drśyante.*

The first mention of the *mahānīṣītham*, of which I am aware, is found in the enumeration of the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts in the *Nandī* etc., where the schol. on N. explains the word as follows :—*nīṣīthāt param, yat grāṃthārthābhyām mahattaram tam mahānīṣītham.* [461] We have already mentioned (p. 445) that the *gacchāyāra* states that it is based upon the *mahān.* as its source.

The introductory words are the same as in *aṅga* 1 etc. : *suyam me āusam, teṇam bhagavayā evam akkhāyam*, and each of the *ajjh.* closes

⁸³⁵ Nominally 584 Vira; see pp. 219, 251, cf. *Āvaśy* 8, 41 fg. *Gaṇadharaśūdrhaś*, v. 23 fg. In reference to the statement above, cf. pp. 463n and 464.

correspondingly with *ti bemi*. Besides this, there is nothing which directly savours of antiquity with the single exception that the dialogue form between the *bhagavant* (who is addressed with (*se*) *bhagavaṃ* and not with (*se*) *ṇaṃ bhamte*) and *Indrabhūti* (Goyamā !) is retained. This form, however, ill suits the introductory formula by which the whole is attributed to the *bhagavant* himself.

The name of the text occurs shortly after the introduction, and is accompanied by laudatory epithets. This fact, together with the epithet *mahā°* in the name, makes it probable that it is of later date. It had need of a special sanction because of its secondary character. The words are : *pavara-vara-mahāniśīthasuyakkhamdha(m) suyāmusāreṇaṃ tiviham*—but there follows no three-fold division.

The first book is entitled *salluddharanaṃ* and treats of the most various kinds of *salla*, *śalya*. The repeated references to the *savvaṃgo-vaṃga* are worth our notice ; whence the existence of the *uvaṃga* at the time of its composition—see above, p. 373 is *eo ipso* clear. Then follows the figure of the useful co-partnership of the lame with the blind man which is specially emphasized :—*hayaṃ nāṇaṃ kiyāhinaṃ, hayā annāṇao kiyā / pāsanto paṃgulo daḍḍho dhāvamāṇo a aṃdhao || ... aṃdho ya paṃgū ya vaṇe samiccā te saṃpāṭṭā nagaraṃ pavittā ||*. Furthermore [462] stress is laid upon reverence (*vaṃde*, *vaṃdiyyā*) for pictures (*paḍimā*) and temples (*ceḷa*, *ceḷālaya*). A special formula seems to have been made use of in this connection, an enigmatical treatment of the letters of which occurs⁸³⁶ after the fashion of the treatment of *a u m* (*om*) in the *Upaniṣads* and in similar formulas in the *tantra* ritual. This entire subject was a riddle to the copyist—cf. p. 456—and so it remains for us. After the real conclusion of the work, in an addition, a similar subject is treated of in like manner merely by means of single letters.

Book II. is entitled *kammavivāyaṇaṃ*, perhaps *karmavipācana* (cf. pp. 270, 280, 335). At the end is found an obscure statement which perhaps has reference to *ajjh.* 1, 2, and which reads : *eesiṃ tu doṇhaṃ ajjhayaṇāṇaṃ vihiṃ puvvageṇaṃ savvasāmanṇaṃ vattehiṇaṃ ti (?)*.

⁸³⁶ *amaṇa / a / maṇ / kaṭṭha aya / addhaṇa / amaa um / ṇ am / up ay / āṇ u / s āraṇ na am / ā um ṇ / amāṇ / sa am bh i / ṇ nas u / ṭ / ṇ amāṇ / khaṭ re ā / sabaddha ṇa / u m / ṇaṃ u* etc.—In a similar manner (each of the single consonants having *virāma*) we find the *mantra* composed which the *Vidhiprapā* cites in mentioning the *āyariya-payaṭṭhāvanavihi* and *uvajjhāyapay°*. These, however, commence with *a / u / m /* : cf. the *Upaniṣade*. Have we here an example of the *māuyakkharā* ? see page 281 (with note) and page 350.

Books III and IV., without apacific titles, are composed almost entirely in prose, and treat especially of the *kuṣiḷa*. It is noticeable that in Book III, frequent reference is paid to the *duvālasaṅgaṃ suya-nāṇaṃ* and the *saṅgovaṅga duvālasaṅgasamudda*. The commencement with *sāmāya* is retained (cf. p. 243), and the *suyanāṇaṃ* is then characterized as *sāmāya-m-āi logabirṇḍusāgara (sāra !)* *payyavasānam* (p. 245). [463] We find in the text the following statements which are very characteristic as regards the origin and history of Book III : *tattha tattha bahuehiṃ suyaharehiṃ sammiliṭṭhaṃ saṅgovaṅgaduḍḍasāṅgāu suya-samuddāu anna-anna-uvaṅgāsuya (kkha) ṛidha-ajjhayaṇa-uddesagāṇaṃ samuccineṭṭhaṃ kiṇciṃ kiṇciṃ saṃvayyaṃāṇaṃ etthaṃlihiyaṃ ti, na uṇa sakavvakayaṃ (svakāvyaḥṭam) ti*. This is an example of the saying *qui s' excuse s' accuse*. It is more probable that the above is a production of the author himself than that it emanates from the hand of a copyist who is inclined to doubt.

Book IV. contains a legend of two brothers, Sumati and Nāila,⁸³⁷ in which we may observe an occasional reference (in Sanskrit !) to an old elucidation (!) of *aṅga* 10 : *śeṣaṃ tu praśnavyākaraṇavṛddhavicāraṇād avaseyaṃ*. Whoever, *bhikṣu* or *bhikṣuṇī*, should praise the adherents of hostile systems or schismatics (*parapāsamaḍḍhaṃ pasamsaṃ kareyya, je yā vi naṃ niṇhagāṇaṃ* p. k), whoever speaks in favour of the schismatics (*niṇhagāṇaṃ anukūlaṃ bhāseyyā*), visits their temples (*niṇh. āyaya-ṇaṃ pavisiyya*), studies their texts (*niṇh. gaṃṭhasattha payakkharaṃ vā parūveyyā*), or follows their ordinances (*niṇh. saṃkalie kāyakilesāie tavei vā saṃjamei vā jāṇei vā vinnāvei vā suei vā paḍivvei vā avimuhasuddhapari-sāmayyagāe salāheyyā*) his fate will be as disastrous as that of Sumati, *sa vi naṃ paramāhammiesuṃ uvavayyeyya jahā Sumati*. The hate against the heterodox and schismatics is here so bitter, [464] that the conjecture is not too bold if we assume that the heterodox and schismatics had at that time got possession of the text of this book, see pp. 293, 368.

Book, V., *duvālasaṅgasuyamāṇassa ṇavattiyasāra(?)*, mentions the *duvālasaṅga*, but merely in a general way. It treats especially of the relation between the teacher (*guru*) and scholar (*śiṣa*) of the *āyāra* (*gacchāyāra*, see p. 445), and *aṇāyāra*.

⁸³⁷ In the *therāvali* of *Kalpas*, one of the four scholars of Vajra (svāmin), p. 460, or of Vajrasena, is called by this name. He was the founder of a school which bore his name. Bhūadinnā, the scholar of Nāgajjuna, was from the Nāilakula ; see v. 44 of the *Therāvali* in the *Nandis*.

Book VI. *giyatthavihāra* (see p. 436, 450), treats of the *pachitta prāy-aścittā*, and contains a legend of a teacher Bhadda and the *ayyiya* (*āryikā*) Rāyyā. The mention of the *dasapuvvi* in the introduction brings *eo ipso* the date of its composition down to a period subsequent to that of Bhadrabāhu, the last *caturdaśapūrvīn*, and to that of Vajra, the last *daśapūrvīn*. See pp. 219, 460.

Books VII., VIII., which (see p. 459) are characterized as two *cūliyaś*, a name which *per se* marks them as a secondary addition, treat likewise of the *pachitta*, and, in fact, in such great detail, that the words *kīm bahūnā*⁸³⁸ together with the formal frame-work enclosing them, are occasionally repeated several times in immediate succession. Shortly before the close these words occur again. A legend of the daughter of Suyyasivi in Avantī plays a very prominent part in these books.

The solemn adjuration (found also in another passage) to save this *sūtram* from any damage, is another indication of its secondary origin : —*jayā naṃ Goyamā ! inam-o pacchitta-suttam vocchiyyihii tayā naṃ cam-dāiccā-gaha* [465] *rikkha-tāragā naṃ satta ahoratte ya no viphuriyyā, imassa naṃ vocchede Goyamā ! kasiṇasamjamassa abhāvo.*

To the conclusion (*samattam mahānisihasuyakkhamdham*) are joined the reverential invocations to the 24 *titthamkaras*, the *tittha*, the *suya-devayā*, the *suyakevalī*, all the *sāhu*, *siddhai* to the *bhagavanti arahanti*. Then follow the incomprehensible separate *akṣaras* etc., mentioned on page 462. The actual conclusion is formed by the statement concerning the extent of the whole book (4504 *ślokas*) ; *cattāri saḥassāim pañca sayāim taheva cattāri | cattāri (again !) silogā viya mahānisthammi pāenam ||*

The *mahānistham* is indisputably much younger than the *nisiham*, and is almost six times its size. It is noteworthy that this *sūtram*, just as the fourth *chedas*, according to its own statements (see above and pp. 456, 458, 461) receives *suyakkhamdha*, *śrutaskandha* as an addition to its name. This is a title that is used in the case of the *aṅgas* for larger divisions of the *aṅga*. But in the case of *aṅgas* 3-5, 7-10, up. 8-12 the expression also holds good for the whole and not merely a part. There is no commentary, as in the case of the *nisiha*, with the exception of the *cūrṇi*. See above, p. 445, for the origin of the *gachhā-yāram* from the *Mahānisiha*.

⁸³⁸ The words, however, occur *Aup.* § 48.

XXXVII. Third *chedasūtram*, the *vavahāra*. We have already seen above, pp. 447, 449, that the three texts *dasā*, *kappa* and *vavahāra*, according to the *Āvaśy*, 16,109, are connected as one group. In the arrangement found in the *Āvaśy* and in that handed down in the *Nandī*, *vavahāra* is placed in the last place after *dasā* and *kappā*. This position after the *kappa* is also allotted to the *vavahāra* [466] in the penultimate verse of the *bhāṣya*⁸³⁹ belonging to it, and consequently in Malayagiri's comm. where there are two statements to this effect—in the introduction⁸⁴⁰ and at the conclusion of the seventh *udd.*⁸⁴¹ The same conclusion may be drawn from the compound *kalpavyavahārau* in schol. on *Oghaniry*. (see p. 449), though there may be here nothing more than a mere reference to the greater brevity of the word *kalpa*. In the *Ratnasāgara* (see p. 449), however, the *vavahāra* stands at the head of the *chedasūtra*.

We have already seen (*ibid.*) that *kalpa* as *vavahāra* is attributed especially to Bhadrabāhu and considered as an extract from *pūrva* 9,3,20. According to *Āvaśy* 2,5, Bhadrabāhu (supposing that he is here the speaker) composed at least a *niyyutti* on it. And we have also seen (p. 446) that the text is divided into ten *uddesas*⁸⁴² in agreement with the statements in *Āvaśy*. 16,109. The contents consists of general regulations in reference to the penances etc. of the clergy and of disciplinary statutes concerning right and wrong—*kappati*, no *kappati*.

Each of the *uddesas* closes, after the fashion of *aṅgas*-1-3 with *ti bemi*. The text is in prose and well preserved. The Prakrit *bhāṣya* in *āryā*, is found entire in Malayagiri's very detailed commentary, which is in reality rather a commentary on the *bhāṣya* than on the text itself. [467] In the commencement of the very lengthy introduction⁸⁴³ we find the relation of the text to the *kalpa* stated as follows :—*kalpādhyayane abhavat prāyaścittam uktam, na tu dānaprāyaścittam dānam; vyavahare tu dānaprāyaścittam ālocanāvidhiś cā bhidhāsyate*.

udd. 1 treats of *parihāraṭṭhānam* lasting 1,2,3 or 4 months—2 of the relation of two *sāhammiyas* 3 of teacher and scholar,—4 of the *merā* (*maryādā*) *sāhūnam*,—5 of the *merā* *saṃjatinam*,—6 of mischances (also

⁸³⁹ *kappavvavahārāṇaṃ bhāsaṃ muttūṇa vitthaiṃ savvaṃ.*

⁸⁴⁰ *uktam kalpādhyayanam, idānim vyavahārādhyayanam ucyaṭe.*

⁸⁴¹ *pūrvam kalpādhyayane bhaṇitā.*

⁸⁴² Or according to its own schol., also in 3 *khaṇḍas* (*udd.* 1, 2; 3-6; 7-10).

⁸⁴³ *pīṭhikā* (see p. 455), in 2355 gr., corresponding to 182 verses of the *bhāṣya*. The entire commentary embraces 35122 gr. The MS. which I have before me is dated *Saṃvat* 1565 A.D. 1509.

niggamthiṇa),—7 of the *rājādīnām avagraha*,—8 of the *sādharmikāvagraha*,—9 of the *āhāra*,—10 of the *abhigraha*.

See above, p. 445, in reference to the *vavahāra* as source of the *gacchāyāra*.

XXXVIII. Fourth *chedasūtram*, the *dasāo* or *avaradasāu*, *dasās*, in fuller form *dasāśrutaskandhā*, in 10 *uddesas* (*uddesaṇakāla Āvaśy.* 16,109), of which 1 to 9 are called *dasā*, the eighth is called also *ajjhayaṇam* and the tenth *ajjhayaṇam* only. In *Āvaśy* 2,5 the speaker declares himself to be author of a *dasānam niyyutti* whose author tradition (see Jacobi, 1. c. p. 12) calls Bhadrabāhu. The great antiquity of the text is proved by the fact that not only is it cited in *aṅga*. 3,10 under the title *Āyāra-dasāu*, but also the names of its ten *ajjh.* cited there are the same as those given here. See p. 272.

Each of the first seven *dasās* begins after the fashion of *aṅga* 1 with the formula : *suyam me āusam ! teṇam* [468] *bhagavayā evam akkhāyam* and closes with *ti hemi*. After *akkhāyam* there follows another formula, which briefly says that the contents of the following section is as "*therahim bhagavan̄tehim pannatta*," as in *up.* 3 (p. 388), see Abhayadeva on *aṅga* 3,10f 288^b. The doctrines in question it refers to the predecessors of the *bhagavant* (see also *up.* 10, p 423). In the first *dasā* 20 *asamāhiṭṭhānā* are treated of, in the second 21 *sabalā*⁸⁴⁴ (*śabalāni*), in the third 33 *āsāyaṇāu*, in the fourth 8 *gaṇisaṃpadā*, in the fifth 10 *cittasamāhiṭṭhānā*, or, according to V. *attasohi* (here there is a legend of a sermon of Mahāvīra at the time of Jiyasattu, king of Vāṇiyagāma, closing with 17 *ślokas*, in the sixth 11 *uvāsagapaḍimāu*, in the seventh 12 *bhikkhupaḍimāu*. All this deals with regulations having reference to the department of the *vinaya*, and treats of the course of life and the discipline of the laity and clergy.⁸⁴⁵ The method of treatment is short and compact.

The eighth section is called *ajjhayaṇam*, but in *aṅga* 3,10 as in V., *pajjosāvaṇākappo*, exceeds the first 7 *dasās* in its contents and in its extent. Certainly its largest portion has been inserted here at a later period. It is formed of the work called *Kalpasūtra* and in fact of the entire work of this name in its three parts, according to the MSS. and

⁸⁴⁴ Cf. *Av.* 18, 94-99, and *Praśnavyāk.* conclusion (Leumann).

⁸⁴⁵ Cf. *Āvaśy.* 16,17 fg.

the *Kalpāntaravācyāni*. Jacobi (*Kalpas*. pp. 22,23) has already called our attention to the fact, that in reality only the last (the third) section, [469] which is called “*sāmācārī*, rules for yatis,” and also *paryuṣaṇā-kalpa*—cf. the title of this book in *aṅga* 3 and V.—belongs in this place, and that it alone could claim, together with the remaining parts of the *daśāśr.*, to be ascribed to Bhadrabāhu. The closing words *tti bemi, payyosaṇākappadasā aṭṭhamam ajjhayaṇam* are similar to those of the other *dāsāu* and substantiates this conclusion. The contents of this section refers to the *varsavāsa*, and treats of that which thereby is *kappai* and *no k*. In the introduction commencing with the legendary formula—*teṇam kāleṇam*—it is stated how Mahāvīra acted in these cases. The following portions, each of whose sentences invariably begins with a stereotyped refrain, is at the end ascribed to Mahāvīra in special legendary form likewise introduced by *teṇam kāleṇam*. I will refer to the other parts of the *Kalpasūtra* below.

The ninth *dasā*, also called *mohaṇiyyaṭṭhāṇam*, has the usual legendary beginning : *teṇam kāleṇam* ..., and tells of a sermon of Mahāvīra under king Koṇiya of Campā in reference to the 30 (so also *aṅga* 3) *mohaṭṭhāṇām*. The portion dealing with this sermon consists of 39 *ślokas*, for the most part with the refrain : *mahāmohaṇ pakuvvai*. The conclusion is *ti bemi*.

The tenth book, *āyātiṭṭhāṇam*⁸⁴⁶ commences with the usual formula : *teṇam kāleṇam* and tells in great detail⁸⁴⁷ how Senia [470] Bhimbhisāra, king of Rāyagiha, together with his spouse Cellaṇā, listened to a sermon of Mahāvīra. The sight of the princely splendour turned the thoughts of the followers of Mahāvīra to worldly things, to rebuke which Mahāvīra preaches a lengthy sermon on the excellence of his doctrine, divided into 10 §§ and beginning with the same refrain.⁸⁴⁸ Nor does he forget to mention the rewards of those who follow his teachings. The result of this sermon was that his audience were delighted and Mahāvīra continued to preach in Rājagṛha.

The legendary excursi of the last *dasāu* (5,8,9 and 10) in reference to Mahāvīra are doubtless the cause of the introduction of the *Kalpa-sūtra*, the first part of which treats especially of the life of Mahāvīra.

⁸⁴⁵ *ajjananam ājāti (h) sammūreccanagarbhopātato janmā, tasyāḥ sthānam saṃsārah*. Abhayadeva on *aṅga* 3,10 (289a) in the introduction.

⁸⁴⁷ It refers to *up.* 1.

⁸⁴⁸ ...*māe dhamme pannaṭte, inam eva niggamṭhe pāvayaṇe, sa ce anuttare paḍipunne kevale*... (cf. *Aupapāt*, § 56 p. 62, ed. Leumann).

The *Kalpasūtram* was the first Jain text which was made known, in 1848, in the very faulty translation of Rev. J. Stevenson. It is now carefully edited by H. Jacobi, 1879, to whose instructive introduction I have so often referred.

We have already observed, that of the three parts of which it is composed, the last alone can claim to belong to the *dasāu*. The two other parts were originally not connected. Each of them is divided into three portions, the first of which contains the history of Mahāvīra, the second that of his 23 predecessors, the third a list of his successors, [471] *Therāvalī*, to Deviddhi-khamāsamaṇa, the nominal redactor of the 45 *āgama*.

This *Therāvalī* agrees as regards each of its first twelve parts with those statements which are found in the *therāvalī* of the *Nandī* and of the *Āvaśyakasūtra*, and in the later tradition of the Jains (*ṛṣimaṇḍalasūtra*, of the Dharmaghoṣa etc.). But from this point on there is no such harmony. The list found here is the most complete, since it embraces a large number of the lateral branches proceeding from each of the patriarchs ; and contains all sorts of divergences from the other lists. Jacobi distinguishes "four or five distinct treatises" (p. 23).

It is self-evident that any connection is impossible between this *Therāvalī* and Bhaddabāhu, the nominal author of the *Kalpasūtra*—see below—who appears in the seventh place in the list of patriarchs. The *Therāvalī* contains eleven members more (ajja Vaira, Vajrasvāmin, as number 16) nor did it belong originally to the *Kalpasūtra*. This conclusion holds good also in the case of the account of the 23 predecessors of Vīra which introduces it. In this account we find some few details in reference to two of Vīra's immediate predecessors, Pāsa and Aritṭhanemo, and in reference to Usabha who is placed first in the series. The other predecessors are treated of in a very few words. The relation is retrogressive, beginning with the 23rd. We find no mention that Malli (Mali in the text of Jacobi) was a woman.

The intention of collecting everything that had reference to Jainism is manifest in the addition [472] (see Stevenson, p. 99) of these two sections, in reference to the successors and predecessors of Mahāvīra, to the main part of the *Kalpasūtra* which treated of his life.

This main portion contains towards the close (§ 148) statements mentioning the dates 280 and 993 after Vīra. According to Jacobi

(p. 23) it is self-evident that these dates do not "refer to the author, but to Devarddhigaṇi, the editor of the *Kalpasūtra*." Tradition places Bhadrabāhu, the nominal author of the *Kalpasūtra*, in the year 170 after Vira (see Jacobi, p. 114). But as far as I can see, an error or confusion has brought it about that the *Kalpasūtra* has been ascribed to Bhadrabāhu, as tradition, e. g. the introduction to the *Kalpāntarvācyāntī*, states. In the well attested statement (see above, p. 449) that the *Kalpavyavahārau* was extracted from *pūrva* 9, 3, 20, by Bhadrabāhu, we must not understand by "*Kalpa*" the *Kalpasūtram*, but the *chedasūtra* 5, a conclusion that may be drawn from the statements in reference to the division of the two texts *kappa* and *vavahāra*, which is found in *Āvaśy.* 16, 109. The similar statement concerning the *dasa-kappa-vyavahāra* in the *Rṣimaṇḍalasūtra* (Jacobi, p. 11) is, after a consideration of this passage of the *Āvaśy.*, not to be referred, as Jacobi refers it, to "the ten *kalpas* and the *Vyavahāra*," but (see p. 357, 450) to the three *chedasūtras* 3-5 ; the *daśau*, the *vavahāra* and the *kappa*.⁸⁴⁹

Personally I am inclined on the strength of § 148 to hold Devarddhigaṇi as the editor, and even as the [473] "author" of the chief part of the *Kalpasūtra*. I will even go a step further and assert that in reality the *Kalpasūtram*, or its present essential part, has no claim to this title, which is at complete variance with its contents. It has received this name after its junction with the *paryaṣaṇākalpa*, the eighth chapter of the *dasāu*. This ancient title (see p. 468) is cited in the beginning of the *saṁdehaviṣaṇasādhī* as a collective title of the work. See Jacobi, p. 99.

The *Paṁcanamaskāra*, placed "*keṣucid ādarśeṣu*" at the commencement of the text, is known to us from *aṅga* 3 and *upāṅga* 4. It is followed here as in *up.* 4 by the passage in its praise, which is supposed to date back to Vajra (see *Kup.* 811), and is designed to glorify this commencement. This passage of the *paṁcanam*. contains the form *havai*—and not *hoi* as in *up.* 4 which in more modern times is regarded as the only well attested form. See p. 393, §§ 1,2, which contain the recital so obnoxious to the Digambara (see Jacobi, p. 22)—see p. 261—that Mahāvira first "entered the womb of (the *māhaṇī*) Devānandā"⁸⁵⁰ before he was placed (§ 21) in that of (the *khattiyāṇī*) Trīśalā"⁸⁵¹, are borrowed outright from *aṅga* 1. Jacobi, p. 23, considers the portion

⁸⁴⁹ We find, however, mention made of a ten-fold division of the *kalpa*, e.g. in the introduction to the *Kalpāntarvācyāni*. See p. 475.

⁸⁵⁰ Wife of Usabhadatta, cf. Wilson Sel. W. I, 292 (See *Bhagav.* 9, 33, Leum.)

⁸⁵¹ Wife of Siddhattha of the Nāya race.

containing the 14 dreams (§§33-46), with their long complex compounds, as a secondary addition, since it is not in harmony with the prevailing 'archaic style' of the text. I should prefer to regard the solemnity of the subject as the cause of these stylistic differences. [474] Upon such occasions the *aṅgas* contain numerous stylistic excrescences, which, it should be remarked, occur not infrequently in other parts of the *Kalpasūtra*. The differences of this kind in §§ 33-46 (or does J. extend the description of the dreams further than 46 ?) may therefore, I should think, be reduced to a minimum.

The historical kernel of the recital is exceedingly small. Upto § 96 (incl.) the events before the birth of Mahāvīra alone are treated of. The following §§ to 111 discuss the birth, naming, childhood of M. and his life as *gihaṭṭha*. It is noteworthy that there is no mention of foreign nurses, as is usual in the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas* on such occasions, nor are the 72 *kalās* etc. referred to. The enumeration of the Brahminical sciences in § 10 is the usual one, which we have already met with in *aṅga* 5. The recital as to how Mahāvīra : *aṇagāriyam paivvæ* (§ 116), and of his further development up to the time of his death (§ 132) is devoid of every particle of life. There is no trace of the many legends concerning him which we find scattered here and there in the *aṅgas*, etc. They have not been made use of at all ; hence the whole makes a most unsavoury impression as regards any biographical information. In §147 the mention of the 55 *ajjhayaṇas* of the *pāvaphalavivāyāṃ* (see p. 271) is of interest, as also that of the 36 *apuṭṭhavāyaraṇāṃ*, which, according to Jacobi, p. 114, are to be referred to the *uttarajjhayaṇaṃ*.

We have in the work entitled *Kalpāntarvācyāni*, a production partly in Prakrit, partly in Sanskrit, and in a mixture of the two [475]. After a self-evident introduction in reference to the ten forms of the *Kalpa* : *ācelukka* (*ācelatvam*), *uddesia* (*auddēśika pīṇḍa*), *sijjāyara* (*sijjātaro* (*ṣayyā*) *vasatisvāmī*), *rāyapiṇḍa* (presents from the king), *kiikamme* (*kṛtī*), *vaya* (*vrata*), *jīṭṭha* (*jyeṣṭhatvam*), *paḍikkamaṇe*, *māsam* (*māsakalpaḥ*), *pajjovasaṇakappe* (*varṣāsu caturmāsāvasthānarūpaḥ*), in reference to the *pūrvas*, out of the ninth of which the *śrikalpa* of Bhadrabāhu, "*uddhṛta*," etc., is the *Kalpāntar*., in loose connection with the text of the *Kalpasūtra*, makes the text of the latter the point of departure for the insertion of a large number of legends and other statements in prose and verse. The frequent mention of Hemacandrasūri and of Manaturn-gasūri, Malayagiri, of the *Vāmanam*, *Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇam* (as *vyākaraṇam* !!) and *Sārasvatam vyākaraṇam* shows that it was composed at a tolerably recent date. In general it may be said that there is a large amount of citations collected here. Of especial interest is the

peculiar attempt made in the introduction to prove the great age of the Jinaśāsanam from supposed Vedic passages, as the two “*vaiśvadeva-rcāu Yajurvede*.”⁸⁵² *Om ṛṣabham pavitraṁ puruhūtam adhvaram yajñeṣu nagnam paramaṁ pavitraṁ śrutadharaṁ yajñapati-pradhānam ṛturyajana (!) paśum indram āhave 'ti svāhā*, and : *trātāram indram ṛṣabham vadamti anitāram indram tam ariṣṭanemiṁ bhavē, subhavaṁ supārśvam indram | have tu śakra ajitam jinendram tad vardhamānaṁ puruhūtam indram svāhā*, and also *Vs. 31,18, Rk. 2,89,6* etc. all of which is cited [476] incorrectly⁸⁵³. The detailed enumeration of the Brahminical sciences in § 10 contains much of interest (18 *purāṇas*, 18 *smṛtis*, 18 *vyākaraṇas*). The foreign serving-women are enumerated in § 16, essentially in the regular way : — *khujjāo cilāo vāmaṇto vaḍabhto babbario pāūsiao joniao palhaviāo isiṇiao cāruṇiao lāsiao laūsiao demalio simhalio ābario (!) pulimḍio pakkāṇto maruṇḍio bahalio sabario pārāsio jāṭiyā dāsyah*. On § 108 : *bhagavato lekhanasālakaraṇaprārambho likhyate* (in Prakrit),—on § 209 a double enumeration of the 72 *kalās* and of the 18 *lipayas*—see above p. 400—on § 211, 64 *mahilāguṇās*.

The oldest of the commentaries to which I have had access is the *Samdehaviṣaṇṣadhir* of Jinaprabhamuni, composed in Ayodhya A.D. 1307 ; at the end there is added a commentary to a *paryuṣaṇākālpani-ryukti*. Both texts are composed in Prakrit, and the commentary is based especially on the *nīśīthacūrṇi*. This fact recalls chap. 8 of *chedasūtra* 4.

XXXIX. Fifth *chedasūtram*, the *bṛhatkalpa*, in 6 *uddesas*. Ordinances for the clergy of both sexes (*niggaṁtha* and *niggaṁthi*) in reference to that which is proper (*kappati*) and that which is not (*no kappati*).

The agreement in reference to the division into 6 *uddesas* shows that it is our text which (p. 446 ff.) is designated in the *Āvaśy.* 16,100 in connection with *dasā* and *vavahāra* and under the name of *kappa* simply.

[477] We shall have to recognize it under the designation of *kappa*, or *kalpādhyayana*, in other passages (see pp. 449,472) where there is

⁸⁵² I am unable to explain the first passage, the second is manifestly *Rk. 6, 47, 11 (Ts. 1,6,12,5)* : *trātāram indram avitāram indram have have suhavam śūram indram | hvayāmi śakraṁ puruhūtam indram svasti no maghavā dhātvy indrah ||* The words of the text which I have enclosed in brackets above do not occur here.

⁸⁵³ *na ce 'dam Jinaśāsanam arvācinam, vedādiṣvapi tadvacanāt, tathā hi : vedeṣu jinapramāṇāṅgula (?) darvī, tathā Yajurvede vaiśvadeva-ricau...*

mention made of the extraction of *kalpavyavahārau* from *pūrva* 9,3,20 by Bhadrabāhu. Its designation as *bṛhatkalpa*, or *vṛhatsādhukalpa* is unsuitable if we regard the diminutive size of the text (only 475 gr.). The conclusion (*ti bemi*) of *udd.* 4 and 6 is worthy of note.

The old *bhāṣya* in Prakrit *āryās*, belonging to this text, is designated simply as *kalpabhāṣya*, and is an enlargement of the “*kappassa nijjutti*,” which the author of the *Āvaśy*, declares that he composed (2,7). See Keilhorn (in the *Report on the Search of Sanskrit MSS.* 1880-81, pp. ix,x), in reference to an old MSS. of it (*Saṃvat* 1218) and to its very curious use of letters of the alphabet to denote numerical notation.⁸⁵⁴ The commencement differs considerably from that in a palm-leaf MS. similar to this, but much younger (*Saṃvat* 1334), of which the Berlin Library possess a copy made on transparent paper. The commencement of the Berlin MS.—after prefacing the first 6 §§ of the text—is *namo arahaṃtāṇaṃ, kāūṇa namokkāraṃ tiṭṭhayaṛāṇaṃ tiloyamahiyāṇaṃ | kappavavahārāṇaṃ vakkhāṇavihiṃ pavakkhāmi ||*.

XL. The sixth *chedasūtram* is called *pañcakalpa*⁸⁵⁵ in Bühler's list :—see p. 226. I have not had access to a text of this name, which is repeatedly mentioned (see pp. 448-449) both in *Avi.* and *V.*, together with a *jītakappa*. According to the *Vicārāmṛtasamgraha*, the *pañcakappa* is a work of Saṃghadāsavācaka, while the *jītakalpa* belongs to the Jinabhadraṇiṣṭamā [478] śramaṇa.⁸⁵⁶ We find in it citations from both texts. The *jītakalpa* is also enumerated in the *Ratnasāgara*, p. 507, as the sixth *chedasūtram*. Raj. L. Mitra, however (see p. 227 above), mentions it as the last of his “five *Kalpasūtras*”.

In lieu of commenting upon a text of the name of *pañcakalpa* I will at least remark on the *jītakalpa*, which is mentioned together with it, that a *śrāddhajītakalpa* in 141 Prakrit *gāthās* actually exists. It treats of the *prāyaścitta*, which suits the character of the *chedasūtras* exactly, but is referred to a definite author, Dharmaghoṣa, scholar of Devendra-muniśvara. In the anonymous commentary on it, it is designated as composed *upaniṣatkalpa* (!)-*kalpa-vyavahāra niśīthayati jītakalpānusāreṇa*. In

⁸⁵⁴ On this see Bhagvānlal Indraji on the ancient Nāgari Numerals in the *Indian Antiquary*, 6,42fg. (1877) and Bühler, *ibid.* p. 47 fg.

⁸⁵⁵ In Kielhorn's report, p. 94, there is mention made of a *pañcakalpasūtracūṛṇi* by Āmradevācārya.

⁸⁵⁶ See above, pp. 427,430. where both texts are counted in with the *painnas*. There are there several other texts ascribed to Jinabhadra. The passage reads : *Jinabha° śramaṇakṛto jītakalpaḥ, kṣetrasamāsāḥ, samgrahaṇi vīṣeṇavati ca*.

the commentary reference is paid to the *pravacanam* as *sāmāyikadibimḍu-sāraparyamtaṁ*, and in v. 58 erroneous doctrines and *pāṣaṇḍin* are treated of in detail. Then the *gīatthās* (see above pp. 437, 450, 464), to which the text refers in v. 141, are expressly explained as *śrīṇīśīthādi-chedagrān̄thār̄thasūtradharāḥ*.³⁵⁷ From all this we may draw the conclusion that the text is closely, [479] if not directly connected with the *chedasūtras*.

We have already mentioned in reference to the *mahākappa*, *Āvaśy.* 8,55 above pp. 446, 447, that the *Nandī* in its *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* list recognizes the existence of a *mahākappasuam*, a *cullakappasuam*, and a *kappiyā-kappiam*. In the scholiast *ibid*, we find the following explanation :—*kalpākālpapratipādakam adhyayanam kalpākālpam ; tathā kalpaḥ sthavira-kalpādiḥ, tat pratipādakam śrutam kalpaśrutam, tac ca dvidhā : kṣullakakalp° mahākālpa° ca, tatrai 'kam alpagrān̄tham alpār̄tham, dvitīyam mahā-grān̄tham mahār̄tham ca*. There is, therefore, no doubt but that texts of this class existed.³⁵⁸

[Vol. XVII. p. 1]

In Bühler's list there follow :—

E. *Nandīsūtram* and F. *Anuyogadvārasūtram*, without any name to connect them. In Rajendra Lal Mitra, *Notices of Sk.* MSS. 3,67 (Calc. 1874) and in the *Ratnasāgara*, p. 508 (Calc. 1880) both texts are mentioned in conjunction, but at the close of the *Siddhānta* after the *mūla-sūtras*. In the *Ratnas*, the *Anuyogadv.* precedes. On the other hand we have already seen (p. 427 fg.) that, at the time of the three *Sāmāyāris*, and indeed at that of the already seen (p. 427 fg.) that, at the time of the three *Sāmāyāris*, and indeed at that of the *Vicārāmṛtasamgraha*, both texts were placed in a much earlier place of the *Siddh.*, at the head of the *painna* group ; though in the *Vidhiprapā* at least, their connection with this group is represented as uncertain (see 429ⁿ).

In bearing the stamp of individuality and having a systematic arrangement, both texts have a claim to a free and independent position.

³⁵⁷ In the scholiast on *Vicārāmṛtasamgraha* the following explanation for *Jiyakappa* is found in citation from the *Paṃcakappa* : *jaṁ jassa ca pacchittam āyariya-paramparāyaiviruddham | jogā ya bahuvihi ya eso khalu jiyakappo u ||* :—and the word *jiyam* is *ibid*. explained as follows :—*jaṁ bahuhiṁ giyaṭṭhehiṁ ainnaṁ tam jiyam ucitam ācittamity anar̄thāntaram vyavahāracūṇipīṭhe, jītam nama prabhū-tānekagitār̄thakṛta maryādā tatpratipādano grān̄tho 'py upacārāt*.

³⁵⁸ Compare, also, the title of *upāṅga* 9.

This shews that their author attempted to give an encyclopædic, but systematic, review of everything that appeared necessary to him as a means of information in reference to the sources and forms of a correct knowledge and understanding of the sacred texts. In this way [2] he could present his readers with a hermeneutical introduction.⁸⁵⁹ These two works are admirably adapted to the use of any one who, having completed a collection or redaction of them, then seeks for light concerning the nature of sacred knowledge itself. The statement of the scholiast on the *Nandī* has no little internal probability⁸⁶⁰ in asserting that Devavācaka, i.e. Devarddhigaṇi himself, was their author. Furthermore, the list of teachers in the commencement of the *Nandī* and also in the commencement of *mūlas* 2, as we shall soon see, breaks off⁸⁶¹ with Dūsagaṇi, whom the scholiast states to be the teacher of Devavācaka, author of the *Nandī*. There is, however, no external support for this conclusion which is not borne out by any information to be derived from the contents. In fact, the contrary view seems to result from these sources of our knowledge ; see p. 17 ff. The *amuyogadv.* contains all manner of statements, which would synchronize with the date of Devarddhigaṇi, 980 Vīra, i.e. fifth or sixth century A.D. But I possess no information which would lead me to connect the composition of the *Amuyogadv.* especially with him ; and the difference in the terminology militates against the probability of both texts being the production of one and the same author ; see pp. 9,11,21. That the *Nandī* is anterior to the *Amuyogadv.* is made probable by some passages of the latter work, which appear to have been extracted from the *Nandī*. But the fact that the *Amuyogadv.* is mentioned in the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* list in the *Nandī* (see p. 12), makes for the opposite conclusion.

We find references to the *Nandī* in the remarks of the redactor scattered here and there in the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas* ; and especial attention is directed to the statement of the contents of the 12 *aṅgas* found in the N. This statement is found in greater detail in part 2 of *aṅga* 4. Hence the fact that in these references of the redactor, the *Nandī* and not *aṅga* 4 is cited. We do not read *jahā samavāye*, but *jahā Nandīe* ; see 284, 352 (accord, to Leumann, also *Bhag.* 25,3 *Rājapr.* p. 243) :—which must be regarded as a proof that the *Nandī* was the authority on which these references were based. The treatment of the subject in *aṅga* 4

⁸⁵⁹ "A glossary of the above-named *sūtras* and a description of five *Jñānas*" is the somewhat peculiar description of the contents of the *Nandīsūtra* by Kāśināth (p. 227).

⁸⁶⁰ See also Bhāu Dāji in the *Journal Bombay Branch R. As.* S. 9, 151.

⁸⁶¹ See Jacobi, *Kalpas.* p. 15, note 2.

is, then, merely an appropriation to itself and extension of the contents of this part of the *Nandī*. Other arguments, notably that many of the readings in the *Nandī* are older in special cases (see 349, 363) incline us to the same conclusion.

If now the nominal redactor of the entire *Siddhānta* or at least of the *aṅgas* and *upāṅgas*, Devarddhigani, was also author of the *Nandī*, it becomes at once apparent why he referred to his own work in reference to so special a subject as the statement of the contents of the 12 *aṅgas*, and the account in *aṅga* 4 is to be regarded as an insertion made after D's time. See p. 19.

I find in the *Siddhānta* no remarks of a redactor in reference to the *Anuyogadvāras*, though Leumann thinks to have discovered one (*Bhag.* 5, 4). In the text of *Āvaśy* 10, 1 the *Anuyogadvāras* is mentioned together with, or rather after, the *Nandī* as a preliminary stage of advancement for the study of the *sutta*. [Both texts are in fact thought to introduce the study of each *sutta* that has been treated by a *Niryukti*. L]

Both *sūtras* are composed in prose, though occasionally [4] *gāthās* are inserted; that is to say if we except the 50 verses in the commencement of the *Nandī*. These *gāthās*, in which the Nom. Sgl. Masc. 1 Decl. always ends in *o* and not in *e*, are manifestly the genuine productions of their authors. In the prose part, the preservation of the nom. in *e* shews that there is an attempt to reproduce the language and form of the sacred texts. The *Nandī* embraces only 719 *granthas*, the *Anuyogadv.* about twice as many.

XLI. The *Nandī*, *Nandī* or the *Nandisūtram*. The three *sāmāyārī* texts understood by *Nandī*, or *nandikaḍḍhāvaṇīā* (*Āvi*), *nandirayaṇavihi* (*Vi*), an introductory ceremony, in long or short form as the case may be, for the *sāvayakaccāṇi* (*śrāvakakṛtyāni*), especially for the didactic exposition or the recitation of the *aṅgas*, etc. It is almost probable that by this the recitation of our text is referred to. We read in *Āvi* : *tao gurū namokkāra-tigapuvvaṃ naṇḍim kaḍḍhai, sā ce yaṃ : nāṇaṃ paṇ-caviham* and then follows the real commencement of the *Nandī*. See below. This is, however, soon interrupted, and the citation passes to that variant textual form which is found in *Anuyogadv.* Another change then occurs, and finally that enumeration of the sacred texts is reached which is found later on in the *Nandī*. We have, therefore, here no immediate citation from the text of the *Nandī* but a relation based essentially on the same foundation but in its form independent, a relation whose designation by the same word is based upon the appellative signification

of this expression. We may compare the [5] similar use of the word *nāndī* in Skt. for these introductory strophes of a drama, which are designed to bring good fortune. Cf. also *nāndika* as the name of a door-post, and *nāndīpaṭa*, a cover of a spring (P. W.). Haribhadra on *Āvaśy.* 9, 1 has the following :— *ādimamṅgalārthaṁ nāndī vyākhyāta*, and in the commencement of his commentary, *ibid.* ;— *no-āgamato bhāvamamṅgalam nāndī, tatra nāmdanam nāndī, nāmdamty anayo 'ty vā bhavyāḥ prāṇina iti nāndī*. The signification of the title of our text is really an introduction designed to bring good fortune. This title can refer either to the entire contents of the work such as I have above sketched, or, and this seems preferable, to the 50 verses which form the beginning.⁸⁶² In vv. 1-19 *Vīra* is praised, in vv. 20, 21 there is an enumeration of the 24 Jinas, in vv. 22, 23 a list of his immediate scholars, the 11 so-called *gaṇadhara*s, and finally, from v. 24 on, a *therāvalī* beginning with *Suhamma* (1) and *Jambū* (2), and embracing in all thirty members ; it closes in the third generation after *Nāgajjuṇa* (29) with *Dūsagaṇi* (30), who, according to the anonymous scholiast (on v. 27) was the teacher of *Devavācaka*, the author.⁸⁶³

As we have already seen on page 471, this *therāvalī* varies, from the ninth member on, from the statements in the list contained in the *Kalpasūtra*. [6] The reason for this is apparent from a consideration of the remarks of the scholiast (*avacūri*) on v. 27 *Suhastinaḥ śiṣyāvalī-kāyāḥ śrīkalpe uktatvāt na ta(s)ya ihā 'dhikārah, tasyāṁ Nāmdikarḍ-Devavācaka-gurvanūpatteḥ*. From this it is clear that the author of the *avacūri* considers *Devavācaka* to be the author of the *Nāndī*, and that this account does not emanate, like that of the *śrīkalpa*, from *Suhastin* (10). The evidence proves that it is rather to be referred to his immediate predecessor, or brother,⁸⁶⁴ *Mahāgiri* (9), whose intellectual descent it makes known.

In reference to each of its members there exists great uncertainty,⁸⁶⁵ according to the statements of the scholiast, who says of verses 31, 32 :

⁸⁶² These recur, as has already been mentioned, in the commencement of the *Āvaśy.* *nijj.* in identically the same form.

⁸⁶³ Cf. the name of the *nāndīmukhāḥ pitaras* or of the *nāndīśrāddham*. In the case of the latter was there any recitation of a list of ancestors ?

^{864?} *gurubhrātarau* in Klatt, *Indian Antiqu.* 11, 251a, or *ubhāvapi bhrātarau* in Dharmaghoṣa's *Gurvāvalī* itself. *Suhastin* is characterized as the *laghugurubhrātar* of *Mahāgiri*, also in the *pattāvalī* of the *Kharataragaccha*, Klatt, 246b. Klatt in accordance with other traditions (cf. *Kalpa-sūtra*) refers both to different *gotras* : and *Mahāgiri* to *Elāpatyagotra* (so here v. 27, *Elāvacasagotta*), *Suhastin* to *Vāsiṭṭha*. Have they different mothers ?

⁸⁶⁵ On this cf. *Jacobi in Journ. Germ. Or. Soc.* 34, 252, 3, especially in reference to verses 27, 28, 36, 37, and *Leumann's* remarks, *ibid.* 37, 497 fg. In v. 27 we must

kṣepakatvād vṛttau no 'ktam.⁸⁶⁸ and remarks on vv. 33, 34 : *etadgāthā-dvayārtha āvaśyakadīpikāto likhito 'sti avacūrṇāv api nā 'sti*, vv. 41, 42 is *vṛttāv avyākhyātātvaṭ prakṣiptam*, and of Govindācārya he says, on v. 43 : *śiṣyakramūbhāvād vṛttau no 'ktaḥ, āvaśyakatīkāto likhitah*.

[7] The list reads⁸⁶⁷ 1. Suhamma,—2. Jambu,—3. Pabhava, 4.—Sijjambhava,—5. Jasabhadda—6. Saṃbhūa,—7. Bhaddavāhu,—8. Thulabhadda,—9. Mahāgiri (and Suhatthi,—10. (Valissaha) the twin-brother of Vahula (see note on p. 6).—11. Sāi,⁸⁶⁸ 12. Sāmajja, Syāmaria,⁸⁶⁹ 13. Saṃḍilla,—14. Ajja⁸⁷⁰ Jīadhara, Jīta,[°]—15. Samudda,—16. Maṃgu⁸⁷¹ v. 30,—17. Dhamma v. 31,—18. Bhaddagutta v. 31—19. Vaara,⁸⁷² Vajra v. 31,—20. Rakkhia v. 32,—21. Ajjānaṃdila, i. e. perhaps Ajja Ānaṃdila (Ajja N° schol) v. 33,—22. Nāgahatthi v. 34,—23. Revaniakkhatta v. 35.—24. Khaṃḍilā vv. 36, 37⁸⁷³—25. Himavaṃta vv. 38, 39,—26. Nāgajjuna⁸⁷⁴ vv. 39, 40, 45,—27. Govinda v. 41,—28. Bhūadinna vv. 42-45, scholar of Nāgajjuna—29. Lohiccha v. 46,—30. Dūsagaṇi vv. 47-49.

That this list actually reaches as far as the author or his teacher is rendered the more probable by the fact that in the last verse of the list (v. 50) the *nāṇassa parūvaṇaṃ* is stated to be the purpose of the account which is to follow—and this purpose reproduces correctly the contents of N. Next follow two secondary insertions, first a *gāthā*, [8] which cites 14 examples or titles of stories in reference to capable and incapable scholars (the *avacūri* contains a more detailed account) and secondly a short polemical notice of the three kinds of *parisā*, *parṣad*, viz :—*jāṇiā*, *ajāṇiā* and *duvviadḍhiā* each of which is illustrated by a *gāthā*.

read in Jacobi : *Bahulassa sarivvayaṃ* (vvayaṃ for vayasam) *vaṃde* instead of *bahulassa Sirivvayaṃ vaṃde* (see Klatt. 1. c 251b); in the scholiast we read *iha Mahāgiriṇ dvau śiṣyau abhūtām : Vahulo Valissahaś* (cf. *Kalpas. Therāv. § 6*) *ca ; tato Mahāgiriṇ anāmtaram Vahulasya yamalabhṛātṭvāt sadṣāvayasam, prāvācāni-katvena pradhānatvāt, Valissaham eve 'ty arthah*.

⁸⁶⁶ Āryanaṃdila (21) v. 33 becomes then Ārya-Maṃgu (16) *śiṣya* v. 30. But even verse 33, in which Āryanaṃdila is mentioned is doubtful : see above.

⁸⁶⁷ See Merutuṅga's *Theravāṭi* in Bhāu Dāji, *Journ. Bombay Br. R As. S. 9*, 151 (1867). Nos 17-20 are not found therein (see p. 6). No. 21 is called Mandilla (ḍila), No. 23 Revaisiṇha, and the list gives one name more in mentioning Devard) dhi himself after Dūsagaṇi.

⁸⁶⁸ *Valissahaśiṣyaṃ Hāritagotraṃ Svātīm*.

⁸⁶⁹ Nominally author of *up. 4*, see p. 392.

⁸⁷⁰ This epithet explained by *Āryagotra* is found also in Nos. 15—17, 19-22.

⁸⁷¹ *ke 'pi Maṃgor Āryadharme 'ti nāmāntaram āhuḥ*, No. 17 then falls out.

⁸⁷² According to the scholiast the *daṣapūrvīṇaḥ* (see Hem. v. 34) *Āryarakṣitas tacchiṣyo Durvalikāpuṣpaś ca navapūrvīṇau*, reach from Mahāgiri to Vajra. See page 348.

⁸⁷³ *Baṃbhādivagaśiḥe, Vrahmadvīpikaśākhopalakṣitān Simhān Simhācāryān*.

⁸⁷⁴ Cf. the Nāgārjunīyās in the Scholiast on *aṅga 2*, 2, 2, and see p. 265.

At this point the investigation of the *jñānam* begins, in which a principal part is played by the enumeration of the different categories and sub-categories of both the principal classes into which the *jñānam* is divided⁸⁷⁵ — the *paccakkhanāṇam* and the *parokkhanāṇam*. The latter contains much that is interesting. It in turn is twofold, *ābhinihoḥiya°* (*°bodhika*) and *sua°* (*śruta*).

In the account of one of the two groups into which the *ābhinihoḥiyaparokkhanāṇam* is divided, are inserted eight *gāthās*, which contain the titles of stories which belong in this connection, and which are intended to serve as examples. The *avacūri* goes into detail on this point.

The *suanāṇaparokkham* is divided into 14 groups among which Nos. 5, 6, 13, 14 are of special importance :—The *sammasuam* 5, *samyakśrutam*, is explained as *jaṁ imaṁ arihaṁtehiṁ bhagavaṁtehiṁ uppannāṇa-darśanādharehiṁ paṇīyaṁ duvālasaṁgaṁ gaṇipīḍagaṁ, taṁ jahā : āyāro diṭṭhivāo*⁸⁷⁶ *icc-eyam duḡgaṁ gaḡgaṁ coddasapuvvissa sammasuam ābhinna*⁸⁷⁷ *dasa* [9] *puvvisa sammasuam*. The posteriority of its composition to Vajra at least is clearly brought out in this passage.

In *micchāsuam* 6 we find that enumeration of some 20 works, or classes of works, of Brahminical literature which I cited from the *Anuyogadvārasūtra*⁸⁷⁸ and discussed on Bhagav. 2, 248. This list is here more detailed and offers several variants :—*Bhārahaṁ Rāmāyaṇam Bhīmāsurokkham*⁸⁷⁹ *Koḍillayam*⁸⁸⁰ *sagabhaddiyāo*⁸⁸¹ *kappāsiyam*⁸⁸² *nāgasu-*

⁸⁷⁵ *nāṇaṁ paṁcavihaṁ : ābhinihoḥiyanāṇaṁ sua° ohi° maṇapajjava° kevala°*. Or *duvihaṁ : paccakkham* and *parokkham*, and the latter is then : *ābhinihoḥiyaparokkhanāṇaṁ ca suanāṇaparokkham ca*; the *āhi°* is *suanissiam ca asuanissiyam ca*; both are fourfold, and the latter is divided into : *uppatiyā, veṇāḍā, kammā, parināmiā buddhī* (see p. 14n).

⁸⁷⁶ In the scholiast *sāmāyikādi viṁḍusārāparyamtam*, see pages 244, 245, 343.

⁸⁷⁷ *tato 'dhomukhaparihānyā yāvat saṁpūrṇadaśapūrvadharasya*; see p. 16n.

⁸⁷⁸ Where it is characterized as *no-āgamao bhāvasuyam* and as *annāpīthim micchādīṭṭhīm sacchāmdabuddhamaivigappiyam* :—cf. the 29 *vihaṁ pāvāsuam Āuasy.*, *Ind. Stud.* 16, pp. 115, 116. I denote the four MSS., to which I have had access as A B C R. The citations from Nēd. are by Laumann.

⁸⁷⁹ *°ktam A, °kam R.*

⁸⁸⁰ *Koḍa° An.*, where *ghoḍamuham* (A, *°ḍayamu° C, °ḍayasuham B, ḍayasuyam R*) follows. Nēd too has *khoḍamuham*, but after *sayabha°*.

⁸⁸¹ *sagaḍabha° B C R, setāmbha° A.*

⁸⁸² *kappakappiam A.*

*humam kanagasattam*⁸⁸³ *vaisesiyam*⁸⁸⁴ *Vuddhavayanam*⁸⁸⁵ *vesiyam*⁸⁸⁶ *Logūyatam saṭṭhitam*⁸⁸⁷ *Mādharam*⁸⁸⁸ *purāṇam vāgaram* *Bhāgavayam*⁸⁸⁹ *Pāamjalī Pussadevāyam leham* (helam MS) *gaṇiam saṇṇarūyam*⁸⁹⁰ *nāḍayāi*⁸⁹¹ *ahavā* [10] *bāvattari kalāo cattāri ya veyā saṅgovamgā*. The commentary offers nothing in explanation⁸⁹² *te ca lokaprasiddhāḥ, tato lokata eva teṣāṃ svarūpam avagantavyam*

Under *anaṅgapaviṭṭham* (No. 14 is, however, treated of before No. 13) are enumerated the titles of all the texts belonging to the *Siddhānta* at the time of the composition of the *Nandī*, but not included in the *aṅgas*. This enumeration is extremely interesting. It must have been retained as a stereotyped list for a long period after the composition of the *Nandī*, since it is to be found *verbatim et litteratim* not only in the *Pākṣikasūtra* (P),⁸⁹³ but also in the 3 *sāmācārīs* (see pp. 369, 370) in a form that is but slightly different.⁸⁹⁴ The great interest which attaches to this list is caused by the fact that the largest portion of the texts similar to these and now belonging to the *Siddhānta* is mentioned here, and that a different arrangement is observed. They are not enumerated in the special groups into which they are now divided. The names of these groups are partly wanting, e.g., *uvamga. painna cheasutta*

883 °sattari vesiyam B C R, vasiyam omitted in A.

884 so An. Nēd. vasesiyam the Berlin MS. of N. (=MS).

885 °vaṇayam MS., Vuddhasāṣaṇam B C R, rutṭha (!) vayanam A; in An. we find also Kāvilam; also in Nēd. Kāviliyam comes before Loga°.

886 tesiyam Nēd., B C R, omit.

887 Already mentioned in the aṅgas, see Bhag. 2, 246 page 304 (cf. Kalpas. pp. 35, 101) and Max Müller: *India, What can it teach us?* p. 362.

888 See *Ind. Stud.* 13, 387, 88, 425, and *Agnimāthara Viṣṇupur* 3, 4, 18 (pp. 44, 45 Wilson-Hall).

889 Bhāgavayam to saṇṇarūyam omitted in An.

890 saṇṇarūyam MS.; perhaps °ruyam, otherwise the last of the 72 kalās; see above p. 283. In the scholiast on *Āvaśy*, 12, 36: *saṇṇipāro vi garahio hoi* we find the following peculiar statement:—*śakunīśabdena caturdaśa vidyāsthānāni pariṭṭhāyante: aṅgāni caturo vedā mīrāṇsā nyāyavistarāḥ purāṇam, dharmasāstram ca sthānāny āhuḥ caturdaśa || tatrā aṅgāni saṭ, tad yathā: śikṣā vyākaraṇam kalpaḥ chaṇḍo niruktam jyotiṣam iti*. The position of the aṅgas in the front of the list is one of the remarkable things in this statement.

891 Mādhara purāṇa vāgaram B R; nāḍagādī A.

892 Hemacandrasūri on the *Anuyogadv.* has likewise only: *etac ca Bhāratādikam nāṭakādi-paryamitam śrutam lokaprasiddhigamyam*.

893 In the *Pākṣikasūtra* this is introduced by the words *namo teṣāṃ khamāsamaṇāṇāṃ jehim imam vaiyam aṅgabāhiram ukkāliyam* (or *kāliyam*) *bhagavaṃtam, tam jahā: dasaveyāliyam*... The *Pākṣikasūtram* is enumerated by Raj L. M. see above p. 227, as the fourth *mūlasūtram* after the *Siddhāntadharmasāra*. It sings the praises of each part of the *Siddhānta* (aṅgabāhira and *duvalasamga*) and contains especially an acknowledgment of belief in the five *mahavvayas*.

894 The enumeration of the names in S. contains a different grammatical construction, i.e. the names are in the genitive.

mūlasutta are not mentioned at all, and *painna* occurs, but in a different meaning. A large number of titles or texts are mentioned which at present are either not found in the [11] *Siddhānta*, or, if found at all, are merely titles of sub-divisions and not of independent texts ; and in some cases these titles appear to have arisen from their connection with the subject-matter itself.

The *anaṅgapaviṭṭham* is divided into two groups : *āvassayam* and *āvassayavairittam*. The *āvassayam* is called *chavvihaṃ* and six names for it are enumerated : *sāmāiyam caūvisathao* etc. Cf. my remarks on page 433 and on *anuyogaḍv*. and *mūlasutta* 2. The *āvassayavairittam* is double : *kāliyam ca ukkāliyam ca*. Then follows the enumeration of the texts counted as belonging to the *ukkāliyam*⁸⁹⁵ 1. *dasaveyāliyam* 45⁸⁹⁶ 2. *kappiyākappiyam*,⁸⁹⁷ 3. *cullakappasuaṃ* 4. *mahākappasuaṃ*,⁸⁹⁸ 5. *ovāiyam*⁸⁹⁹ 13, 6. *rāyapaseṇiyam*⁹⁰⁰ ; 14, 7. *jīvābhigamo* 15, 8. *pañṇavaṇā* 16, 9. *mahāpañṇavaṇā*,⁹⁰¹ 10. *pamāyappamāyam*,⁹⁰² [12] 11. *naṃdī*⁹⁰³ 41, 12. *devimdatthao*⁹⁰⁴ 31, 13. *anuogadārāim* 42, 14. *taṃdulaveyāliyam* 29, 15. *caṃdāvijjhayam*⁹⁰⁵ 30, 16. *sūrapaṇṇatti*⁹⁰⁶ 17, 17. *porisimaṃḍalam*,⁹⁰⁷ 18.

⁸⁹⁵ The *avacūri* gives explanations (occasionally in detail) of at least some of the names. A large number of the names is, however, passed over in silence. (Explanations may however be found at the end of the *Vyavahārabhāṣya*, as the corresponding part of the *sūtra* mentions most of the names. — L).

⁸⁹⁶ These numbers represent the arrangement which I have observed here in essential agreement with Bühler's list in the enumeration of the part of the *Siddhānta*.

⁸⁹⁷ The texts which are no longer found as separate texts in the *Siddhānta*, are printed in italics. On *kappiyak*, (cf. *kappākappiam* p. 9n. 24) *cullak*, and *mahāk.*, see the scholiast's remarks, p. 479 above.

⁸⁹⁸ Name of the first *chedasūtra* according to *Āvaśyaka* 8, 55 see pages 446, 479.

⁸⁹⁹ So V., *uvavā°* P, *uvā°* N. *Āvi. Svi.* ; in S before No. 5 we find : *pamāyappamāyam* : *pamāy*, here is No. 10.

⁹⁰⁰ So also P. *Āvi.* a form which suits *rājaprasāniyam* better than the usual *paseṇaiyam* ; *Svi. V.* have *paseṇaiyassa* but with one y ; see p. 382.

⁹⁰¹ For explanation of the scholiast on Nos. 8, 9, see p. 392.

⁹⁰² In S before No. 5, in P. after No. 15 ; *pramāḍapramāḍasvarūpabhedaphalavipākā-pratipādakam adhyayanam* (cf. *Uttarajjh. Cap. 4*), *Avac.*

⁹⁰³ The *Nandī* itself ! *naṃdīyādi sugamam*.

⁹⁰⁴ °*thū* P ; in Ned. P. S, transposed with No. 13 (°*dārāo* P).

⁹⁰⁵ °*vijjiyam* P, °*vijjayam* Ned.

⁹⁰⁶ Is omitted here in PS and comes after No. 37 ; *sūryacaryāprajñāpanam yasyam grānthapaddhatau sā sūryaprajñaptiḥ*.

⁹⁰⁷ *porasam* P ; *pauruṣimaṃḍalam iti, puruṣaḥ saṃkuḥ, puruṣaśarīram vā, tasmān nih-pannāpauruṣi, sarvasyā 'pi vastuno yathā svapramāṇā chāyā jāyate tadā pauruṣi syāt, etac ca pauruṣipramāṇam uttarāyaṇasyā 'mte dakṣiṇāyanasyā 'dau ca ekam dīnam syāt, tataḥ param aṃgulasyā 'śṭāv ekasāṣṭibhāgā (8/31) dakṣiṇāyane vardhamte, uttarāyaṇe ca hrasānti, evaṃ maṃdale-maṃdale pauruṣi yatrā 'dhyayane varṇyate tat pauruṣimaṃḍalam, Avac.* Cf. book 9 in up. 5 [and *Bhag.* 11, 11, L].

maṇḍalappaveso,⁹⁰⁸ 19. *vijjācaraṇa-vinicchao*,⁹⁰⁹ 20. *gaṇivijjā*⁹¹⁰ 32, 21. *jhāṇavibhatti*,⁹¹¹ 22. *marañavibhatti*,⁹¹² 23. *āyavisohi*,⁹¹³ 24. *viyarāyasuam*,⁹¹⁴ 25. *saṁlehaṇāsuam*,⁹¹⁵ 26. *vihārakappa*,⁹¹⁶ 27. *caraṇavihi*,⁹¹⁷ 28. *āura* [13] *paccakkhāṇam*⁹¹⁸ 26, 29. *mahāpaccakkhāṇam*⁹¹⁹ 33 *evam-ai*.⁹²⁰ To the *kāliyam* the following texts are ascribed :— 30. *uttarajjhayaṇāim*⁹²¹ 43, 31. *dasāo* 38, 32. *kappo* 39, 38. *vavahāro* 37, 34. *nisiham*⁹²² 35, 35. *mahā-nisīham* 36, 36. *isibhāsiyāim*,⁹²³ 37. *jaṇvuddivapaṇṇatti* 18, 38. *divasā-garaṇṇatti*,⁹²⁴ 39. *caṁdapaṇṇatti* 19. 40. *khuḍḍiyā vimāṇapavibhatti*,⁹²⁵

908 *sūryacāṁdrīmasor yatra dakṣiṇeṣū 'ttareṣu ca maṇḍaleṣu saṁcarator yathā maṇḍa-lān maṇḍale praveṣe* (°ṣo) *vyāvarṇyate sūn (tan) maṇḍalapraveṣaḥ*, *Avac.* ; cf. the first book in *up. 5*.

909 *vijjā*° P, S ; in P S transposed with No. 20 ; *vidyā samyagjñānaṁ caraṇaṁ cāritram, eṭeṣāṁ phalavinīscaya pratipādako grāṁthaḥ*, *Avac.* (= *Bhag.* 20, 9 Leumann.)

910 See p. 443.

911 *yatrā 'rtadhyānādīnām vibhajanaṁ proktaṁ tat*, *Avac.* ; appears in the *Vidhiprapa* among the *painnaṣ* in the eighth place. See p. 428.

912 Omitted in *Āvi. pr. m.*, *marāṇāni prāśastāprāśastarūpāṇi teṣāṁ pārthakyena yatra vibhajanaṁ uktam* *Avac.* ; see p. 428n.

913 *yatrā (!) "tmano jīvasyā" locanā-prāyaścitta-pratipatti-prabhṛtikaraṇena viśuddhir yatra vyāvarṇyate tat*, *Avac.* In *Svi. V. marāṇaviśohi* in addition follows here.

914 In P S after No. 25 ; *sarāgavāpohena vitarāgasvarūpaṁ vyāvarṇyate yatra tat*, *Avac.*

915 *yatra dṛavyabhāvasaṁlekhanāsvārūpaṁ pratipādyate*, *Avac.* ; three verses are added in attestation thereof : *yathā, cattāri vicittāṁ vigāṇijjūhiyāi cattāri saṁvacchare u dunnī u egaṁtariyaṁ ca āyāmaṁ || 1 || nāvigittṭho atavo chammāse parimāṁ ca āyāmaṁ | anne vi ya chammāse hoi vikiṭṭhaṁ tavokammaṁ || 2 || vāse koḍisahiyaṁ āyāmaṁ kaṭṭu ānupuvvī | girikaṁdarmmi gaṁtuṁ pāvogamaṇaṁ aha kareḥ || 3 || bhāvasaṁlekhaṇaṁ tu krodhādipratipakṣābhyaṣaḥ (!)*. (The three verses are taken from the *Ācāra-niryukti* (287-289).—L)

916 *vihāraḥ sthvirakalpādirūpo yatra varṇyate*, *Avac.*

917 *visohi* P, *vibhatti* *Svi* ; *cāritrasya vidhiḥ*, *Avac.*

918 The scholiast appears to have had before him another text than the usual one. See p. 437.

919 *mahat pratyākhyānaṁ yatro 'ktaṁ*, *Avac.*

920 Instead of *evamāi* P has : *savvehiṁ pi eyamma aṁgabāhire ukkālie bhagavaṁte sasutte sa-atthe saggamaṁte sanijjuttie sasamgahaṇie je guṇā va bhāvā va...te bhāve saddahāmi*.

921 *eṭāny adhyayanāni nigamaṇaṁ sarveṣāṁ adhyayanānāṁ pradhānatve 'pi rūḍhyā 'mūny evo 'ttarādhyayanaśabdavācyatvena prasiddhāni*, *Avac.*

922 Without any explanation. See p. 460 for No. 35.

923 In P S before No. 34 ; without explanation. See pages 259, 272, 280-81, 402, 429, 432, 442.

924 In P S No. 16 is inserted here. The order in P is *sūrap. caṁdap.*, *divasāg.*, in S ; *caṁdap.*, *sūrap.*, *divas.* ; or *divasāgarap.* See pp. 268, 389, 429.

925 *khuḍḍiyā* and *mahālliyā* also in S (i.e. °yāvi°) not °yāe as we should expect ; *āvalikā-praviṣṭānāṁ itareṣāṁ vā vimānānāṁ prabhajanaṁ yatro 'ktaṁ, sā vimānapravibhaktir dvīdhā, 'lpakṣarārthā" dyā, dvitīyā naṇāgrāṁthārthā*. See the *kārikās* above pp. 223, 224 in reference to Nos. 40-44, 45-49 as the object of study for the eleventh and twelfth years. In *aṅga 3* Nos. 40-49 appear together as forming the *saṁkhevi-yadasāu*, or as the 10 *ajjhayanās* that belong in this connection. See pp. 273, 274.

41. *mahalliyā vimāṇapavibhaṭṭi*⁹²⁵ 42. *aṃgacūliā*,⁹²⁶ 43. *vaṃgacūliyā*,⁹²⁷ 44. *vivāhacūliyā*,⁹²⁸ 45. *Aruṇovavāe*,⁹²⁹ 46. *Garulovavāe*,⁹³⁰ [14] 47. *Dharanovavāe*,⁹³¹ 48. *Vesamaṇovavāe*,⁹³² 49. *Velamḍharovavāe*, 50. *devimḍovavāe*, 51. *uṭṭhāṇasue*,⁹³³ 52. *samuṭṭhāṇasue*,⁹³⁴ 53. *nāgapariyāvaliyāo*,⁹³⁵ 54. *nirayāvaliyāo*,⁹³⁶ 20, 55. *kappaiyāo*,⁹³⁶ 20, 56. *kappavaḍimsayāo*⁹³⁷ 22, 57. *pupp-hiyāo* 21, 58. *pupphacūliyāo* 23, 59. *Vaṇhidasāo* 24, *evam-āiyāim*⁹³⁸ *caūrāsī painnagasayasahassāim bhagavao Vaḍḍhamāṇasāmissa; ahavā jassa jattiyā sīsā uppattiyāe*⁹³⁹ *veṇaiyāe kammīyāe pāriṇāmiyāe caūvviḥāe buddhīe uvaveyā tassa tattiyāim painnagasahassāim, pattegabuddā vi tattiyā ceva; se 'taṃ kālīam suam*. This is the conclusion in the Berlin MS. of N. Dr. Leumann, [15] however, says that this conclusion contains a large lacuna. We find in the edition of N⁹⁴⁰ : *evamāiyāim caūrāsī painna-*

926 *aṃgasyā* "cārādes cūlikā uktānuktārthasamgrahāt mikā grāṃhapaddhatī; see pp. 255, 274.

927 so MS. P. *Āvi*, but *vagga*° Ned. *aṃga* 3 (see p. 274) *Svi*, V. *Avac*; *vargo* 'dhyayanānam samūho yathā 'mtakḍḍasāsv aṣṭau vargās (see p. 320), *teṣāṃ kalikā* (cūl° ?)

928 *bhagavaticūlikā*, see pp. 274, 296.

929 *Aruṇa nāma devas, tadvaktavyatāyāḥ pratipādako grāṃthaḥ, parāvartyamānā ca tadupapātaheṭuḥ so ruṇopapātoḥ; evam garuḍopapātādayo 'pi vācyāḥ*; see pp. 224, 274, 316; cf. *Aruṇa* as name of the dawn or as that of the charioteer of the sun. Up to this point the nominatives end in *o*, from this point on in *e*; so also in P.

930 *Garuḍo*° P. In P after 47.

931 So also S, but *Varu*° in P and scholiast on *aṃga* 3, *Vara*° in the text there (see p. 274). The king of the Nāgas is probably referred to.

932 In N after No. 49, we find *vesamaṇa* = *vaśīravana*.

933 *uṭṭhāṇasrutam, udvasanahetukam srutam, Avac*. See page 224, where mention is made of four *ajjh*, which begin with *uṭṭh*., and which are the subject of the study of the thirteenth year. In this place, however, we find only Nos. 52-55 devoted to this year; but does No. 50, too, belong in this connection? In Sv. No. 50, stands between 52 and 53.

934 *samupasthāpanasrutam, bhūyas tatrai 'vā 'vāsana(?)hetukam srutam; vakārālo-paḥ, prākṛtatvāt, Avac*.

935 so P. *°yāvanīyāo* MS.; *°yāvaliyānam* *Svi*, V., *°pāriaveliānam* *Āvi*: *nāgakumārās, teṣāṃ pariñā yatro 'ktā, Avac*.

936 so MS. 2 P, *°līo* MS. 1; *°liyānam* S; No. 54 in the existing *Siddhanta* is the collective name of *up* 8 to 12 and at the same time the specific title of *up* 8; No. 55 is there merely another name for No. 54. See p. 418; and p. 420 for the explanation of 54-59. On page 420 we must read *°gocarā grām*°.

937 *ḍaṃsi* P, *ḍiṃsi* V.

938 Instead of *evam āiyāim*..P has 60 *āstvisabhāvaṇāo*, 61 *diṭṭhivisabhāvaṇāo*, 62 *cāraṇasamaṇabhāvaṇāo*, 63 *mahāsuvinabhāvaṇāo*, 64 *teaginīsaggā nam savvehiṃ pi eyammi aṃgabāhire kālie bhagavante*... (as above, p. 13, note 3). These five names are cited in S, too with the following variations: *cāraṇabhāvaṇānam* (omitted in *Āvi*), *mahāsuminagabhāv*. (V., also omitted in *Āvi*), *teyaga* (*teagga*° *Āvi*.) *nisaggānam*. These five texts are found in the same order in the *kārikās* mentioned in p. 224 as designed for the fourteenth to the eighteenth year of study. *Teyanisagga* is the special name of the fifteenth book in *aṃga* 5. See p. 301n.

939 See above p. 8, note 1; *āutpattikī, vāṇayikī karmasamutthā pāriṇāmikī*.

940 The *Avac*. agrees with the account in our MSS. :—*evam ādini caturastisamkhyāni prakṛṇakasahasrāṇi Rṣabhasvāminas, tāvatpramāṇānam śramaṇasahasrāṇāṃ sambha-*

gasahassāim bhagavao [*Usahasāmissa ātitthagarassa, taha saṁkhijjāim painnagasahassāim majjhamagāṇam Jīṇavarāṇam, cauddasa painnagasahassāim bhagavao*] *Vaddhamānasāmissa*, etc.

From this we may draw the conclusion that the 59 titles⁹⁴¹ according to the opinion of the author of the *Nandī*, represent merely a portion of the 84,000 *painnas* (our MS. has 184,000 in the text), which belonged to the first tīrthakara Rṣabhasvāmin and to the 22 Jīṇavaras following him; but that at the time of Vardhamānasvāmin their number was reduced to 14,000. Or according to another view, each of the 24 tīrthakaras had just so many thousand *painnas* or *pratyekabuddhas*⁹⁴² [16] as he possessed scholars endowed with the correct fourfold knowledge. Estimating these exaggerated figures at their true value, let us consider the 59 titles.⁹⁴³ Of the texts now enumerated as parts of the *Siddhānta* the titles of the four *painnas* 25, 27, 28, 34, of the sixth *chedasūtra* 40 and of two of the *mūlasūtras*, 44 and 46 are omitted. Of these the four *painnas* are to be regarded as modern productions and later than the N; the titles of the sixth *chedasūtra* 40 and of the fourth *mūlasūtra* 46, are not certain; and, finally, the title of the fourth *mūlasūtra* 44, *āvaśyaka*, has been already mentioned. See on p. 11. The remaining 27 titles of texts of the present *Siddhānta* not belonging to the *aṅgas* (13 fg.) are one and all contained in the above list, though in a different order of arrangement and without any statement in reference to the names of their groups. Some, however, belong together as groups—the first four and the last five *upāṅgas* (Nos. 5-8 and 55-59) and the five *chedasūtras* (Nos. 31-35). Besides these the list contains

vāt, prakīrṇakāṇāṁ ca tadracitatvāt; madhyamatīrthakṛtām api saṁkhyeyāni prakīrṇakasahasrāṇi vācyāni; Vardhamānasvāminas caturdaśasahasrāṇi.— anye punar āhuḥ: idam Rṣabhādīnām caturāśtisahasrādikaṁ śramaṇamānaṁ pradhānesūtraracanāsāṁ adhyāni (or merely °canām?) *adhikṛtyo 'ktam, anyathā sāmānyaśramaṇāḥ prabhū-tatārā api tadā Rṣabhādīkāle āsīran.— anye punar evam āhuḥ: Rṣabhādīnām jīvatām idam caturāśtisahasrādikaṁ śramaṇamānaṁ, pravāhataḥ punar ekaikasmin tīrthe bhūyāmsō 'py āsīran, tatra ye pradhānasūtraracanāsaktisamanvitāḥ suprasiddhatatvaṁdhāya (?) tatkālikā api tīrtham pravartamānās tatrā dhikṛtā (h): etad eva darśayann āha: ahave 'ty-ādī sugamaṁ.*

941 Or 60 including *maraṇavisohī* (Svi, V. between 23 and 24) and 65 with the addition of the five names in PS.

942 *pratyekabuddhā api tāvaṁta eva syuḥ; — atrai 'ke vyācakṣate: ekaikaṣyā 'pi tīrthakṛtas tīrthe parimāṇāni prakīrṇakāni, tatkāriṇām aparimāṇatvāt; kevalaṁ pratyekabuddharacitāny eva prakīrṇakāni, draśṭavyāni tatparimāṇena pratyekabuddhaparimāṇasya pratipādanāt* This explanation of *eke* is designed to effect a perfectly comprehensible limitation, but cannot be brought in agreement with the context. The title *pratyekabuddha* is of great interest. It occurs also in the *aṅgas*, see pp. 265, 334. Similar statements to the above are found in the scholiast on the first *painna*. See p. 435. In the *Vicārāmṛtasamgraha* is quoted the following interesting citation from the *piṭha* of a *kalpabhāṣya*: *suttam gaṇahararaiyaṁ taheva patte-yabuddharaiyaṁ ca | suyakevaliṇā raiyaṁ abhiuna dasapuvviṇā raiyaṁ ||*

943 Or 60 and 65, see p. 15, note 2.

32⁹⁴ additional names which are not directly represented by texts in the existing *Siddhānta*. Among these there are five for which corresponding sections in the S. can be shown, thus :—10 *pamāyappamāyam*, 17 *porisimarṇḍalāṃ*, 18 *marṇḍalappaveso*, 38 *divasāgarapannatti* [64 *teya-gaṇisagga*]. [17] In the *Siddhānta* there are references to 12 others : thus for 4, 36 (and 38), 40-49 ; 8 others are mentioned elsewhere 9, 21, 51, (60-64) ; and finally there is a whole list of titles (12 or 13), which cannot be attested from any source whatsoever, thus 2, 3, 19, 22, 23, 24 (a, b, including *marāṇavisohī*—27, 50, 52, 53). It is of special interest that we find statements concerning a whole series of texts held to belong to the *kāliam suam* in old *kārikā* verses. The source of these statements is not further attested. These texts were a special object of riper study at the time of the composition of these verses. Of Nos. 40-49, 51 (50-53 ?), 60-64 it is said that they were designed for the eleventh to the eighteenth year of study : 40-44 for the eleventh, 45-49 for the twelfth, 51 (50-53 ?) for the thirteenth, 60-64 for the fourteenth to the eighteenth year ; the nineteenth year forming the conclusion with the study of the *diṭṭhivāda*. Cf. my remarks on pp. 225, 344, 345.

This list at least opens up to us a wide perspective for the literature existing at the time of the composition of N. It is certainly very remarkable that N is itself cited in this list (as No. 11). Is this the only work of the author inserted by him in the list ? Or did he avail himself of this capital opportunity to procure a resting place for other of his productions ? If in reality Devarddhigaṇi, the nominal redactor of the *Siddhānta*, is to be regarded as the author of N, then the discrepancy between this list and the existing *Siddh.*, is especially remarkable. [18] Did all these differences arise after his time ? And is the division into the groups *uvamga*, *painna*, etc., or the names *uvamga*, *painna* themselves etc., to be ascribed to a period subsequent to his ? In the case of the *painna* this is evidently very probable.

Next follows the *aṅgapaviṭṭham* 13, the thirteenth group of the *suānāṇaparokkham*, which strictly belongs before the *aṅgapaviṭṭham*. It is called *duvālasaviham* and then the 12 *aṅgas*, *āyāro* to *diṭṭhivāo* (*aṅga* 5 as *vivāhapannatti*) are enumerated in order. This in turn is followed by the detailed statement of contents and extent of the 12 *aṅgas*, which (see p. 284 ff.) recurs in identical form but in greater detail in *aṅga* 4.

⁹⁴ Or 33 and 38.

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

⁹⁴⁶ This is introduced in just the same manner as the previous one. See pp. 10, 13 : — *namo tesīm khamāsanaṇāṇaṃ jeṭhīm imaṃ vāiyaṃ duvālasaṅgaṃ gaṇipīḍagaṃ, taṃ jahā...*, and concludes in the same way ; *savvehīm pī eyamma duvālasaṅge gaṇipīḍage bhagavaṃte sasutte.....*

contain statements in reference to the correct [20] attainment of the *suanāṇam*; the last one reads : *suttattho khalu paḍhamo, bho nijjutti (!)-māsiso bhaṇio | taiou niravaseso, esa vihi hoi añuoe || 5 ||* According to Leumann, the reference in *Bhag.* 25, 3 cites this verse as the conclusion of this entire account (*jāva suttattho añuoe*). 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 *Gaṇadharaśārdhaśata* (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 ca "ha bhagavān Umāsvāmivācakaḥ : samyagdarśanaññānacārītrāṇi mokṣamārga iti Nandivṛtttau, vācakaśabdaś ca pūrvagataśrutadhare rūḍho, yathā : pūrvagataṁ sūtram anyac ca vineyān vācayantīti vācakaḥ, Nandivṛtttau : [21] vādi 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. *ābhinibohiya*,⁹⁴⁸ *suya*,⁹⁴⁹ *ohi*,⁹⁵⁰ *maṇapayyava*,⁹⁵¹ *kevala*. 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 : *āvassayam nikkhivissāmi, suam (śrutam) ni, kharidham ni ajjhayaṇam ni*. After a *kārikā* inserted here the author proceeds to a discussion of the *āvassayam per se*, [22] which is *caūvviham*, viz. :- *nāmā, ṭhavaṇā, dāvva, bhāvā*, respectively, the latter two being distinguished from the others as *āgamao* and *no-āgamao*. At the end the synonyms (*egaṭṭhiyā nāṇāghosā nāṇāvamjaṇā nāmadhiyyā*) are stated as follows :- *āvassayam, avassakaraṇiyya, dhuvaṇiggaho, visohi ya ajjhayaṇachakkavaggo nāo ārāhaṇā maggo || samaṇeṇa sāvaṇe ya avassakāyavayaṇam havai jamhā|arito aho-nisassa ya tamhā avassayam nāma ||*⁹⁴⁹ This designation as *ajjhayaṇachakkavagga* points unequivocally to a definite text, divided into 6 *adhyayanas*. By the 6 *adhyayanas* we may understand the six kinds of *āvassayam* enumerated in the *Nandi*, above p. 11, and occurring below (see pp. 23, 24). These names as well as all the other synonyms of *āvassaya* belong to the domain of ethical, ritualistic or disciplinary matters. Our text, however, touches upon these subjects only occasionally.

Next to the enumeration of the synonyms of the *āvassayam* come the *suyam* and the *kharidha*, 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-gaṇṭha—siddhamta-sāsane 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 :— *sāmāyikādi-śaḍadhyayanakalāpāt makatvād adhyayanaśaḍvargaḥ; tathā abhipretār-thasiddhaḥ samyagupāyatvān nyāyo, mokṣārādhanāhetutvād ārādhana, tathā mokṣapuraprāpakatvād eva mārgaḥ;— ahoṛātrasya madhye*.

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

synonyms of *kharīdha* :- *gaṇakāe a nikāe kharīdhe vagge taheva rāsi a | puriṇe piṇḍe niare saṁghāe āula samūhe ||* The first names for "sacred text" refer then to the contents, the second to the extent. In one subdivision of *kharīdha*, the *no-āgamao bhāvakaṁdhe*, the following explanation is found (*se kiṁ taṁ no-ā°*) :- *eesim⁹⁵¹ ceva sāmāiya-m-āiyāṇaṁ chaṇham ajjhayaṇāṇaṁ samudāya-samiti-samāgameṇaṁ āvassaya-suabhāvakaṁdhe labbhate, se taṁ-no-āgamao bhāvakaṁdhe*. By this is meant in all probability the connection of the totality of all the above cited six *adhyayanas* of the *āvaśyaka*, *sāmāyika*, etc.

The last of these four sections designed to explain the *āvassayam*, refers *ex professo* to the *ajjhayaṇam*, and begins with an enumeration of these six *ajjhayaṇas*. A *kārikā* is first introduced,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 *sāmāyam*, 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^b; *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 *sāmāyamādīnaṁ (!) A: eṣaṁ eva prastutāvaśyakabhedānāṁ sāmāyikādīnāṁ saṇṇāṁ adhyayanānāṁ samudāyaḥ, samudāyasya samiti(r) nairāntaryeṇa, mīlanā, ... samāgamas, tena niṣpanno ya āvaśyakaśrutaskamdhā sa bhāvaskamdhā iti labhyate.*

952 *āvassayassa naṁ ime atthāhigārā bhavaṁti, taṁ : sāvajjaḥogavirati ukkittāṇa guṇavato a paḍivattī/khaliassa nīḍanā vāṇa-tigicchā guṇadhāraṇā ceva || āvassayassa eso piṇḍattho vānnio samāseṇaṁ / etto ekkekkāṁ puṇa ajjhayaṇaṁ kittaiṣṣāmi || taṁ : sāmāyaṁ, cauvisathao, vaṁḍaṇayaṁ, paḍikkamaṇaṁ, kāussa-ggaṁ paccakkhāṇaṁ; tattha paḍhamajjhayaṇaṁ sāmāyaṁ, 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), *vattavayā* (to 52^a), *atthāhigāra* (ib.), *samavayāra* (to 53^b). And the *āṇupuvvī* is in turn divided into *nāmāṇupuvvī*, *thavaṇā°*, *davvā°*, *khetṭā°*, *kālā°*, *ukkittañā°*, *gaṇañā°*, *saṁthāñā°*, *sāmāyārī-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 *resume* of the results of interest for the history of literature. It may be prefaced that the nom. sing. masc. I decl. ends now in *o*, now in *e*, and that in the verses, the nominative and case forms in general are frequently represented by the theme. In the case of feminine nouns thematic *ā ī ū* are shortened,

A species of *davvāvassayam* (A 2^b) is divided into *loiyaṁ*, *kuppāvay-aniyaṁ* and *louttariyaṁ*. 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 aṅgas : je ime rāi-“sara-talavara-koḍambiya⁹⁵⁴-māḍambiya-ibha-seṭṭhi-seṇāvai-satthavāhapabhiio.⁹⁵⁵ The kuppāvayaniyam describes in the following enumeration the character of those sects which do not share the Jaina belief :—je ime⁹⁵⁶ caraga-cīriya-cammakhaṇḍiya-bhicchaṇḍaga-paṇḍuraṅga Goyama-govvaiya-gihidhamma-dhammacim-[27] taga-aviruddha-viruddha-vuḍḍhasāvagapabhiyao pāsamaṇḍatthā, and states that these : Imḍassa vā Khaṇḍassa vā Ruddassa vā Sivassa vā Vesamaṇassa vā devassa vā nāgassa vā jakkhassa vā bhūyassa vā Mugumḍassa vā Ayyāe vā Koṭṭakiriyaē vā⁹⁵⁷ uvalevaṇa-sammayyaṇā-” varisaṇadhūvapupphagaṇḍha-mallāiyāim dāvāvassayāim kareṇṭi. The loguttariyam finally is referred to the merely external Jaina-yogin : je ime samaṇagunamukka-jogī cakkāyaniraṇukampī hayā iva uddāmā gayā iva niramkusā ghaṭṭhā maṭṭhā tuppottṭhā⁹⁵⁸ paṇḍurapaḍapāuraṇi⁹⁵⁹ jīṇāṇam aṇāṇāe (anājñayā) sacchaṇḍam vihariṇaṁ ubhayo-kālam āvassagassa uvatṭhamṭi.

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 āsaṇnam aparaṁ grāmanagarāḍikam nā 'sti tat sarvataśchinnaṇaṇāśraya-viśeṣarūpam maḍambam ucyate tasyā 'dhipatir māḍambikāh.

955 ... muhadhoyāṇa-damṭapakkhāṇa-tella-phaṇiha-siddhatthaya-hariyāliya-addāga-dhūva-puppha-mallagaṇḍha-tambolavattha-m-āiyāim dāvāvassayāim kareṇṭi tao paccha rāyakulāṁ vā devakulāṁ vā sabhaṁ vā pavam (prapam?) vā āramam vā uyyāṇam vā niggacchaṇṭi.

956 dhātī(?)vāhakāh saṁto ye bhikkhāṁ carāṇṭi te carakāh; rathyāpatitaciraparidh-ānās citrikāh; carmaparidhānās carmakhaṇḍikāh; ye bhikkhāṁ eva bhumjate na tu svaparigṛhītāṁ godugdhādikāṁ te bhikkhāṇāh, Sugataśāsanasthā ity anye; paṇḍuraṅga bhasmoddhulitagaṭṭhāh; vicitrapāḍapatanaḍiśikākalapayuktavarāṭakamulika-dicarcitavṣabhakopāyatah (?) kaṇabhikkhāgrāhino Gauṁamāh; cf. Kaṇabhuji, Kaṇāda !) gacaryānukāriṇo govratikāh, te hi “vayam apī kila tiryakṣu vasāma” iti bhāvanāṁ bhāvayāṁto gobhir nirgacchaṇṭibhih saha nirgacchaṇṭi sthittabhis tiṣṭhāṇṭi āsinaḍbhir upaviśāṇṭi bhumjāṇābhis tathai 'va tṇapattrapaus paphalādi bhumjate, tad uktāṁ ; gāvīhi samāṁ niggamaṇavesathāṇāsaṇāi pakarimṭi | bhumjāṇṭi jahā gāvī tiriṇchavāsaṁ vibhāvaṇṭi || ; gṇasthadharma eva śreyāṇ iti ... gṇidharmās, tathā ca tadanusāriṇāṁ vacāh : gṇhāśramasamaṁ dharmo na bhūto na bhaviṣyati | tam pālayāṇṭi ye dhīrāh, klīvāh pāsamaṇā āsritā iti ||) ; Yājñavalkyaprabhṭiṣṣipranīṭadharmaśāṇṭiśā cimtayaṇṭi.. dharmacimtakāh; devatā-kṣitīśāṇṭiśāṇṭi tiryagāḍiṇāṁ avirodhena vinayakāritvāḍ aviruddhā vānāyikāh; puṇyapāpaparalokāḍyanabhyupagamapara akriyāvāḍiṇo viruddhā(h), sarvapāśāṇṭibhih saha viruddhacāritvāt; prathamam e-ā “dyatirṭhakarakāle samutpannatvāt. prāyo vṛddhakāle dikṣāpratipatteṣ ca vṛddhās tāpasāh; śrāvakāh brāhmaṇāh ... ; anye tu vṛddhāśrāvakā ity ekam eva padam vrāhmaṇavācakatvena vyācakṣate (Buddha is therefore not referred to here ! (see Bhag. 2, 214); and AC2 R read vuddha, BC1 alone having vuddha); pāsamaṇā vrataṁ, tatra tiṣṭhāṇṭi 'ti pāsamaṇasthāh; on Goyama fg. see Aupap. § 73. See chap. 15 in Varāhamihira's Bṛhajjātaka (pravrajyāyogāḍhyāya), or Laghujāt. 9, 12). Ind. Stud. 2 287, where also vṛddhāśrāvaka.

957 Mukuṇḍo Baladevaḥ; Āryā prasāṇṭarūpā Durgā; sai 'va mahiṣarūḍhā tat-kuṭṭanaparā Koṭṭakiriya; atro 'pacāraḍ imḍrāḍiśabdena tad-āyatanam apy ucyate; the same arrangement of the gods, except Mukunda, occurs also in the Bhagavati. 3, 1, 66; 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 *loiyam* : *puvvaṇhe Bhāraham, avaraṇhe Rāmāyaṇam*⁹⁶⁰ and as regards the *kuppāvayaṇiyam*, it is said of the same sects as above (*caragaṭṭriya*^o) i.e. that they *ijja'mjali-homa-japa-umdurukka-namukkāra-m-āiyāim bhāvāvassayāim kareṇti*.⁹⁶¹ The *davvasuyam* is characterized⁹⁶² as *pattaya-potthayalihiyam* and as *aṇḍayam, voṇḍayam, kīḍayam, vālayam, vakkayam*.

The works of the Brahminical literature cited by me *ad Bhag.* 2, 248 are quoted in the case of the *loiyam 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 *diṭṭhivāa* (*aṅga* 5 as *vivāhapannatti*) the *duvālasaṅgam gaṇipīḍagam* takes the place of the *louttariyam*, etc.

In the case of the *khettāṇupuvvī*, the groups of the *aholoe* (*Rayana-ppabhā* to *Tamatamappabhā*), *tiriyaloe* (*Jambuddive* to *Sayambhuramaṇe*), *uḍḍhaloe* (*Sohamme* to *Isipabhārd*) 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 vācanam śravaṇam vā pūrvāparāhṇayor eva rūḍham*.

⁹⁶¹ *ijjā yāgaḥ, athavā deśibhāṣāyām ijje ti (iṣṭeti B) mātā(!) tasyā namaskāravidhau...; umdurukka tti deśivacanata umdu mukham, rukkam viśabhādiśabdakaraṇam, devatātipurato viśabhagarjitādikaraṇam*.—B has also *itthamjali* 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)rakāṇi talatālyādisambamdhīni, tatsaṅghātaniṣpannās tu pustakās, tataś ca patrakāṇi ca pustakās ca, teṣu likhitaṁ; athavā potaṁ vastram* (see I. S. Vol. 16, p. 155) *pa(t)trakāṇi ca teṣu likhitaṁ :—aṇḍayam haṁsagabbhādi; haṁsaḥ pataṁgaḥ, garbhas tu tannivartitakośikāro... tadutpannam sūtram aṇḍajam ucyate ādiśabdhāḥ svabhedaprakhyāpanaparah :—voṇḍayam (bo° R, po° A) karpāsa-m-ādi, Ind. Stud. XVI. 111 : voṇḍam vamanīphalaṁ tasmāj jātam voṇḍajam; phalaḥ vamanī, tasyāḥ phalaṁ phalaḥ karpāsāśrayakośakarūpaṁ;—kīṭaj jātam kīṭajam sūtram ; is fivefold : paṭṭe paṭṭasūtram (detailed citation from the *vīddhavyākhyā*), *Malae Malayaviṣayoṭpannam, aṁsue, Cīṇaṁsue Cīṇaviṣaye, kimirāge,—lomabhyo jātam vāḷajam; is fivefold unnie aurnikam, utthie auṣṭrikam, miyalomae, kutave (ko°) umdururomanispannam, kiṭṭise urnādinām yad uddhari tam ;—vakkayam (vāgayam A) saṇa-m-ādi vāḷajam, tatrā 'tatisūtram Mālavakādiprasiddham*. 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 *ukkittanāṇu*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 *am, im, um*), *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* : *āgameṇam.. padmāni payāmsi, loveṇam.. te atra te 'tra, paṭo atra paṭo 'tra payatīe.. agni etau, paṭu imau, śāle ete, māle ime, vikāreṇam.. daṁḍasya agram daṁḍāgram, sā āgatā sāgatā, dadhi idam, dadhidam, nadi ūhate nadīhate, 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 saṁjhā gaṁdhavvanagarā ya ukkā vāyā disādāghā vijjū gajjiam nigghāya jvā, jakkhalittā (yakkṣādīptakāni, nabhodīśyamānāgnipīṣācāḥ) dhumā mahiā (dhumikāḥ mahikāḥ) raugghāyā (raja-udghātāḥ, rajasvalā dīśāḥ) cāmdovarāgā sūrovarāgā cāmdaparivesā sūrapa° paḍicāmdayā paḍisūrayā, imdadhaṇu, udagamachhā (°matsyāḥ, indradhanuḥkhamdāni) kavīhasiā (kapihasitāny akasmān nabhasi jvaladbhīmasābdarūpāni) amohā (amoghāḥ sūryabimbād adhaḥ kadācid upalabhyamānaśakaṭoddhisamsthītāśyāmādirekhāḥ) 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 *khettasamjoga* :- *Māgahae*, *Mālavae*, *Soraṭṭhae*, *Marahattṭhae*, *Kuṇṇakaṇae*, *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 secondāry titles (*pussa*, *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*, *rakkhīa*,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 kāvālie*, *tāvase* and *parivvāyāe*, s. *Bhag.* 2, 213°. The scholiast explains *bhikkhū* by Buddhadaṛśanāśritaḥ 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. *vividhi* 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* : *niggaṇṭha-Sakka* (Śākya) *tāvasa-geruya ājīvā* with which Abhayadeva too is acquainted (see p. 281ⁿ). He connects the *paṇḍurāṅga* 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. *daṇḍa*, examples : *daṇṭās ca oṣṭhaṁ ca, daṇṭoṣṭhaḥ, stanau ca udaram ca stanodaram.. vastrapātraṁ .. aśvamaḥiṣau... ahinaku-lam.* 2. *bahuvrīhi*, 3. *kammadhāraya*, 4. *digu*, 5. *tappurisa*, 6. *avvayibhāva*, and—7. *ekasesa*, the plural as a collection of several units (there is no dual). The eight-fold *taddhitas* follow the compounds : *kammaṁ 1 sippa 2 siloe 3 saṁjōya 4 samīvao 5 a saṁjūhe 6/ issariā 7 vacceṇa 8 ya taddhitānāmaṁ 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 taddhitapṛāptihetubhūto 'rtho gṛhyate, tato yatrā'pi tūnnāe taṁtūvāe ity-āḍau taddhitapratyayo na dṛśyate tatrā 'pi taddhetubhūtārthasya vidyamānatvāt taddhitajatvaṁ (perhaps merely taddhitatvaṁ) siddhaṁ bhavati.*

It is especially interesting that here *saṁjūha*, *saṁyūtha* are explained by the scholiast as *grāṁtharacanā*, so that the examples cited in the text are to be regarded as titles of literary compositions :— *Taraṁgavatī*, *Malayavatī*, *Sattānusatṭhi* (*attā°*) and *Bimdu* are such names ! *dhātue* is said by the text to be the third group of *bhāvapamāṇa*. It is explained in Sanskrit in the following most singular fashion :— *bhū sattāyāṁ parasmaibhāṣā, edha vṛddhau, spardhā saṁharṣe, gādhr pratiṣ-ṭhālipsayor grāṁthe ca, bādhr loḍane, se'ttarā 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; *mahyāṁ śete mahiṣaḥ*,

⁹⁶⁹ On 1 *taṇahārae* etc., — on 2 *vatthie*, *tūnnāe taṁtūvāe* etc., — on 3 *samaṇe*, *māhaṇe*, — on 4 *raṇno sasurāe sālae*, — on 5 *girissa saṁve nagaraṁ girinagaraṁ. Vidiśāe s. n. Vedisāṁ* — on 6 *Taraṁgavaṅkāre* (in BR invariably *kārae*), *Malaya-vatī* (vai BR) *kāre*, *sattā* (*attā* BR) *nusatthikāre*, *bimdukāre* (cf. *dharmabimdu lokabimdu*, p. 457) — on 7 *isare talavare māḍambie* ... on 8 *arahaṁtamāyā*, *cakkavaṭṭimāyā*, *Baladevamāyā*, *Vāsudevamāyā*.

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

Under the head of *pamāna*, 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 *kālānupuvvī*, above page 29, the progression by 84's beginning three gradations after the quinquennial yuga. In the discussion on *paliyame* (*palyopama*) we find inserted a lengthy passage from the *Pannavayā* (*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 nam codae (cōdakah), prerakah, prcchakah) pannavayam (ācāryam) evam vayāsi*, and then follow questions and answers in the usual way introduced by *atthi nam* , and *hamtā ! 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 *nāṇagūṇap*. 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 *annāññim micchādittiehim saccaṇḍabuddhimativigappiyam* :— *tam jahā : Bhārahāṇ Rāmāyāṇāṇ jāva* (BCR, *evam A) cattāri a vedā saṅgovamgā*. Here we have a reference to an earlier enumeration. See above, pp. 9,28. We find that *jam imam arahamtehim bhagavamtehim savvadarisim paṇiam duvālasamgam gaṇipiḍagam, tam : āyāre jāva dittiehim* is considered to be *loguttarie*. There are, however, other divisions of the *āgama* ; thus, those into *suttā*°,

⁹⁷⁰ *ūrdhvakarna* ... omitted in R.

⁹⁷¹ Where *uddhareṇu* is to be translated by *ūrdhvareṇu saṇha*°, *ussaṇha*°, by *slak-ṣṇaślakṣṇikā, ucchlakṣṇa*°; *saṇha* can be also for *sūkṣma*; see Hem. 1, 118, where, however, we have *ārṣe 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 *tadubhayā°*, or into *attā° aṇamtarā°*, and *paramparā°* original doctrine, doctrine that has been directly received, and traditional doctrine (see p. 216). The *carittagūṇapamāṇe* is said to be five-fold, *sāmāiacar.*, *chedovattḥāvāṇiacar.* (AC, merely °tḥāva 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 *diṭṭhamāntas*, 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 *aṅgas*,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*, *suakkaṃdha*, *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 Paḍalutte 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 *Vicārāṃṭasaṃgraha* in reference to a *Māthuri vācanā* (*Skandilācāryāṇām 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 *anaṅgapavittḥa*, or *aṅgaḥhira*.

⁹⁷⁵ *veḍha*, *veṣṭa*, perhaps a group of verses? an explanatory section? *anuogadāra* a paragraph *tatra paryavāḥ paryāyā dharmā itī yāvat, tadrūpā saṃkhyā paryava-samkhyā* (the meaning of *paryava* here as a preliminary stage of *akkhara* is obscure; *per se* it doubtless denotes the different groups of alphabet, *sā ca kālikaśrute anantaparyāyātmikā draṣṭavyā, ekaikasya 'py akārādyakṣarasya tadabhidhe-yasya ca jivādivastunaḥ pratyekam anantaparyāyatvāt; evaṃ anyatṛā 'pi bhāvanā kāryā; navaram (!) saṃkhyeyāny akārādyakṣarāṇi; dvyaadyakṣarasamyogāḥ saṃkhyeyāḥ saṃghātāḥ; sūptināntāni samaya (?) prasiddhāni vā saṃkhyeyāni padāni; gāthādicaturthāṇsarupāḥ saṃkhyeyāḥ pādāḥ; .. saṃkhyeyā veṣṭakāḥ; niksepaniriyukti-upodghātaniriyukti-sūtrasparsikaniriyuktilakṣaṇā trividhā nir-yuktir* (see p. 38); *vyākhyopāyabhūtāni tatpadaprārūpaṇatādīny (?) upakramādīni vā saṃkhyeyāny anuyogadvārāni*.—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 *rjusūtra* (*°śru a !*) i.e. the orthodox believer, recognizes only the first two *vatt.*, and of these two the first alone as entitled to authoritativeness.

The *atthāhigāra* section consists⁹⁷⁷ merely of the *gāthā* : *sāvajajoga*,^o 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.*,^o *uvagghāyanijj.*^o and *suttaphāsianiijj.* (*sūtraspārśika*^o) — 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 : *āgāraṃ āvasaṃtā vā āraṇṇā vā pavvaiyā idam darisaṇam āvaṇṇā savvaḍḍukha vimucchaṃti* 'tyādi; on this the scholiast says : *gṛhasthāḥ, āraṇyā vā tāpasādayaḥ, pravrajitāś ca Śākyaḍayaḥ idam asmādiyaṃ matam āpannā āśritāḥ sarvaḍḍukhebhya vimucyaṃta ity evaṃ yadā Sāṃkhyādayaḥ pratipādayaṃti tad evaṃ parasamayavaktavyatā, yadā tu Jainās tadā svasamayavaktavyatā, tatas 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; *sāvajajoggaviraḥ sāvajajoggaṇṇaṃ atth° ukkittapaṇaṃ cauvisatthassa atth°* etc.; i.e. according to the scholiast : "arthādhikāro 'dhyayane" *āḍipadā ārabhya sarvapadeṣyanuvartate*.

978 Is threefold : *ohanipphanne nāmaṇi°* *suttālavayani°*; *ohani°* is fourfold : *ajjhayaṇaṇṇam*, *ajjhine* (*akṣiṇa*), *ae* (*ayaḥ*), *jhavaṇa* (*kṣapaṇā*), names which are also : *sāmāyikacaturviṃśatistavādīśrutaviśeṣāṇam 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 kaivhiṃ kassa kaḥiṃ kesu kaḥaṃ keciraṃ (kacci°) havai kalam | kai saṃtaraṃ aviraḥiṃ bhavā.* "garisa phāsana - 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.⁹⁸³ 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*, *vayahāre*, *ujjusue*; *sadde*, *saṃabhiruḍḍhe*, *evaṃbhūe*. The scholiast says that they are named thus in reference to their connection which the *sāṃyikādhyayanam* 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 *sāṃyikaṃ*, even if it does not mention it by name. It was quite necessary that here at the close some regard be had for the *sāṃāiam*; 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 *oghaniriyukti* we read : *askhalitapadoccāraṇaṃ saṃhitā; padavibhāgaḥ padāni; padānām arthaḥ padārthaḥ; padavigrahaḥ samāsabhāṃjī padāni; cālaṇa purvapākṣa-saṃkā; 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 *pdaṇḍas*, 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 Mahāvīra's time. Cf. also *Pussabhūi*, *Siva*°. See *Mahabh.* on Pān. 8, 2, 107 (*Ind. Stud.* 4, 381) on the common name of *Agnibhūti*.

⁹⁸⁵ Other predecessors are Munisūndarasūri, Viradeva and Jayasīnhasūri; the *gaccha* is *Śrī-Harṣapuriya*, the *kulam* that of *Sri Praśnavahana*. The well-known Hemacandra is, therefore, not referred to, and the above mentioned Abhayadeva is doubtless not the *navāṅgīrṭtikṣṭ*. 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 *dasakāliā* 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 *Anuyogadv.* (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 *vinayapīṭaka*. 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.

XLIH. 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 *chattisaṃ ca aputṭhavāyaraṇām*, 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 *isibhāsiām* mentioned there by *Uttarajjhayaṇādīni*;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 *Āvaśyakaniḥji.* 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 āusam teṇaṃ bhagavayā evaṃ akkhāyam* (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 : *saṃjogavippamukkassa aṇagārassa bhikkhuṇo | viṇayaṃ pāukkarissāmi | vāṇupuvvīm 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. *parisahaḥji.*, 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 Devendraṇi, which was composed *Samv.* 1179 (A.D. 1123), is based upon that of Śāntisūri.

paveiyā. In the metrical portion the first person is used : *parīśahāṇaṁ pavibhatti / Kāsaveṇaṁ paveiya / taṁ bhe udāharissāmi / āṇupuvviṁ suṇeha me ||1||*

3. *cauraṅgaṁ*, °*giyyaṁ* in S,⁹⁹⁰ *cāu(ram)gijjaṁ* V, 20 vv.; of the *mānusatvādi*. In the commentary on v. 9 we find particular statements in reference to the seven schisms.

4. *asaṁkhaṇaṁ*, *asaṁskṛtaṁ*, *paṁāyappamāyaṁ* vā V, 13 vv. Of *pramādāpramāda* (cf. No. 10 in the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* list of N., above p. 11), and of the *apramāda*, *maraṇakale* 'pi.

[45] 5. *akāmamaraṇijjaṁ*, 19 vv.; of the *paṁḍitamaraṇaṁ*.

6. *khuddāga-niyaṁṭhiijjaṁ* (cf. chap, 20), *purisaviyyaṁ* 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. *elaiijjaṁ* (so also V; of *eḍaka*); *ura(b)bhiyaṁ* S and *urabbhi* also here in C, in an enumeration of the chapters which is added to the close of this MS. only : 30 vv.; *urabhrādi-driṣṭāntaḥ* resp. *rasagraddhityāgaḥ*,

8. *Kāvilīyaṁ liijjaṁ* S.V.; 20 vv. Of the *nirlobhatvaṁ*. It closes : *ii esa dhammo akkhe / Kavileṇaṁ visuddhapanneṇaṁ / . . tti bemi ||20||*

9. *Namipavviijā*, 62 vv. Of the *carāṇaṁ prati niḥkampatvaṁ*; *puttaṁ ṭhaviijja rajje abhinikkhamai* *Namī rāyā*.

10. *dumapattayaṁ* *drumapattrakaṁ*, 37 vv.; *apramādārthaṁ upamādvāreṇā* 'nuṣāsaṇaṁ. Instruction addressed to Goyama. It closes thus : *buddhaṁ nissamma bhāsiyaṁ / sukaḥiaṁ atthapahopasoḥiyaṁ / rāgāṁ dosāṁ ca chindiyā / siddhigayaṁ gāe Goama tti bemi ||37||*.

11. *bahussuyapujjaṁ* (°*puvvaṁ* V), *bahuśrutapūjā*, 32 vv.—In v. 1 the refrain of 1,¹ 2,¹ : *pāukarissāmi, āṇupuvviṁ suṇeha me*.

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

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

13. *Cittasambhūijjam*, *Citrasambhūtiyam*, 35 vv.; *nidānaṃ tyājyaṃ nidānaḍoṣa* | *Kampillasambhūo Chitto*.

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

[46] 15. *Sabhikkhu*, °*ugam* S, 16 vv. Of the *bhikṣuguṇās*. Each verse closes with the refrain : *sabhikkhū*, cf. *Dasaveālia* 3,10. Begins : *moṇaṃ carissāmi samicca dhammaṃ*.

16. *bambhacerasamāhiṭṭhāṇaṃ*, *bambhagutti C*, *samāhiṭṭhāṇaṃ S*. First an enumeration of the ten *bambhaceras* of the *bhikkhu* in prose, then 17 *silogas*. Of the *brahmahacaryagupti*.

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

18. *Samjaijjam*, *Samjayīyam*,⁹⁹¹ 54 vv. Of the *bhogarddhityāga*. *Kaṃpille nayare rāyā* | *udinnabalavāhaṇe* | *nāmeṇaṃ* | *Samjao nāma* | *migavvaṃ* (*mṛgavyāṃ*) *uvañijjae* ||.

19. *Miyāputtiyam*, *Ma°ijjam* V, *Miyacaritta* (or *Miyācāritā*) S, 97 vv. Of the *niḥpratikarmatā*, and of *Miyāputta*, son of King *Bala-bhadda* and of *Miyā*; *Suggīve nayare*.

20. *mahāniyaṃthijjam* (cf. chap. 6), *mahānirgrāṃthīyāṃ*; *aṇāhapav-vayya* S; 60 vv. Of the *anāthatvaṃ*; *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), *samudrapālīyam*, 24 vv. Of the *vivikṭacaryā*. Begins : *Caṃpāe Pālie nāma* | *sāvāe āsi vāṇie* | *Mahā-virassa bhagavao* | *sīso so u mahappaṇo* ||

⁹⁹¹ This might be *per se* for *saṃyatīyam*; since the *pāpavarjanaṃ* is : *saṃyatasyai'va, sa ca bhogārdhityāgata eva*.

22. *rahanemijjam*, 49 vv. Of the *anorathanemivac caranam*; *utpannaviśrotasikenā* 'pi *dhrtiḥ kāryā*. Begins : [47] *Soriyapurammi nayare / āsi rāyā mahiddhie / Vasudeva' tti nāmenam / rāyalakkhaṇasamjue* ||1|| *tassa bhajjā dūve āsi / Rohiṇī Devaī tahā / tāsīm dūphaṇ pi do puttā / itthā Rāma-Kesavā* ||2|| v. 1^{ab} / *Samuddavijae nāman / v. 1^a ||3|| tassa bhajjā Sivā nāma / tise putte mahāyase / bhagavaṇ Aritṭhanemi tti / loganāhe damtsare* ||4||...

23. *Kesi-Goyamijjam*, *Keśi Gautamiyam*; *Gotamakesiyyam* S; 89 vv.; *cittavipluṭiḥ pareṣām api Keśi-Gautamavad apaneyā*. Begins : *jīre Pāsi tti nāmenam / arahā logapūie / . . || 1 || tassa logapaivassa / āsi sise mahāyase / Kesi Kumārasamaṇe / vijjācaraṇapārage* || 2 || See p. 837 on *upāṅga* 2.

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

25. *jannaijjam*, *yajñiyam*, 45 vv. *Jayaghoṣacaritavarṇanaadvareṇa brahmaguṇā iho'cyaṇte*. Begins : *māhaṇakulasambhūo / āsi vip̐po mahājaso / jāyāt jamaṇammi (yamayajñe) / Jayaghosu tti nāmāo* || ||

26. *sāmāyārī*, *dasasā°C*, 53 vv. Only he who is in possession of the *brahmaguṇas* (chap. 25) is a *yati tena cā'vaśyam 'sāmācārī vidheyā*. This is ten-fold⁹⁹² : [48] *āvassiyā, nisīhiyā, 993 āpucchanā, paḍipucchanā, chaṇḍanā, icchākāro, micchākāro, tahakkāro, abbhūṭṭhāṇam, uvasampayā*. The similar enumeration in *Āvaśy*, *nijj*. 7, 12, where there is, however, a different arrangement (the same as in *āṅga* 3, 10, and *Bhag*. 25, 7 according to L.) :—*icchākāro, micchā, tahakkāro* (6-8), *āva°... chaṇḍanā* (1-5), *nīmaṇtanā* (instead of 9), *uvasampayā* (10) — *Haribhadra* on *Āvaśy*, *nijj*. 6, 88, says⁹⁹⁴ that there are three kinds of *sāmācārī*, 1. the

⁹⁹² The word *sāmāyārī* 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 *sāmāyārī* is an intentional deformation of *sāmāyācārī*: see pp. 223, 238, 243 fg.

⁹⁹³ *naīṣedhikī*, see pp. 452, 257.

⁹⁹⁴ See pp. 357, 449.

oghasāmācārī, represented by the *oghaniryukti*, on the 20th *prābhṛtam* (*oghaprā°*) of the 3. *vastu* (*ācārābhidhāna*) *pūrva* 9.2. the *daśavidha-sāmācārī*, for which our chapter and *Āv. niḥj. 7* is authoritative, and 3, the *padavibhāgasāmācārī*, which too is represented by *chedasūtra-lakṣaṇān navamāt pūrvādeva nirvyūḍha*, or by *kalpavyavahārau*.⁹⁹⁵—Begins : *sāmāyārīm pavakkhāmi savvadukkha vimukkhāṇīm | jam carittāṇa niggaṇṭhā | timā saṁsārasāgaram || 1 ||*

27. *khalumkijjam*, *khulu° V*, 15 vv. Of the *śaṭhatā*; the *asāṭhatā* is the antecedent condition for the *sāmācārī*. It begins : *there gaṇahare Gagge (Gārgyaḥ) muṇi āsī visārāe | ainne gaṇibhāvammi samāhīm paḍi-saridhāe || ||* The name comes from v. 3 : *khalumke jo u joei khalumkān galivr̥ṣabhān* (s. Hem. 1263) *yo yojayati*.

28. *mukkkhamaggagaī*, *sivamagga° C*, 36 vv. Of the *mokṣamārga*. Begins : *mukkkhamaggagaim taccam | suṇeha jīṇabhāsiyam*.

29. *sammattaparakkamam*, *samyaktva°*; *appamāo S*. In prose; *anam-taram* (in chap. 28) *jñānādīni muktimārgatveno'ktāni, tāni ca saṁvegā-dimūlāni akarmatavasānāni* ; [49] *yadvā mokṣamārgagater apramāda eva* (on this then is based the title in S) *pradhānam*. Enumeration of the 73 *saṁvegādīni*, means of deliverance (cf. Leumann, Gloss. *Aup.* p. 155, s. v. *saṁvejaṇa*) : *saṁvege 1, nivvee 2, dhammasaddhā 3, gurusāhammiya-susūsaṇayā 4, āloṇāyā 5, nimḍaṇayā 6, garihaṇayā 7, sāmāie* and the remaining 5 *āvassaya 8-13*, etc. to *akammayā 73* (cf. the 48 *saṁvegādīni*, *Bhagav.* 16, 3 and 27 *saṁv.* in *aṅga 4*, 27 Leum). As in the beginning (see p. 43) so in the end there is a direct reference to Mahāvīra : *esa khalu sammattaparakkamassa ajjhayaṇassa aṭṭhe samaṇeṇam bhagavayā Mahāvīreṇam agghavie pannavie parūvie daṁsie nidāṁsie uvadaṁsie tti bemi*.

30. *tavamaggiijam*, *°ggo S*, *°maiijam V*, 37 vv., *tapomārgagati*. Begins : *jahā u pāvagam kamam rāgadosasamajjiyam | khavēi tavasā bhikkhū tam egagamaṇo suṇa || 1 ||*

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

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

⁹⁹⁵ The three *sāmāyārī* 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 kammāim* (cf. *Bhag.* 2, 166) *vucchāmi | āṇupuvvīm jahakkamaṃ | jehim baddhe ayaṃ jīve | saṃsāre parivattāe || 1 || nāṇassā "varaṇijjaṃ | daṃsaṇāvaraṇaṃ tahā | veyañijjaṃ | tahā moham | āukammaṃ taheva ya || || nāmakayyaṃ ca goyaṃ ca | aṃtarāyaṃ taheva ya.* Closes : *eesim saṃvare ceva | khavaṇe ya jāe (yateta) buhe tti bemi || ||* The *nāṇam* e. g. is (see N. *Anūy. Āvaśy. Aupap.* p. 41) five-fold *suyaṃ, ābhiniḃohiyaṃ, ohināṇaṃ, maṇaṇāṇaṃ, kevalaṃ.*

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

35. *aṇagāramaggaṃ, °gge S, °ggo V*; 21 vv.; *hiṃsāparivarjanādayo bhikkhuguṇāḥ.* Begins : *suṇha me egamaṇā maggaṃ Savvannudesiyaṃ | jaṃ āyaraṃto bhikkhū | dukkhāṇa 'ntakaro bhava || 1 ||* Closes : *nimmamo nirahaṃkāro vīyārāgo aṇāsavo | saṃpatto kevalaṃ nāṇaṃ sāsayaṃ parinivvuda tti bemi || 31 ||.*

36. *jivājivavibhatti*, 268 vv. Begins : *jivājivavibhattim | suṇha me egamaṇā io | jaṃ jāṇiūṇa bhikkhū | sammaṃ jayaī saṃjāṇe || 1 ||* Closes : *ii pāukāre būddhe | nāyāe parinivvue | chattiṣaṃ uttarajjhāe | bhavasiddhiā 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 bhavā | te kira paḍhamti ee | chattiṣaṃ uttarajjhāe || 1 ||...*

XLIV. Second *mūlasūtram, āvaśyakasūtram.* By *āvaśyaka*, as we have often seen in the case of *painna* 1, *Nandī* and *Anuyogadv.*, 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 *Anuyogadv.* the word *ajjhayaṇachakkavagga* is expressly given as its synonym. See p. 22, We have also seen [51] that the *Anuyogadvārasūtram* 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 *sāvajjajogaviratim* which frequently secures the Anny. By this limitation an ethical character is ascribed to the work, the contents of which is, furthermore, at variance with the claim made by the *Anuy*.

The *āvaśyakaśūtram* is a work which deals with all the six *āvaśyakas* in the order⁹⁹⁶ which is followed in the *Nandī* and *Anuyogad-vāra*, 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 *caūvīsaithava* 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 Jñānadarśanacāritrāṇām 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 *gaṇaharas* 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 yaṃ śiṣyahitā, nāmā "vaśyakaṭikā kṛtiḥ Sitāmbarācārya Jinabhaṭanigadānusārino Vidyādharakulatilakācārya Jinadattaśiṣyasya dharmato joṇi (yākiṃ !) -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 *vr̥tti* of a Śrī-Tilakācārya, scholar of Śivaprabha, composed Śaṃvat 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 *diṭṭhamta* 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 *mūlaṭīkā* (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 *Samgrahaṇikāra*, 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 *granthakāra*, °kṛt (see for example *Nijj.* 8, 44, 10, 95) and even as *sūtrakārā*, °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 *pratīkramāṇasūtram* 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, 2, 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 *Nijjutti*, 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 nijjutti* 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, *iyam niryuktigāthā, etas 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; idam gāthādvayam sūtrakṛt-niryuktigāthābhir eva prakatārthābhir 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 samāsārthaḥ, vyāsārthas tu viśeṣavivaranād avagāntavyaḥ*. Or on 10, 19, *iti gāthākṣarārthaḥ, bhāvārthas tu bhāṣyagāthābhyovaseyaḥ, taś ce māḥ* (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 *Nijjutti*, and in reference to the form of the text of the *Āvaśyakam* which existed in the time of Haribhadra, I subjoin a review of the 20 *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, *Kalpas* p. 100(104) as 2,₉₇ and p. 101 as 2,₃₃₂ are e. g. here 3, 281 (291), 332 (342). Very great divergences come to light in the two MSS. in Peterson's [56] *Detailed Report* (1883), pp. 124 and 127. These MSS. are numbered Nos. 273 (=P) and 306 (=π, with a break in the beginning; and chapters 1,2 and 6 are lost). The text is composed exclusively in *gāthās*. One of its special peculiarities is formed by the frequent *dāragāthās*, i.e. verses which state briefly the contents of what follows, principally by the enumeration of the catch-words or titles of paragraphs. Unfortunately the use or denotation of these verses is not regular; from which fact the benefit to be derived from this otherwise excellent method of division is materially reduced. The Nom. 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*.¹⁰⁰⁶ 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 : *ābhiniḥbohianāṇaṃ/suanāṇaṃ ceva ohināṇaṃ ca | tāha maṇapajjavanāṇaṃ | kevalanāṇaṃ ca paṃcamayaṇaṃ ||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 upadghātaniryuktir iti*, but in such a way that it is not mentioned as the "eighth chapter"; nor is the statement made that it is concluded.

Usabha, the first of their number. In the introduction it is of extreme interest to notice the statements of the author in reference to his own literary activity. It is as follows :

titthayare bhagavarṇite / aṇuttaraparakkame amiaṇāṇi /
 tinne sugaigaigāe / siddhipahapāesae vaṇde ||1||
 vaṇdāmi mahābhāgaṃ / mahāmuṇiṃ mahāyasaṃ Mahāvīraṃ /
 amaranararāyamahīam / titthayaram imassa titthassa ||2||
 ikkārasa vi gaṇahare / pavāyāe pavayaṇassa vaṇdāmi /
 savvaṃ gaṇaharavaṇsaṃ / vāyagavaṇsaṃ pavayaṇaṃ ca ||3||
 te vaṇdiūṇa sirasā / atthapuhuttassa¹⁰⁰⁷ tehiṃ kahiassa /
 suanāṇassa bhagavao / niyyuttim¹⁰⁰⁸ kittaiṣṣāmi ||4||
 āvassagassa dasakā / liassa taha uttarajjha-m-āyāre¹⁰⁰⁹ /
 suagaḍe niyyuttim / buccāmi taha dasāṇaṃ ca ||5||
 kappassa ya niyyuttim / vavahārasse 'va paramaniṇṇassa /
 sūriapannattie / buccaṃ isibhāsiāṇaṃ¹⁰¹⁰ ca ||6||
 eesiṃ niyyuttim / buccāmi ahaṃ jīṇovāsesaṇaṃ /
 āharaṇaheukāraṇa- / payaṇivaḥaṃ iṇaṃ samāsesaṇaṃ ||7||
 sāmāianiyyuttim / buccaṃ uvāsesiṃ gurujaṇeṇaṃ /
 āyariaparaṃpareṇa / āgayaṃ āṇupuvvito ||8||
 niyyuttā to atthā / jaṇaṃ baddhā teṇa hoi niyyuttī /
 taha vi ai cchāvei / vibhāsiṃ 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 parasparaṃ niryojanaṃ niryuktiḥ*; - *kiṃ aśeṣasya śrutajñānasya? no, kiṃ tarhi? śrutaviśeṣāṇāṃ āvaśyakādīnāṃ ity ata evā 'ha: āvassa'*; - *niryukti* is perhaps an intentional variation of *niryukti*.

¹⁰⁰⁹ *samudāyaśabdānāṃ avayave vṛttidarśanād, yathā Bhīmasena Sena iti, uttarādhyā ity uttarādhyāyanam avāśeyam*.

¹⁰¹⁰ *devendrastavādīnāṃ*.

¹⁰¹¹ They are placed thus in a palmleaf MS. No. 23, in Peterson's *Det. Report* (1883) (only 1, 51 *ābhiniḥohia*... see p. 56, precedes) at the beginning of a text entitled "*niryuktayaḥ*," 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 *oghaniryukti* cited as 6, 89, and chapter 8, etc. The statements made there refer to a period much later than that of Bhadrabāhu, the old bearer of this name, and who is assumed to be the last *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 *Nijjī*. 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 *oghanijjuttī*. 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. nijjī*. 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 *niryuktayāḥ*, mentioned above p. 58ⁿ, we must confess that Peterson's account does not make it clear in which of the above ten texts it is contained. On the *ācāraniryukti* 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 | suttaṃ gaṇṭharitī gaṇaharā niṇṇam | sāsaṇassa
(*ṇasa* !) *hi aṭṭhāe | tao suttaṃ pavattat ||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 *Araham*, 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 *diṭṭhivāa*, *aṅga* 12. See above pp. 243, 244.

3. *biā varacariā*, 349 (also P π , 359 B) vv., of like contents.¹⁰¹⁴ It begins *Vīram Ariṭṭhaṇemim Pāsam Mallim ca Vāsupujjam ca | ee muttūṇa 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 P π) 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, *Vaubhūi* 3, *Viatta* 4, *Suhamma* 5, *Maṇḍia* 6, *Moriaputta* 7, *Akampiā* 8, *Ayalabhāyā* 9,

¹⁰¹⁴ Jina 6 is called *Paumābha* (v. 23), Jina 8 *Sasippaha* (v. 24), Jina 19 *Malli* appears as a masc. (*Mallissa* v. 30)

¹⁰¹⁵ On *Devānamā* see v. 279 (289); but *Usabhadatta* is not mentioned. We read *Somilābhidhāno* in the scholiast.

¹⁰¹⁶ *Gosāla* v. 15 fg.

Meajja 10, Pabhāsa 11 (see Hemac. vv. 31, 32); *tittham ca Suhammāo, niravaccā gaṇaharā sesā* (v. 5). The contents is as above, and almost no reference is paid to the account in the *āṅgas*. It concludes with the statement (above p. 48) : *sāmāyāri tivihā : ohe dasahā pādavibhāge* ||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 6,₈₈, 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 *ohanijjutti* 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 *ohanijj*. (cf. above p. 59), or rather referred to it merely by the citation of its introductory verse. A complete incorporation brought with it no little difficulty, because of the extent of the text in question.¹⁰¹⁹ The economy of the whole work, would have lost considerably if the entire text had been inserted. The text which we possess under this name and of which the first verse alone is cited here, consists of 1160 Prakrit *gāthās*.¹⁰²⁰ I shall refer to it later on, and call attention for the present to what I have said on p. 37ⁿ² : —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 *caṇḍidasapuvvi*. The same, of course, holds good *à 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 jogavihāṇa*) the *ohanijjuti* is said to be "oinnā," *avatīrṇā* into the *āvassayam*.

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

1020 The *oghaniryukti*, which in P π 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 nisihīā | āpucchāṇā ya [63] paḍipucchā chaṇḍaṇā ya nimaṇṭaṇā ||1|| uvasaṇpayā ya kāle sāmāyārī bhavē dasavihā u | eesim tu payāṇaṃ pattea paruvaṇaṃ buccam ||2||*

8. *Uvagghāyanijjutti*, 211(214 B, 216 P, 210π) vv. In vv. 40-50 glorification of Ajja Vayara (plur. *maj.*), °Vairā, Vajrasvāmin, who extracted¹⁰²¹ the *āgāsagamā vijjā* from the *mahāpāinā* (see p. 251) and made ample use of the latter. In his time there still existed (p. 247) *apuhatte kāliānuoassa, pṛthaktvaṃ kālikānuyogasya*, but after him (*teṇārena, tata ārataḥ*, Haribh.), i.e. perhaps through him there came into existence *puhattaṃ kāliasua diṭṭhivāe*¹⁰²² *a, pṛthaktvaṃ kālikaśrute dṛṣṭivāde ca* (v. 40). *Tumbavaṇa, Ujjeṇī, Dasapura, nayaraṃ 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 Āryarakṣita (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, I, c. pp. 246_b, 247_a), 252_b, 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 "*daśapūrvin*," 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 *Kupakṣakauśik*, *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 : *kāliasuaṃ ca isibhāsiyāim taio a sūrapannattī | savvo a diṭṭhivāo cauttthao hoi aṇuogo ||54|| jaṃ ca mahākappasuaṃ jāṇi a sesāṇi cheasuttāṇi | caranaḥkaraṇānuoga tti kāliatthe uvagayāṇi ||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 sutta a tha kahaṇā ya*; each of the 7 etc. *nayas* —see p. 350 ff. and p. 39 — *śatavidhaḥ*.

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*” (*kalpādini*, scholiasts) are said to have been borrowed from *aṅga* 12, they are akin (or *ṛisibhāṣita*) 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 Jamālī in Sāvattthī in the fourteenth year after he obtained knowledge (*Jiṇeṇa uppāḍiassa nāṇassa*), —the second (vv. 64, 65), the *Jivapaesiya*, under Tisagutta (*caūḍasapuvvi*) 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 (*siddhim gayassa Vīrassa*). They were “brought back to the right faith” (Jacobi, *Kalpas* p. 9) by the Muria (Maurya) Balabhadra in Rāyagiha. The fourth schism (vv. 68, 69), the *Sāmuṇḍheya* 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 Gaṁga in Ullamatīra (? A, *Ullaga* B, *Ulluga* scholiast, *Ullukā* in Skr.) in the year 228. The sixth, the Terāśia, *trairāśika*, under Chaluga in Am̐taramjīā, 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 *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* texts, is opposed to the *duvālasaṅga gaṇip*; the *iṣibhāṣitām* together with the *sūrap*. are regarded as parts of the *kāliyam*. In reference to the use of the word *Anuy*, see above, p. 36n 2.

1025 *upalakṣaṇāt kālikaśrutam caraṇakaraṇānuyogaḥ, ṛisibhāṣitāni dharmakathānuyoga itī gamyate; sarvaś ca dṛṣṭivādāś caturtho bhavaty anuyogaḥ, dravyānuyoga itī; tatra ṛisibhāṣitāni dharmakathānuyoga ity uktam, tataś ca mahākālpaśrutādini ṛisibhāṣitam tvā (tatvāt?), dṛṣṭivādād uddhṛtya tesām pratipāditatvāt dharmakathānuyogavā(? tvāc ca?) prasāṅga ity atas tadapohadvāracikīrṣayā 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* ?

though in a very obscure fashion. We have already seen (p. 351) that *āṅga* 12, according to the account of *āṅga* 4 and *Nandī*, devoted considerable attention to these schisms. Finally, the *therāvālī* of the *Kalpasūtra* (§6) contains several statements in reference to the *Terāsiyā sāhā* and its founder *Chalue Rohagutte Kosiyagotte*. The latter it calls the scholar of Mahāgiri, who, as in the *therāvālī* of the *Nandī*, is called the ninth successor of Vīra. But this is not in harmony with the above-mentioned date (544 after Vīra), since it is equivalent to an allotment of 60 years to each *patriarchate*. There is then here, as in the case of the name of the founder of the fourth schism—see 351^a, 381—a considerable discrepancy in the accounts. The seventh schism, the *Abaddhīā* (vv. 88—91), under *Goṭṭhāmāhila* in Dasapura is referred to the year 584 and brought into connection with Ayya Rakkhia, Pūsamitta and with the ninth *puvva* (p. 356). The first of these statements harmonizes with the other information concerning Rakkhia which we possess. See p. 63, Klatt p. 247^b. The name Pūsamitta is frequently met with. According to Merutuṅga's *Vicāraśreṇī* (see Bühler, *ante*, 2, 362 and Jacobi, *Kalpas*, p. 7), there reigned a Pūsamitta, successor of the Maurya (the Puṣyamitra of the *Mahābhāṣya*, etc!) in the years 323—353 after Vīra. Neither can he be the one referred to here, nor the Pūsamitta who was the founder of the *Pūsamittijjam kulam* of Cāraṇagaṇa in § 7 of the *therāvālī* of the *Kalpas*., which emanated from Sirigutta, the pupil of the tenth [67] *patriarch* Suhatthi. The name Pūsamitta occurs here too in chap. 17(16), 190 (see p. 74^a.) as that of a contemporary of king Muḍimbaga and of Ayya Pussabhūi. Abhayadeva on *up.* 1 mentions him as the founder of the fourth schism. See p. 65^a.

In addition to these seven schisms there was an eighth (vv. 92—95), that of the *Boḍḍia*, *Paṭṭika*, according to Haribh, under Sivabhūi in Rahavīrapura (*Ratha*^o) in the year 609. According to the account in Dharmaghoṣa's scholiast on his *Kupakṣakaṇṭh*., the Digambaras are referred to; see *Kup.* p. 6 (796) where I have attempted to shew that the name Boḍḍia has the same meaning (naked) as *digambara*. The animosity against the Boḍḍikas is as keen as can possibly be imagined. In the 22nd chapter of the *Vicārāmṛtasamgraha*, the remaining 7 *nihnavas* are said, according to Malayagiri's commentary on the *Āvaśy.*, to be *deśavisamvādino dravyalīṅgenā 'bhedino*, but the Boḍḍika : *sarvavisamvādino dravyalīṅgato 'pi bhinnās*. Similarly Haribh. on v. 92 (*deśavi^o* and *prabhūṭavi^o*); see also Jacobi, *Kalpas*, p. 15^a. In the *kālasattari*,

v. 40, they appear as *khamañā pāsamḍiyā*; also in *Kup.* 1, 37, 71, 2, 3; *ibid.* 1, 8, or as *khavaṇaya*, i.e. *kṣapaṇaka*. See below, p. 75.

In contradistinction to these heterodox opinions (*micchādittī*) we have the praises of the *sāmāiaṃ* sung in v. 102 fg. We find it called.¹⁰²⁸ (v. 108) an "*ajjhayaṇaṃ*" as opposed to the "remaining (five) *ajjhayaṇas*;" and the two verses closing with the refrain ii *kevalibhāsiaṃ* [68] are cited in reference to it. These verses recur in the *Anuyogadvārasūtra* (see above pp. 37, 38) as I have shewn on *Bhagav.* 2, 186. After the conclusion of the *upodghātaniryukti* we find in the scholiast (see above p. 55) the following statement: *atra sūtrasparśikaniryukty* (see p. 38) *-avasaraḥ, sā ca prāptāvasarā 'pi no 'cyate, yasmād asati sūtre kasyā 'sāv iti*; to which is joined an elaborate deduction in reference to *sutta* and *niryukti*.

9. *namukkāranijjutti*, 139 (P π , 144B) vv. Towards the end we find the verse *eso paṃca*^o (132), glorifying the *paṃcanamukkāra*, a verse we have already met with in *upāṅga* 4; see p. 393. In the last *pāda* we have here the reading *havai maṅgalaṃ*; see *Kup.* p. 21 (811) fg., where this form of the verse is referred directly back to Śrī Vajrasvāmin. See p. 38ⁿ.3 on v. 6^b. A detached copy is found in Peterson, Palm-leaf No. 77^b.

10. *sāmāianijjutti*, 100 (π , 111 P, 112 B) vv. Begins: *naṃdi-anuoga-dāraṃ vihivāḍ uvagghāiaṃ ca kāṇaṃ/kāṇa paṃcamamgala-m āraṃbho hoi sutassa || 1 ||*. The knowledge of the *naṃdi* and of the *anuoga*¹⁰²⁹ is here regarded as a preliminary condition for the understanding of the *sūtra*. This citation is both *per se* of interest (see p. 3), and also because from it we can prove that the *āvaśyaka* texts, quoted in these two works are to be distinguished from our *av. nijj.*—though this was tolerably self-evident after the remarks on p. 53 ff. The text continues:

ahavā (!) : kayapaṃcanamukkāro karei sāmāiaṃ ti so bhihio | sāmāiaṃgam eva ya jaṃ so sesaṃ ao bucchaṃ [69] *||2|| sūtram (atra 'mtare sūtraṃ vācyam B). On this Har. (see between 8 and 9) : atra 'mtare sūtrasparśaniryuktir ucyate svasthānatvād, āha ca niryuktikāraḥ :*

¹⁰²⁸ *ajjhayaṇaṃ pi a tivihāṃ | sutte atthe tad-ubhāe ceva | sesesu vi ajjhayaṇesu (caturviṃśatistavādiṣu) hoi ese 'va nijjutti (uddesaṇirdeśadika niryuktiparyaya-sāṇā).*

¹⁰²⁹ *naṃdiṣ ca anuyogadvārāṇi ca* Haribh.

akkhaliya (v. 3) *tti*,¹⁰³⁰ *gāhā*. We have here then a very incomplete quotation of the text, see above p. 55—In vv. 30—38 there are special statements in reference to the 11 *karāṇas*, the fourth of which is here called *thiviloṇaṇam*. See p. 414. In v. 40 we find a division of the *suam* into *baddham* and *abaddham*. The former is explained by *duvālasaṃgam* and called *nisiham* and *anisiham* (see pp. 452, 553); the *nistham* is explained as *pacchannam*, and the following added in illustration :- *nistham nāma jaha 'jjhayaṇam* (v. 41). In verse 42 we find a citation from *pūrva* 2—see above p. 354—in immediate conjunction with the foregoing.

11. *Caūvisatthai*, 62 (61 BP) vv., second *ajjhayaṇam* in Haribh. Stands alone in Peterson's Palm-leaf 77°.

12. *Varidaṇaṇijjuttī*, 191 (189 π B, 190 P) vv., equivalent to the third *ajjh.* of Har. Stands alone in Peterson's Palm-leaf No. 77d. From v. 36 on there is a dialogue between *guru* and *co° codaka*, see above p. 34. After v. 176 we read in the text *atra sūtram*, and Har. quotes a text which begins with the words *icchāmi khamāsamaṇe vaṇḍium*.

13. *paḍikkamaṇaṇijjuttī*, 54 (52 PB, 51π) vv. Chap. 13-18, which correspond to the fourth *ajjh.* of Haribh., presuppose a [70] *pratikkramaṇasūtram*¹⁰³¹ given by him in full in sections. These chapters form a species of running commentary to each of the sections of the *pratikk.* Chap. 14, 15 take up one section each, chap. 17 two, chap. 13, 16 contain the explanation of several sections. The sections explained in chap. 13 read :- *paḍikkamāmi egavihe asaṃjame ... p. dohiṃ baṇḍha-ṇehiṃ*, *p. tihīṃ daṇḍehiṃ*, *p. caūhiṃ jjhāṇehiṃ*. The entire following chapter is an explanation of the latter sentence. In π a *dharmajjhāṇam* of 69 vv. precedes these sections commented upon in chapter 13.

14. *jhāṇasayaṇam*, *dhyānaśatakam*, 106vv. The last verse (106) which is omitted by Haribhadra, mentions only 105 vv., and states that

¹⁰³⁰ *akkhaliyasāmbhai vakkhāṇacattikkāe darisiammi | suttapphāsianijjuttivittthara-ttho imo hoi* || schol. *tatrā 'skhalitapadoccarāṇam saṃhitā, athavā paraḥ saṃni-karṣaḥ saṃhitā* (a fine Brahminical reminiscence) . . . *padam, saṃhitā padārtha, padavigraha, cālanā, pratyavasthānam* (see above p. 38) are here referred to.

¹⁰³¹ It begins *icchāmi paḍikkamium...*; it is in prose and different from the *śrāddha*-or *śrāvaka-pratikkramaṇasūtra*, whose 50 *gāthās*, divided into 5 *adhikāras*, were commented in Śaṅkha 1496 (A.D. 1440) by Ratnaśekhara from the *Tapāgaccha* (No. 32 in Klatt). In Peterson's Palm-leaf MSS. there are two other similar texts, a *pratikkramaṇasūtram* 86e 83c (where it is called *aticāraprāt°*) and a *pratikkramaṇam* 154a (see p. 125b), which is different from the first.

Jiṇabhadra is the author of this cento¹⁰³² : *pañcuttareṇa, gāhā-sāṇa jhāṇasayagaṃ samuddiṭṭham / Jiṇabhadrakhamāsamāṇehi kammasohikaraṃ jaiṇo || 106 ||*. It had originally, as at present (see Peterson's Palm-leaf 77a 161^h), a quite independent position and was later on inserted here. This is clear from the fact that the beginning contains a special salutation, which is usual only in the case of independent texts :— *Vīraṃ sukkajjhāṇag-gidaḍḍhakammimādhanaṃ paṇamiuṇaṃ joṣsaraṃ saraṇaṃ, jhāṇajjhayaṇaṃ pavakkhāmi ||1||* Haribh. cites this *dhyānaśatakaṃ* just as he usually cites his [71] *kathāṇaka* : *ayaṃ dhyānasamāsārthaḥ, vyāsārthaḥ tu dhyānaśatakāḍ avaseyaḥ, tac cedam dhyānaśatakam asya mahārthatvād vastunaḥ śāstrāntaratvāt (!)* this is plain; we should have expected °*tvāc ca*) *prārambha eva vighnavināyakaśāntataye maṅgalārtham iṣṭadevatānamaskāraṃ āha : Viram ..* The explanation concludes (omitting verse 106) with the words :— *samāptaṃ dhyānaśatakam*, and the commentator proceeds with his explanation of the *pratikramaṇa-sūtram* : *paḍikkamāmi pañcahiṃ kiriyāhiṃ*, again having recourse thereby to the *pāriṭṭhāvaṇiyanīyutti*.

15. *pāriṭṭhāvaṇī*, 151 (152 P, 153 π B vv. Begins : *pāriṭṭhāvaṇiavihiṃ/bucchāmi dhīrapurisapannattāṃ / jaṃ nāṭṭa suvihā pavayanasāraṃ uvalahaṃti || 1 ||* This chapter, too, gives me the impression of having originally enjoyed a separate existence. Nevertheless it is closely connected with chapter 18, since they both share this form of introduction. It is also noticeable that the same verse recurs with tolerable similarity in 20, 9; from which we may conclude that chapters 16, 18, 20 were composed by one author. Haribh. in this chapter omits or leaves a large number of verses unexplained; and beginning with v. 79. His commentary is partially composed in Prakrit, probably taken from the old *bhāṣya* (see p. 52). After the conclusion :— *pariṣthāpanikā samāptā*, he proceeds to cite and explain the *sūtram* : *paḍikkamāmi chahiṃ jīvaṇikāhehiṃ*. In π there is an additional chapter *leṣā*, with 13 vv., inserted between the conclusion and explanation.

16. *paḍikkamaṇasaṃghayaṇī, pratikramaṇasaṃgrahaṇī*, 133 (80 P π B) vv. The verses, which are not found in [72]B,¹⁰³³ are cited in full by Haribh. as a part of his commentary¹⁰³⁴. The verses which A B have

1032 He appears in Ratnaśekhara as the author of a *viśeṣāvaśyaka*. See preceding note.

1033 Pπ also presumably do not contain the verses : A 18-30, 32-43, 50-64, 68-80.

1034 On one occasion he calls these verses (vv. 50-64) *niryuktigāthās* of the *sūtrakṛt* (!), by which the *sūtrakṛt* (!) is said to explain the two preceding verses (48, 49) of the *saṃgrahaṇikā* ! See above p 54n³.

in common, are cited by him here, not as verses of the *niryuktikṛt*, but as a part of the *saṃgrahaṇikāra*. In these chapters we find explanations and enumerations of the contents of sections 6—31 of the *pratikramaṇasūtram*. Each group of verses is explained under its proper section. Chapters 14 and 15, however, belong to but one section. The following is treated of : 6 *jīvanikā*, 7 *bhayaṭṭhāṇa* (v. 14), 8 *mayatṭhāṇa* (v. 14^b), 9 *baṃbhaceragutti* (v. 15), the 10-fold *samaṇadhamma* (v. 16), 11 *uvāsagapaḍimā* (v. 17), 12 *bhikkhupaḍimā* (v. 31), 13 *kiriyaṭṭhāṇa* (v. 44), 14 *bhūyagāma* (v. 45), 15 *paramāhammī* (vv. 48, 49), 16 *gāhāsola* (vv. 65, 66), the 17-fold *saṃjama* (v. 67), the 18-fold *abaribha* (v. 81), 19 *nāyajjhayaṇa* (vv. 82, 83), 20 *asamāhiṭṭāṇa* (vv. 84-86), 21 *sabala* (*śabala* v. 87),¹⁰³⁵ 22 *parisaha* (v. 100), 23 *suttagaḍajjhayaṇa* (v. 102), 24 *deva* (v. 103), 25 *bhāvaṇa* (v. 104), 26 *dasū-kappavavahārāṇa* *uddesaṇakāla* (v. 109), the 27-fold *aṇagāracaritta* (v. 110), the 28-fold *āyārapakappa* (v. 112), 29 *pāvasutapasāṃga* (v. 115), 30 *mohaṇiyyaṭṭhāṇa* (v. 117) and 31 *siddhāiguṇa* (v. 132). We find herein enumerations of the 23 chapters of *aṅga* 2 (in two groups, one of 16, the other of 7; [73] see above p. 260), of the 19 chapters of the first part of *aṅga* 6, of the 26 chapters of the three *chedasūtras* 3-5, and of the 28 chapters of *aṅga* 1.

17. *Jogasamṅgaha-āsāyaṇā*, *āsātanā*; 64 vv.: in A counted continuously in conjunction with chapter 16, i.e. as vv. 134-197. In P π B, however, it is divided into two chapters : *jogasamṅgaha* of 60, and *āsāyaṇā* of 5 (4 π) vv. It contains the vouchers for and examples (*udāharaṇagāhā* of the 32 *jogasamṅghas* (to v. 193) and 33 *āsāyaṇās*,¹⁰³⁶ *āsātanās* (v. 194-197), which are mentioned in the last two sections of the *pratikramaṇasūtram*. The *pratikramaṇasamṅrahaṇī* (*pr^onī samāptā*) ended here according to Haribh. But with the words *sāmprataṃ sūtroktā eva trayastrīṇśad vyākhyāyaṃte* ... Haribh. comes back to the explanation of v. 197. These verses contains principally matters of legendary and historical purport, and consist chiefly of proper names and of some catch-words. Haribhadra cites very detailed *kathāṇakas* on them composed in Prakrit, from which the meaning of the verses is to be extracted (*svabuddhyā 'vaseyaḥ*); but he does not enter upon the explanation of

¹⁰³⁵ On vv. 87-96 we read here : *āsāṃ vyākhyā ... ayam ca samāsārthaḥ, vyāsārthas tu dasākhyāḍ-grāṃthāntarād avaseya evam (eva), asammohārtham dasānusāreṇa sabalasvarūpaṃ abhihitam saṃgrahaṇikāras tu evam āha : varisaṃ* (v. 97). The fourth *chedasūtram* (or its second book, see p. 468) is meant by the *dasākhyagrantha* mentioned here.

¹⁰³⁶ Explained by *ayaḥ(!) samyagdarśanādyavāptilakṣaṇas, tasyā sātanaḥ khaṃḍarā āsātanās* ... ; as if the word was *āyasāyaṇā* (or *āya°*)

the text of each of the verses, or even of the *kathāṇakas* cited by him. It is very interesting that *Thūlabhadda* is here brought into connection with the (ninth, Haribh) Nanda, and with *Sagaḍūla* and *Vararuci* (v. 144, cf. the statements in Hemac's *pariśiṣṭaparvan* 8, 3 fg). The same may be said of the mention of *Salavāvahana* in *Paiṭṭhāṇa* (v. 164; Vikramaditya is, however, not noticed), and of the identification, in all essentials, of all these and similar [74] names¹⁰³⁷ with the names of king Dummuha of Paṃcāla, of Namī of Videha, Naggai of Gaṃdhāra (v. 172), and with the *Paṃḍavavaṃsa* (v. 161) ! As far as the legends admit of being comprehended (which is no easy matter, if we take into consideration the enigmatical character of the text and the corrupt condition of the MS. of the commentary), they are in only partial agreement with our information in respect to these persons obtained from Brahminical sources. The information they convey, is quite independent of any other source, and is probably the result of their arbitrary desire for change. It is of interest that the *gāthā* (v. 188), cited pp. 158, 159, which is quite in keeping with the character of the verses of Hāla, is here inserted in the legend of two prostitutes (*Magahasumdari* and *Magahasiri*).

18. *asajjhāianijjutti, asvādhyāyika*,^o 111 (P π , 110B) vv. Begins¹⁰³⁸ : *asajjhāianijjuttim buccāmi dhīrapurisapanhattam | jaṃ nāṭṭa suvihiā pavayaṇasārāṃ uvalabhamti || || asajjhāiam tu duviham āyasamuttham ca parasamuttham ca | jaṃ tattha parasamuttham tarit paṃcaviham tu nāyavvam || 2 ||* Closes : *asajjhāianijjutti kahiā bhe dhīrapurisapanhattā | samjama-tavaḍḍhagāṇam | niggamthāṇam mahārisiṇam || 10 ||* This chapter, too, appears to have originally existed by itself (see above p. 71, on chapter 15). It refers to certain faults in the study and recitation of the *śrutam*, which are enumerated at the conclusion of the 33 *āsāyaṇās* : but special reference is made to the cases in which *akāle kao sajjhāo*, etc. The *pratikramaṇasūtram* consequently is joined on in Haribh. as follows : *nama cāvisāe tittthayārāṇam Usabhāi Māhavīrapayyavasāṇāṇam, ... iṇam eva niggamtham pavayaṇam savvam aṇuttaram ity ādi .. neḍuam (naiyāyikam) [75] ti saṃsuddham ti, sallakattanam ti, siddhimaggaṃ muttimaggaṃ nejjāmaggaṃ nevvāṇamaggaṃ ti, icchāmi paḍikkamiṃ goyaracariyāe ity-ādi,*

19. *kaussagganijj.*, 172 vv., fifth *ajjh.* in Har.

¹⁰³⁷ As for example *Vijaa* in Bharuaccha v. 189, *Muḍimbaga*, *Ajja Pussabhi*, *Pūsamitta* in *Sambavaddhaṇa* v. 190.

¹⁰³⁸ Verse 1 is omitted by Haribh.

20. *paccakkhāṇanijjutti* corresponds to the sixth *ajjah.* in Haribh., and consist of three parts :—1. A metrical section in 22 (26 B) vv., with an enumeration of the 5 *mūlaguṇas*.¹⁰³⁹ 2. A prose portion treating of the 12 *vratas* (5 *aṇuvr.* 3 *guṇavr.*, 4 *śikṣāpadvr.*) Haribhadra calls its sections *sūtram*; this is doubtless to be regarded as a bit of the *sūtram*, which is presupposed in the other chapters, but not directly admitted into the text of the *Nijj.* 3. A metrical conclusion of 74(70B) vv., which closes with the same two verses as chapter 10 There are 194 vv. verses in all given in P, but in π only 90. It stands alone in Peterson's Palm-leaf 77° (without statement as to the number of verses) and 86g (94vv.), —The prose part (nominative in e!) is directed with great vigour against the *annautthiyas* (*anyatīrthika*) and against the *parapāsaṃdāpasamsās*, or the *parapāsaṃdāsaṃthavas*. According to Haribhadra, the Brahminical sects¹⁰⁴⁰ *Bhautika* and *Voṭika* (Digambara, see above p. 67) are treated of under *annau*°. The 363 doctrines attacked in *aṅga* 2 are referred to under *parapāsaṃdā*. See p. 259.¹⁰⁴¹ According to H. there is no mention here of the seven schisms. [76] He mentions also a legend (in Prakrit) of *Cāṇakka* and *Camdagutta* in *Paḍaliputta*. Cf. Hemac. *pariś.* chap. 8 and 9).

¹⁰³⁹ *pāṇivaha musāvāe adatta mehuṇa pariggahe ceva ||8|| sāvaḍadhammassa vihiṃ buccāmi dhīrapurisapānattam | jaṃ carīṇa suvihiā giṇṇo vi suhāim pāvānti ||9||* On this vers see p. 71 on chap. 15.

¹⁰⁴⁰ *anyatīrthikapariḡhītāni vā caityāni arhatpratimālakṣaṇāni, yathā Bhautapariḡhītāni Virabhadra-Mahā kālādīni, Voṭika, pariḡhītāni vā.*

¹⁰⁴¹ Dr. Leumann called my attention to the fact that a letter of Schiefner to me dated Dec. 1857—see *Ind. Stud.* 4, 335—contains the following statement extracted from the introduction of a Thibetan work edited by Wassiljew: “there are 363 different schisms in the religion of India.” Since I found nothing of the kind in the introduction of Tāranātha, which was doubtless referred to here, I had recourse to Wassiljew himself. On the 8th of October, 1883, I received from him the following kind reply:—“I cannot inform you definitely in which of my works 363 Indian schools are mentioned, if at all; but it is certain that this number is frequently mentioned in Thibetan works. In Djandja Vatuktu's *Siddhānta*, which I have at present before me, I find the following; “In the *sūtras* are mentioned 96 *darsana papantika* (?), 14 *dijakṣta muluni* (?) 62 injurious *darsana*, 28 which do not permit salvation, and 20 which are ruinous.” In Bhanja's work *Tarkadīvala* all the *darsanas* are enumerated in 110 species, ‘viz’... According to my hasty count there are more than 120 names, probably because the same school is mentioned twice, i.e. in Sanskrit and Thibetan. And at the end, after mention of all 110 (—120) species, we read:—in all 363 *darsanas*. As regards the names of these *darsanas*, it is too difficult for me to translate them into Russian and *a fortiori* into German, though, should you desire it, I will attempt it as best I may be able”. I did not consider it necessary to have recourse again to Wassiljew's kindness, since, for the purpose in view, his communication was amply sufficient. It is clear from the above compared with p. 259, that it will be difficult to expect complete agreement in detail; nevertheless the fact that the number of 363 *darsanas* is common to the Jains with the Thibetan Buddhists, is of great value.

Besides the *Nijjutti* I possess a fragment of a second metrical treatment of the *āvaśyaka*, which is, however, confined to *vaṇḍana* and *paccakkāṇa*. The former is divided into two sections, *caityavarh-dana* and *guru*.^o The text is only partially based upon the *Nijjutti*. There is an *avacūri* (°cūrṇi) to it from the commentary of a Somasum-dara (from the *Candragaccha*). This *avacūri* can be traced back to a *Jñānasāgara*.

[77] XLV. The third *mūlasūtram*, *dasaveāliasuakkhaṇḍha*, *daśavaikālika*, or merely : *dasālika*,¹⁰⁴² *daśakālika*. It consists of ten *ajjhayaṇas*, which are composed in ślokas, with the exception of a few prose sections. There are furthermore two chapters called *cūlā* (and hence secondary¹⁰⁴³) of similar contents. These are in *gāthās*. After them follow four *gāthās*, in which Sijjambhava, according to the old *therāvali* (*Nandī*, *Kalpas*) the fourth patriarch after Mahāvīra, is stated to be the author,¹⁰⁴⁴ but his son Ajja-Maṇaga and his pupil Jasabhadda¹⁰⁴⁵ are mentioned in connection with him. This is indeed a claim of great antiquity for the author.

The contents refers to the *viṇaya*, and is clothed in a very ancient dress. That this is the case is proved by the close of a chapter : *it bemi* (also in the case of the two *cūlās* !) and by the introduction : *suam me āusaṃ* in the prose sections (with the exception of that in *cūla* 1). The *dasaveāliam* (see p. 11) is mentioned in the *Nandī* as being in the forefront of the *ukkāliya* group of the *anamaṇapavittṭha* texts; its position here, however, almost at the end, does not agree with the prominent place ascribed to it by N. It appears elsewhere as the last or smallest of the *āgama* (if I understand the words correctly; the preceding leaf is wanting in the Berlin MS — see p. 214) in Hemac. [78] in the *pariśiṣṭap* 9, 99, and in the commentary on Nemicaṇḍra's *pravacanasāra*, v. 1445, where Duḥprasaha, the last of the 2004 *sūris* which Nemic. accepts, is designated as *daśavaikālikamā-trasūtradharo 'pi caturdaśapūrvadhara iva śakrapūjyaḥ*. The author of the *Āvaśy. nijj.* asserts (2,₅) that he composed a *nijjuti* on it. A MS. of a *nijjutti* which recognizes the *cūliya* is found in Peterson's Palm-leaf

¹⁰⁴² Thus in *Av. nijj.* 2, 5 and in the *Vidhiṭṭhapā.*

¹⁰⁴³ This is evident from the title *dasakāliam* itself. At the time that the four *gāthās* were added at the end, these two *cūlās* had not yet been affixed, since the text in v. 1 is called, as one might expect from its title, merely *dasajjhayaṇam*.

¹⁰⁴⁴ According to v. 37 of the *kalasattari* it was composed in the year 98 Vira.

¹⁰⁴⁵ These three names recur in the same connection in the *therav.* of the *Kalpas*. *saṅghabadda* is also in the *Nandī* the fifth successor of Vira.

167. Is it the work referred to? The word *vedliam* is said here to mean about the same as *vaikālikam*, "belonging to the evening" (*vikāle 'parāhṇe*).¹⁰⁴⁶

1. *duṃapupphā drumapuṣpikā*, 5 vv. Comparison of the *dhamma* with a flowering tree. Cf. *āṅga* 2, 2, 1, *uttarajjh.* chap. 10.

2. *sāmannapuvva, śrāmaṇyapūrvikā*, 11 vv. Of firmness, *dhṛti*.

3. *khuḍḍiāyārā, kṣullikācāra*, 15 vv.; *sā dhṛtir ācāre vidheyā*.

4. *cajjīvaṇiyajjh.*,¹⁰⁴⁷ *śaḍjīvanikhādhy.*, i.e. doubtless °*nikāyajjh.*; see above, pp. 71, 72. In two chapters, the first of which, in prose, begins *suam me..* and treats of the 6 grades of the four elements (earth, water, light, air), plants (*vaṇasai*) and insects (*tasa*); and of the 5 *mahavvayas* to be observed in reference to them. To these five a sixth, the *rāibhoṇāu veramaṇam* (command against eating at night), is added. Chapter 2, in 29 vv., treats of the six forms of activity (walking, standing, sitting, lying, eating, speaking) necessary for these 6 *mahavv.*

5. *piṇḍesaṇā*, in 2 *uddesakas*, with 100 and 50 vv., *bhikṣāśodhiḥ*, of the collection of the necessities of life and of rules for eating; see *āṅga* 1, 2, 1. To this is joined, [79] according to the *Vidhiprapā*, the *piṇḍanijjuttī* (*mūlas.* 4); *ittiho piṭṭi oyarai* (*oiṇṇā* v. 7 of the *jogavihāṇa*).

6. *dharmārthakāmajjhayaṇam*, also *mahācāra-kathākhyān*; in 69 vv. —This *trivarga* (*tiavaggo* also in the *Abhidhānappadīpikā*) which plays so important a role in epic literature (*MBhār.*, *Rāmāy.* *Manu*) is not known to the Veda. Among the Jains and Buddhists, by whom *dharma* and *artha* are often brought into connection, though in quite a different signification (*artha* sense, explanation), the *trivarga* does not claim any place whatsoever. It is probable that we must connect it with the three *guṇas*: *sattva*, *rajas* and *tamas*. But in that case *artha* would respond to *rajas*, *kāma* to *tamas*, though *kāma* suits *rajas* much better. Has the Platonic trinity *καλον, ωφελιμον, ηδον* which is Cicero's *honestum, utile, dulce*, wandered to India?

7. *vakkasuddhi, vākyaśuddhi*, 57 vv.

8. *āyārappaṇiḥi, ācārapranidhi*, 64 vv.

¹⁰⁴⁶ In *āṅga* 2 the word means *valdārikam*; in *paṇṇa* 5 the meaning is not clear.

¹⁰⁴⁷ *dhammapannatti* v. 2, in the *Vidhiprapā*.

9. *vinayasamāhi*, 'samādhi, in 4 *uddeśakas*, of which the first three in metre, in 17, 23 and 15 vv., treat of the correct *vinaya*, especially in reference to the *guru*. The fourth is in prose with the introduction *suam me* ... and establishes four fixed categories of the correct *vinaya*.

10. *sa bhikkhu-ajjhayaṇam*, in 21 vv. All the verses end, as in *Uttarajjh*, chap. 15, with the refrain *sa bhikkhū*, and consequently enumerate the requirements made of a correct *bh.*, who desires to live in accordance with the regulations contained in the preceding 9 chapters.

11. *raivakka cūlā paḍhamā, rativākya*, in two sections. The first in prose, without the introduction *suam* [80] *me* ... enumerates 18 *thāṇas* which the *bhikkhu* must take and fulfil in order gradually to acquire *mukha*. The second, in 18 vv., partly with the refrain : *sa pacchā paritappai*, emphasizes especially the obstacles to this quest and serves *stāḍaṭṭh* *sthirikaraṇāya*.

12. *cūla* 2 without any special title (also in the *Vidhiprapā* merely *cūliyā*) in 16 vv., describes the correct course of action of the man of firmness.

The conclusion is formed by the 4 *gāthās* in reference to *Sijjambhava*, which have already been referred to. These *gāthās* are probably of later date. The work is called in v. 1 *dasakāliṃ* (as in *Āv. niḥj. 2, 5*, and in the *Vidhiprapā*) and also *dasajjhayaṇam*; so that verse 1 at least dates from a period in which the two *cūlās* had not been added (see p. 77^{na}).

The text is frequently doubtful in the two Berlin MSS. The commentary calls itself an *avacūri* of the *vṛhadvṛtti* of Haribhadrasūri.¹⁰⁴⁸ Another *avacūri*, in *bhāṣā*, is the work of a Rājahaṃsopādhyāya. A *laghuvṛtti* too is ascribed to Haribhadra. See p. 458.

XLVI. Fourth *mūlasūtram*, *piṇḍaniryukti*. There is no text of this name in Berlin. We find MSS. of it mentioned in Kielhorn (Report 1881) pp. 9, 26—29, 95, and Peterson's Palm-leaf 166¹⁰⁴⁹. According

1048 Ratnaśekhara (on *Pratikramanaśūtra*) cites this *vṛtti* frequently; likewise the *Vicārāṃśasamgraha* quotes e.g. the following verse from it (or from the *niḥj*?) :
tiṭṭhayaṛatthāṇam khalu attho, suttam tu gaṇaharattthāṇam (see p. 60) *atthēṇa*
ya vaṃjijjai suttam tamhā ya so balavaṃ. ||

1049 It begins according to Peterson as follows :- *piṇḍa uggamaṃ uppāyaṇesaṇa* -
saṃjogaṇappamaṇeyam, and concludes *nijjaraphalā ajjhatthā visohijuttassa*.

to what I have cited on page 79 from the *Vidhiprapā*, [81] the *piṇḍan*, is connected with the fifth chapter of the third *mūlasūtra*. It is surprising that a *niryukti* text should appear as a part of the *Siddh*. (see above p. 41). It deserves to be noticed that the *piṇḍan* is not mentioned in the *anaṅgapaviṭṭha* list of the *Nandi* (see p. 11 ff). In the list of Rāj. L. Mitra and Kāśināth Kunte *piṇḍaniryukti* appears as the name of their fourth *chedasūtra*; Kāśināth says that its contents is "on the cause of hunger and the nature and kind of food to be taken." A *piṇḍaniryuktivṛtti* is ascribed to the old Haribhadra (see p. 458⁹). Kielhorn, l.c., cites a *vṛtti* of Vīraṅga. (see above pp. 44, 51). According to his account its extent is 61 leaves, four or five lines on a page, each line 50 *akṣ* and in all about 900 ślokas.

It remains for us to give a brief account of those texts quoted as parts of the *Siddhānta* in the *Ratnasāgara*, and by Rajendra Lāla Mitra, and Kāśināth Kunte—see pp. 226, 227 - which do not appear in Bühler's list.

In the first place in reference to the *jītakalpa*¹⁰⁵⁰ cited in the *Ratnasāgara* as the sixth *chedasūtra* and in reference to the *gacchayāra* called *ibid*, the eighth *paimam*. Cf. pages 478 and 445.¹⁰⁵¹

[82] The third variation in the *Ratnasāgara* from Bühler's list which we find there has reference to the fourth *mūlasūtram* whose place is taken by the *oghaniryukti*¹⁰⁵² and in fact as No. 3.

We have already seen (p. 61) from *Āv. Nijj*, 6, 88, that a text of this name ought strictly to be cited there as a constituent part of the text of the *Āv. Nijj*. in P. π it is actually cited as such and from the scholia on it and on *Uttarajjh*. 26, above p. 48, that tradition regards it as an excerpt made by Bhadrabāhusvāmin from *pūrva* 9, 8, 20. This is confirmed by the introduction of the *avacūri* to the *oghan*. We have also

¹⁰⁵⁰ Fifth "*kalpasūtra*" in Rāj. L. M. and Kāś.

¹⁰⁵¹ I add that a *Jītakalpasūtram* is mentioned by Kielhorn, l.c. p. 51 and a *jītakalpacūṛṇi* on p. 17; also in Petersons Palm-leaf 101, where the beginning and the conclusion are given, the total contents being 202 (102?) *gāthās*. It begins *siddhisahayāramāyāvaṇibhavadavamayaṇapaḍibhaḍaṇa kamo | kīraṁ stram ntram vīram namium mahāvīram || 1 || vocchaṁ paṁcagaparihāṇipagara-gaṁ*,—closes : *gaṇesu || jītakalpasūtram samāptam*.

¹⁰⁵² Fifth *chedasūtra* in the list of Rāj. L. M. and Kāś, who says that the contents is "on the duties of *Sādhus*."

seen (p. 357) that this composition cannot be referred to the old Bhadrabāhu (+170 Vīra), since in the introductory verse cited in the Āv. 6,⁸⁹ the *dasapuvvi*, *daśapūrvī* are honoured besides the *arihaṃta* and the *caūddasapuvvis*. It is quite surprising that this verse also refers especially to the *ikkārasaṃgasuttadhārāe*; a fact diametrically opposed to the tradition just mentioned that regards a part of *aṅga* 12 as the source of the *agh*. Further on in our present *ogh*, we find a direct reference in v. 14 to *aṅga* 12 : *sāmāyārī ohe | nāyajjhayaṇḍim (aṅga 6?) diṭṭhivāo a | loiyakappāsāi aṇukkamā kāragā caūro ||* It is, however, *sub judice* whether or no this verse belonged to the original text. That this was quite a different text from that which the present *ogh*, as an independent work presents, is proved by the fact that the two *Āvaśyaka*-MSS. Pπ, which [83] cite it as integral part of the *Āvaśy. nijj*, and allot to it but 58 (P) or 79(π) verses (cf. above p. 62). The *oghanijj*, which exists in detached form embraces, according to its last verse, 1,160 *gāthās* :¹⁰⁵³ *ikkārasehi sāehi saṭṭhihiehi saṃgahiya*.¹⁰⁵⁴ The contents is stated in vv. 4,5 to be as follows :

vaya(vrata) 5 samaṇadhamma 10 saṃjama 17 veyāvaccam 10 ca barṃbhaguttlo 9 | nāṇāṭṭiyam 3 tava 12 kohaniggahāi 4 karaṇam eyam ||4||.

pimḍavisohi¹⁰⁵⁵ 4 samii 5 bhāvaṇa 12 paḍimā 12 ya imḍiyaniroho 5 | paḍilehaṇa 25 guttlo 3 abhiggahā 4 ceva karaṇam tu ||5||

The contents consequently refers to a right name of living; *karaṇakaraṇātmikā* is the designation of the *oghaniryukti* in the introduction of the *avacūri* on it, and it calls itself at the end (vv. 1156-57) *sāmāyārī* (see above p. 48).

The beginning of the *avacūri*¹⁰⁵⁶ contains several accounts in reference to the connection of the text with the *Āvaśyaka*, and

¹⁰⁵³ The MS. shews but 1, 158 and the text belonging to the *avacūri* has but 1, 132 vv.

¹⁰⁵⁴ In the palm-leaf MS. 165 of Peterson these words run : *ekkārasahim sāehim athahim (!) ahiehīm saṃgahiya*; the number of verses is stated to the 1,156(!),

¹⁰⁵⁵ A text of this name by *Jinavallabhagaṇi* appears in the account of Kielhorn, p. 30 (with commentary) 95 and in the list of Peterson's Palm-leaf 86m. 104c. 177d.

¹⁰⁵⁶ Composed by *Jñānasāgara saṃvat* 1439, and belonging to the *vṛtti* fo *Droṇacārya*.

sāmāyikādhyayana.¹⁰⁵⁷ These accounts are very obscure because we do not possess any of the immediate sources whence they are taken. [84] A *propos* of v. 1 several interesting statements are made concerning the relations of the *daśapūrvin* to the *caturdaśapūrvin* (*trayodaśapūrvinaḥ* are said to have never existed) The *daśap.* are said to be *upakāraḥ*, *upāṅgādi* (*dinām C*) *saṁgrahanyuparacanēṇa* (*°nena hetunā C*).

I have found no other trace of the *devavijjiyā*, see p. 431 cited in the *Ratnasāgara* as the sixth *painnam*. The *vyotiṣkaraṇam* which is the ninth *painnam* in the *Ratnasāgara* is at least mentioned in the *painna* list in *Āvi.*, see p. 427.

As regards the texts enumerated by Rajendra Lāla Mitra and Kāśināth Kunte, I refer to pages 392 and 11 for the *mahāpannavaṇā* mentioned by K. K. as the sixth *upāṅgam*.

In both the above authorities we find the second *mūlasūtram* called *viśeṣāvaśyakasūtra*; and a text of this name exists according to Kielhorn's Report, pp. 36 to 38. In the beginning of Ratnasekhara's commentary on the *śrāddhapratikrāmaṇasūtra* it is cited as a work of a Jinabhadra (see above p. 70) : *yad āhuḥ śrī Jinabhadraṇiḥṣamāśra-manapādāḥ śrī viśeṣāvaśyake* (then two *gāthās* in Prakrit). According to Klatt, 247^b and Kielhorn p. 37 Jinabhadra is merely author of a commentary on this work. A *ṭīkā* by Koṭyācārya is cited by Kielhorn, the MS, dating saṁvat 1138 (A.D. 1082). According to Klatt Koṭyācārya is another appellation of Śīlāṅka, whose commentary on *aṅga* 1, see p. 250 dates A.D. 876. Kielhorn mentions [85] an anonymous commentary on the text itself, which bears the much sought for name *śiṣyāhitā* (see pp. 44, 51, 81). This MS., too, is very old saṁvat 119 — (?) i.e. dates at least from A.D. 1134. The *viśeṣāvaśyakam* is often cited in the *Vicārāmṛtasamgraha*. According to Kāśināth Kunte it contains "a detailed explanation of what is written in the *Āvaśyakasūtra*."

The fourth *mūlasūtram* in the list of Rajendra Lāla Mitra, by name, *pākṣikasūtram*, contains (with some independent additions) the same

¹⁰⁵⁷ *prakrānto 'yam āvaśyakānuyogas, tatra sāmāyikādhyayanam anuvartate, tasya catvāry anuyogadvārāni* (cf. p. 24); *upakramo nikṣepo 'nugamo nayaḥ* : *ādyau dvāv uktau, anugamo dvīdha* : *niryuktyanugamo sūtrānugamas ca*; *ādyas tridhā* : *nikṣepo-podghāta-sūtrasparśiniryuktyanugamabhedāt* (see pp. 36, 38), *sūtra-sparśiniryuktyanugamo 'nugato vakṣyamāṇas ca, upodghātaniryuktyanugamas tv abhyām dvāragāthābhyām anugaṇṭavyaḥ* : *uddeśe niddese* (see p. 67n1) *ity-adi...*

enumeration of the *aṅgabāhira* texts, etc., which is found in the *Nandī*. See p. 10 ff. According to an introduction¹⁰⁵⁸ consisting of 4 *gāthās* it deals in prose especially with the 5 *mahavvayas* to which as the sixth the *rāṭbhoyanā veramaṇam* is joined. See p. 78. Then follows a metrical discussion of the same subject in 41 (13,7 and 23) *āryā*. Thereupon (*esā khalu mahavvaya-uccāraṇā kayā, icchāmo suttakittāṇam*¹⁰⁵⁹ *kāuṇ*) reverential salutations (*nama*) for the *khamāsamaṇā* by which partly *imaṃ vāiyam chavviham āvassayaṃ bhagavaṇtaṃ*, partly *imaṃ vāiyam aṅgabāhiraṃ kāliyaṃ*, or *ukkāliyaṃ, bhagavaṇtaṃ*, and partly; *imaṃ vaiyaṃ dūvālasaṃgaṃ gaṇipīḍagaṃ*. According to Kāśināth Kunte the work gives "an account of all what is to be done by the *Sādhus* in every fortnight." Perhaps the name is derived from the fact that it is to be recited every fortnight.

[86] The work stated to be the third member in the group of *Kalpasūtras* and which has the specific title *Kalpasūtram* is, according to the statements in Kaś, the text which claims this title *kaś' εξοχην*. It appears as the *dasāo* section of the fourth *chedasūtra*.

The first three members of the group of "*Chedasūtras*" in Rāj. L.M. cf. p. 227 :— the *bṛhat*, *laghu* and *madhyama-vācanā* of the *mahānīśītha*, are stated by Kāśināth to "treat of the penances to be performed by the *Sādhus* in a detailed, abridged and middling manner respectively." I have not found any other mention of this work.

The sixth member of the same group *paryuṣaṇākalpa*, contains, according to Kāśināth : "directions as to the manner of observing fasts and hearing the *Kalpasūtra* from the twelfth day of Bhādon (*Bhādrapada*) *Badi* (dark fortnight)¹⁰⁶⁰ to the 4th or 5th day of Bhādon *Sudi* (lunar, i.e. light, fortnight)." Is this the *paryuṣaṇākalpanijjuttī* in 66 *āryā* belonging to the third part of "*Kalpasūtra*" (Jacobi, pp. 86-95)? This *paryuṣ*. was commented on (see p. 476) by Jinaprabha at the end of his *saṃdehaviṣaṇasādhī*.

See p. 82 on *aughaniryukti* and pp. 427, 429 on *maraṇasamādhī*.

¹⁰⁵⁸ The first verse : *titthaṃkare atitthe atitthasiddhe ya titthasiddhe ya vaṃdāmi* //1// glorifies strangely enough the *atīrtha*, or *atīrthasiddha* too... According to an *avacūri* on it this refers to the *dharmavyavaccheda* "*Suvidhiprabhṛtīnām tīrthakṛtām saptaśv aṃtareṣu*," see p. 211 fg. 242. 348,

¹⁰⁵⁹ *śrutotkīrtanam* in the *avacūri*, perhaps *sutaki*."

¹⁰⁶⁰ *badi*, *bahuladina*, as *sudi*, instead of *sudi*, *suddhadina* (or *sukladina*). See my treatise on the *Kṛṣṇajñānamāṣṭamī* p. 350n.

I give in conclusion a list of the texts which are either found in the *Siddhānta* itself (1-29), or are mentioned elsewhere (30 fg.) as belonging to the *Siddh.* but which at present are no longer extant, at least as independent texts.

[87] 1. *dīvasāgarapannatti*, *aṅga* 3, 3, 1, 4, 1, see pp. 268, 389, also in the *paiṇṇa* list in *Āvī*. see pp. 427, 429 (where there is but one *saṃgahaṇī* on it).

2. *kammavivāgadasāu*,¹⁰⁶¹ ten *ajjhayaṇas*, *aṅga* 3, 10¹⁰⁶², see p. 270; cf. Nos. 7, 10.

3. *baṃdhadasāu*, ten *ajjh.*, *aṅga* 3, 10, see p. 273.

4. *dogiddhidasāu*. ten *ajjh.*, *ibid.*

5. *dīhadasāu*, ten *ajjh.*, *ibid.* (cf. *up.* 8-12).

6. *saṃkheviyadasāu*, *ibid.*, ten *ajjh.* viz. :- 1. *khuddiyā vimāṇapavibhatti*, 2. *mahalliyā vim.*, 3. *aṃgacūliyā*, 4. *vaggacūliyā*, 5. *vivāhacūliyā*, -6. *Aruṇovavāe*, 7. *Varaṇovavāe* (*Dha°*), 8. *Garulovavāe*, 9. *Velamdharovavāe*, 10. *Vesamaṇovavāe*. All these titles recur in essentially the same order in the *Nandī* among the *aṇaṃgapaviṭṭha* text, group *kāliya*; see pp. 13, 14. In the *kārikās* quoted on pp. 223, 224 we find the statement that 1-5 belong to the fifth, and 6-10 to the twelfth year of study,

7. *kammavivāgajjhayaṇa*, *aṅga* 4, 43, see p. 280; cf. Nos. 2, 10.

8. *isibhāsiyā devalogacuyabhāsiyā*, 44 *ajjh.*, *aṅga* 4, 44; the *isibhāsiyā* also in the *Nandī* in the list of *aṇaṃgapaviṭṭha* texts; see pp. 280, 259, 272, 402, 419, 432, 442, above pp. 13, 57, 58; on *ṛṣibhāṣita* see also p. 446^{n 3}.

9. *devalogacuyabhāsiyā*, see just above and also p. 280.

[88] 10. *pāvaphalavivāgāṇi*, 55 *ajjh.*, *Kalpas*, *Jinac.* § 147,¹⁰⁶³ see p. 474; cf. Nos. 2, 7.

¹⁰⁶¹ We possess several texts on *kammavivāga*; thus 167 *Prākṛt-gāthās* by Jīṇavallabha in Peterson's *Palm-leaf* 42f.; also 168 ditto by Garga *ibid.* Nos. 52, 81b,—and, without the name of the authors, Nos. 88h, 106, 161d. There is a *bālāvabodha* on it by Maticandra, see Kielhorn p. 93.

¹⁰⁶² The *āyāradasāu* mentioned there are identical with *chedasūtra* 4.

¹⁰⁶³ The *aputtavāgaraṇāṇi* in 36 *ajjh.* mentioned *ibid.* are doubtless identical with *mūlasūtra* 1, see p. 43.

11. *mahākappam*, *Āvaśy.* 8, 55, as first *cheasuttam*, see p. 446, 449; in the *Nandi* among the *aṇaṃgapaviṭṭha* texts, see p. 11 (*mahākappasuam*).
12. *kappiyākappiam*, N among the *aṇaṃgap.*, p. 11.
13. *cullakappasuam*, *ib.*, p. 11.
14. *mahāpannavanā*, *ib.*, pp. 11, 84; see p. 392.
15. *pamāyappamāyam*, *ib.*, p. 11.
16. *porisamaṇḍalam*, *ib.*, p. 12.
17. *maṇḍalappaveso*, *ib.*
18. *vijjacaraṇaviṇicchao*, *ib.*
19. *jhāṇavibhatti*, *ib.* and in the *Vidhiprapā* among the *painna*, see p. 428.
20. *marañavibhatti*, in N among the *aṇaṃgap.*, p. 12.
21. *āyavisohi*, *ib.*
22. *vīyarāyasuam*, *ib.*
23. *saṃlehaṇasuam*, *ib.*
24. *viḥārakappo*, *ib.*
25. *caraṇavihi*, *ib.*
26. *deviṇḍovavāe* in N among the *aṇaṃgap.*, p. 14.
27. *uṭṭhānasuam*, *ib.*; *uṭṭhānasuyāiyā caūro* in the *kārikās* quoted p. 224 as the subject of the study of the thirteenth year.
28. *samuṭṭhāṇasue*, p. 14.
29. *nāgapariyāvaliyāo*, *ib.*
30. *āsivisabhāvaṇāo* in the *Pākṣikasūtra* and the three *sāṃdārī* texts, *ib.*, in the *kārikās* cited p. 214 as designed for the fourteenth year.
- [89] 31. *diṭṭhivisabhāvaṇāo*, *ib.*, for the 15th year.
32. *cāraṇabhāvaṇāo*, (*cāraṇasamaṇabh°*), *ib.*, 16th year.
33. *mahāsuviṇa* (*sumiṇa*)*bhāvaṇāo*, *ib.*, 17th year.
34. *teaganisaggā*, *ib.*, 18th year. According to *Vidhiprapā* title of the 15th book in *aṅga* 5, see p. 301.
35. *marañavisohi*, in *Vidhiprapā* among the *aṇaṃgap.*, see p. 12.
36. *rāhaṇapaḍāga*, in the *painna* list in *Āvi.*, see p. 427.
37. *aṃgavijjā*, *ib.*
38. *joisakaramḍam*, *ib.*, and in the *painna* list of the *Ratnasagara*, see p. 431; cf p. 84.

39. *maraṇasamāhī*, in the *painna* list in *Āvi.*, and in *Rāj. L. M.*, see p. 427; p. 86.
40. *titthogālī*, in the *painna* list in *Āvi.*, see p. 427¹⁰⁶⁴.
41. *narayavibhatti*, *ib.*
42. *devavijjīyā*, in the *painna* list of the *Ratnasāgara*, see p. 431, cf. p. 84.

Corresponding to the number of the 46 *āgamas* which exist or are recognized as parts of the *Siddhānta*, we have 42 texts which are at present not extant. If we add *pañcakalpa*¹⁰⁶⁵ and the two special *vācanās* of the *mahānīṣṭha* and if we count singly the ten titles comprised in No. 6 (as is always the case in *aṅga* 3 and elsewhere)—then the number of the texts no longer extant [90] is eight greater than the number of those in existence. It must, however, be confessed that the ten pieces collected in No. 6 are very brief in compass, since they are each counted as one *ajjhayaṇam*; and the same may be the case as regards others of the texts now no longer extant. Nevertheless in the *Siddhānta* there are short texts and among the *aṅgas* there is one and that is not small (*aṅga* 4) which has but a single *ajjh.*

If we take into consideration the conclusions which we were obliged to adopt in regard to the loss of the *mahāparinnā* chapter in *aṅga* 1, in regard to the changes which *aṅgas* 5, 7-11, up. 8-12 are proved to have undergone, and in regard to the total loss of *aṅga* 12 etc. etc.—it is at once evident that great uncertainty reigns in this department of Indian literature, despite its seemingly firm articulation. The beginning of our knowledge is here contemporary with the beginning of our doubts. One fact is of cardinal importance:—Nos. 6, 27, 30—34 of the above list existed at the date of the *kārikās* cited on p. 224, and formed an integral part of the sacred study. The portion of the extant *Siddhānta* that is mentioned in p. 224 besides these is but trifling in comparison. The ultimate significance of this last assertion cannot, however, be seen at the present day. Cf. p. 225.

In conclusion, I desire to extend my most hearty thanks to Dr. E. Leumann for the generous assistance he has rendered in reading the proof of this treatise. This assistance comprises very numerous corrections made on the basis of MSS. and printed matter which were not accessible to me. I have also used to great advantage Kielhorn's Report and especially Peterson's Detailed Report.

¹⁰⁶⁴ The *siddhapāhuḍapainnam* *ib.* belongs to *aṅga* 12. see pp. 355, 356.

¹⁰⁶⁵ In Kielhorn's report p. 94 there is mention made of a *pañcakalpasūtracūrṇi* by Āmradevacārya. See p. 477.

